



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/Z/24/3353323

139 Greenwich High Road, Greenwich, London SE10 8JA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr Karl Adjei of AKA Build Limited against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref is 24/2011/A.
- The advertisement proposed is the installation of 1 x Internally illuminated fascia sign (resubmission).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and express consent is granted for the display of 1 x internally illuminated fascia sign at 139 Greenwich High Road, Greenwich, London SE10 8JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/2011/A. The consent is for five years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit a fascia sign that I am informed has previously been refused consent (Ref: 24/1000/A) had already been installed. For the avoidance of doubt, I can confirm that my determination of the appeal is based on the drawings submitted with application Ref 24/2011/A.
3. The description of the advertisement proposed in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes it. However, I have omitted the word 'resubmission' in my decision as it is superfluous.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

Reasons

5. The building on which the proposed advertisement is to be installed is relatively new and modern, containing commercial units on the ground floor with residential apartments above. The appeal relates to one of two ground floor units within this building, which is occupied by a private doctors and fronts Greenwich High Road.
6. The surrounding area has a mixed character comprising retail, commercial and residential properties of varying age, style and design. The site is also located adjacent to the Ashburnham Triangle Conservation Area (CA).

7. The proposal comprises an aluminium louvre framed internally illuminated grey fascia sign with stencil cut 'GPD' logo and 'Greenwich Private Doctors' LED text below. It would be positioned immediately above the glass entrance door and three vertical glazing panels, sitting within the contemporary stone pilasters and horizontal slab edges that frame the shopfront. Whilst it would be flush with this surround, most of this unit's recessed design would be retained through the set back of the glazing below. This would be similar to the existing relationship between the frosted glass balustrades and recessed openings above them on the upper levels of the building. These factors, in combination with its limited size and scale, would result in the proposed advertisement being proportionate to the shopfront. They would also ensure that the loss of a small amount of the setback would have little bearing on its overall visual effect.
8. In reaching my findings I have had regard to photographs submitted with the appeal which show a clear set back between the previous fascia sign at the premises and the front façade of the building. Whilst the Council state that this is replicated at the adjoining vacant unit, there is no signage at this property, and over half of its frontage is covered by timber cladding. Moreover, its frontage is set back further than No 139's glazed shopfront and so is not identical to it or of a symmetrical appearance.
9. I recognise that the Council are trying to ensure consistency across the building. However, in light of my reasoning above, I am not convinced that this minor variation to its frontage would unbalance the appearance of the building to such a degree as to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, or the setting of the CA or nearby listed buildings.
10. Furthermore, given the brightness of surrounding similar advertisements, outside of the CA, the Council has not raised any objections to the luminance of the proposed sign, and I have no reason to disagree. Even if both the logo and text are to be internally illuminated, I am satisfied that the small size of these would ensure that the proposed signage would not appear unsympathetic or uncharacteristic.
11. The Council has referred in its decision notice to Policies DH1 and DH(e) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and advice within the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2023. Whilst not decisive I have had regard to these policies and guidance as material considerations noting particularly the design criteria, including that for new advertisements, shopfronts and signs.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the proposed sign is acceptable in terms of its impact on visual amenity and as such the appeal is allowed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR