



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/Z/24/3357677

80 High Street, Iver, Buckinghamshire SL0 9PJ

- 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 Shabaz Khaliq against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - East Area (Chiltern).
 - The application Ref is PL/24/2948/AV.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as “proposed signage replacing old shop signage for a community shop and proposal for new signage for new barbershop and proposal for a new billboard with 2 no trough downlight.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The appeal form uses the description on the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the description on the application form, which I have used above, accurately describes the scheme to which the appeal relates. I have also corrected what appears, having seen the submitted plans, a minor typographical error in the description of development in regard specifically to the billboard element of the proposed works.
4. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 sets out the relevant considerations for this type of appeal. These are amenity and public safety. The Council do not have concerns in regard to public safety, nor do they object to the non-illuminated shop fascia signs. I have no reason to disagree on these matters. My recommendation therefore focusses on the effect of the advertisement on visual amenity insofar as it relates to the remainder of the proposals, namely the one illuminated billboard style sign.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is in a prominent position on the corner of High Street and Bangors Road South. It has clearly been used as a retail unit in the past. The wider area is defined by dwellings along with community facilities such as a church, doctors’

surgery and a nursery. Together, and as a built environment, they form a pleasantly consistent feel of small to medium scale.

6. The illuminated billboard sign would be large and obtrusive against the currently blank facade. A sign of this scale is more akin to a busy retail park setting rather than the mixed-use village feel of the appeal site's surroundings. Any example of community type boards is generally of a much smaller scale and at pedestrian height, to which this proposal would appear incongruous and obtrusive. Moreover, the introduction of the sign would result in a cluttering effect which would detract from the pleasant mixed-use smaller scale street scene.
7. With this and the above in mind, and appreciating that elements of the proposal are considered acceptable (which is a neutral matter), the signage taken as a whole is unacceptable in amenity terms, contrary to the 2007 Regulations. The Council has drawn my attention to Policy EP7 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999 which is concerned with similar matters to the regulations in regard to amenity and public safety. I have had regard to it but as a consideration relevant to the main issue. The development plan has not been determinative.

Other Matters

8. I have seen limited information pertaining to the other local examples cited by the appellant. Putting aside the scope of the aforementioned regulations, I am therefore unable to consider them sufficiently similar to the appeal scheme. In the same vein, the proposal would potentially provide community benefits by way of advertising local businesses, but this does not lead me to find other than I have above.
9. The Council express substantive concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the setting of three grade II listed buildings. Namely, Iver House, Iver Croft and No 90 High Street. The setting of listed buildings is in this case a relevant material consideration in terms of the appearance of the advertisements and consideration of amenity, but the statutory duty related thereto is not engaged. Whilst the visual amenity harm I have found would relate to the area, it would not translate to the setting of these listed buildings. The immediate area is built up, they are read separately to the appeal site and there is substantial intervening tree cover.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Be these other matters as they may, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed owing to its failure to be acceptable under the abovementioned regulations.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR