



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2025

**by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 1<sup>st</sup> August 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/Z/25/3359775**

**86 - 87 Preston Street, Brighton BN1 2HG**

- 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 S Salama (Fish & Chips) against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application Ref is BH2024/00848.
  - The advertisement proposed is described as 'Change existing signage to meet approval of Council - Existing large internally illuminated wall sign to be retained & converted to non illuminated by removal of all lighting components  
Existing individual halo letters to be disconnected and all lighting components removed.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the advertisement preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Regency Square Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a part one/part two storey building located on Preston Street, a road which predominantly comprises restaurants, pubs and hot food take aways. While building heights vary along Preston Street, those in the vicinity of the appeal site are generally one and two storeys. They are noticeably subservient to the buildings in Regency Square, onto which they back, suggesting that they may have once been ancillary buildings to the houses in Regency Square.
4. The Regency Square Conservation Area (RSCA) extends over a large part of the central part of the City. Its architecture and irregular grid pattern signify the westward expansion of Brighton from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Buildings are predominantly from the 'Regency' period, often set around formal squares or terraces, although buildings from differing eras and of differing designs are evident. This contributes to an interesting urban context in which there is variety but one in which the regency buildings and environment are the dominant characteristic.
5. Therefore, in so far as it relates to this appeal, the RSCA derives much of its significance from the distinctive and consistent architecture and the relationships between, and spaces around, the buildings themselves.

6. Given the nature of Preston Street, there are a range of signs and shopfronts. This variety contributes to the colourful character of the road. Nevertheless, the regency ambience and architecture remain evident and no one shopfront or sign is overly dominant.
7. However, even in the varied context of Preston Street, the large sign on the two-storey part of the appeal building is, given its size and finish, particularly prominent and brash. The fascia sign, which uses similar materials and is also excessively scaled and out of proportion to the shopfront below, visually dominates the single storey part of the building.
8. Consequently, either individually or in combination, the signs are highly conspicuous and visually intrusive features in the streetscene. As such, they harm the building's contribution to the variety and interest that characterises Preston Street, adversely affecting the significance of the Conservation Area.
9. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed advertisements would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the RSCA and would have an unacceptable effect on visual amenity. I have taken into account Policies DM24 and DM26 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part 2 and Policies CP12 and CP15 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part One, which are cited by the Council in its reason for refusal. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure advertisements do not harm the visual amenity of a site or wider area and that the character and appearance of a conservation area is preserved or enhance. Given my conclusions above, it follows that the proposal conflicts with these policies.

#### **Other Matters**

10. I have been referred to other signs in Preston Street. I observed these during my site visit. However, for the reasons indicated above, they do not provide a context into which the proposed signs could be placed without causing harm.
11. The signage may offer benefits to the business but there is no evidence to indicate that less harmful signs would not provide the same benefits. Consequently, this is insufficient justification to allow the appeal.

#### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Stewart Glassar*

INSPECTOR