
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA FRGS MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/Z/25/3359606

16 Nelson Road, London, SE10 9JB

- 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 Mrs Natalie Edwards (Technical Sign Company) against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/3101/A.
 - The advertisement proposed is Installation of externally illuminated fascia text, retention of existing externally illuminated projection sign (in altered position), retention of existing non illuminated awning, retention of internally illuminated menu (in altered position).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Another appeal for the same site, but for listed building consent, has been submitted under reference APP/E5330/Y/25/3364816. This is the subject of a separate decision letter. The appeal in this decision relates to the refusal of advertisement consent.

Background and Main Issues

3. Regulation 3(1) of *The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007* (as amended), Paragraph 141 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), and the national Planning Practice Guidance¹ (the Guidance), set out clearly that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.
4. The Guidance goes onto set out that: *'Unless the nature of the advertisement is, in itself, harmful to amenity or public safety, consent cannot be refused because the local planning authority considers the advertisement to be misleading (in so far as it makes misleading claims for products), unnecessary, or offensive to public morals.'*²
5. The s72(1) duty of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, as amended (PLBCAA), sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of *'preserving or enhancing the character or appearance'* of a

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 18b-026-20140306 Revision date: 06 03 2014 [Advertisements - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/advertisements)

² Ibid.

conservation area. As such, this is an important consideration for advertisements located within conservation areas.

6. The main issues in this case are the effect of the advertisement with specific regard to amenity and public safety.

Reasons

7. Advertisement consent is sought for the installation of externally illuminated fascia text, retention of existing externally illuminated projection sign (in altered position), retention of existing non illuminated awning, retention of internally illuminated menu (in altered position).
8. The appeal building is a Grade II listed building that is located in the West Greenwich Conservation Area and the Greenwich World Heritage Site. At ground floor level, most of the units along the terrace are presented as retail or shop fronts. It is unclear whether or not the shop frontages are original as many have large, glazed areas in timber surrounds which suggest that they are Victorian or later additions or alterations, with timber stallrisers and recessed or set back thresholds.
9. One feature where there is some variation is fascia signage. This is typically restrained to the fascia board itself, with many examples of individual spotlights used for illumination, where found locally. There are also some limited examples of trough lighting used to illuminate fascia. Many of the fascia are hand or machine painted signs. These play an important part in linking the modern retail operations on the ground floor to the traditional painted signage that would have likely been used for fascia for much of the life of these shops. In doing so, the use of hand painted signage in this location respects the historical and architectural character of the area. They also make an important contribution to the amenity of the area and how it is experienced by local residents, employees and visitors alike.
10. It is from architectural and historical features such as these, that the significance of both the listed building and this part of the conservation area derives.
11. The appeal scheme seeks advertisement consent to use individual flat cut 8mm brushed stainless steel finished letters with a brass lacquer set on a repainted fascia board for one of the advertisements. From the submitted drawing 596993-3 dated 25 September 2024 labelled as 'Proposed Signage', the section through the text showing section A-A is annotated with 22mm being the distance between the front part of the proposed lettering and the fascia board. Therefore, on the basis of the Appellant's plans, it would have a significant protrusion from the fascia board compared to a fully painted sign.
12. The Council's adopted *Shop signs, Advertisements and Illumination in Greenwich Town Centre Design Guidance Note (2003)* indicates that '*hand painted timber fascia are most commonly associated with historic shopfronts in Greenwich Town Centre*'. The guidance goes on to indicate that '*where existing fascias (sic) are out of scale or character with the shopfront or the building, the opportunity should be taken to install a replacement of a more traditional design and size*'.
13. This clearly indicates that, wherever possible, the hand painted timber fascia board is preferred by the Council in this location. This continues to be case

even now – 22 years - after this guidance was first issued. This is logical given the heightened heritage status found within this part of the Royal Borough; with the appeal site benefitting from Listed Building and World Heritage Site statuses and being located within a Conservation Area.

14. The proposed advertisement would result in the loss of the painted signage within the fascia board, which is a typical feature of shop frontages within this area. As such, the proposed projecting individual lettering signage would result in a negative impact on the Conservation Area by failing to preserve or enhance its character or appearance; as specifically sought by s72(1) PLBCAA.
15. With regard to the projecting hanging sign, this is shown on the proposed drawing to be sited approximately 2540mm from the ground, whereas the existing hanging sign is roughly 2765mm from the ground. Whilst the lowering of the projecting sign would bring it into line with some examples found in the locality, it would be at odds with the Council's shop signs guidance which indicates that hanging signs '*must be positioned to take account of the design of the building...and hanging signs should be displayed in line with the fascia*'.
16. The proposal here would fail to adhere to this guidance. Instead it seeks to attach to a listed building a hanging sign that would be noticeable lower than existing and be at odds with the typical location of this architectural feature in this location. As such, the proposed location and siting of the hanging sign as an advertisement, would result in a negative impact on the Conservation Area by failing to preserve or enhance its character or appearance; as specifically sought by s72(1) PLBCAA.
17. Whilst I note the points made by the Appellants in terms of other non-hand painted timber signs within the area and that some hanging signs are in the lower position sought here, this does not provide justification for the harm that I have identified in this case.
18. Accordingly, the proposal would have an adverse affect on amenity, principally through harm to the West Greenwich Conservation Area. As such, I find that the appeal should be dismissed.
19. I have taken into account policies D3, HC1 and HC2 of the London Plan 2021, and policies DH1, DH3, DH4, DH(e), DH(f), DH(i) and TC4 of the *Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014*, which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the proposal would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.
20. For clarity, similar to the Council, I do not find that the proposed advertisements would result in specific harm to public safety. For example, I do not find that the advertisements would necessarily distract road users. Nonetheless, the absence of harm in respect of this aspect of considerations does not alter my findings in respect of amenity matters.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Parker INSPECTOR