



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 August 2025

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd of September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Q3820/W/25/3367661

10-11 Queens Square, Northgate, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Banning Dental Group against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2024/0583/FUL, dated 16 October 2024, was refused on 31 March 2025.
 - The development proposed is the reconfiguration of the shopfront to incorporate a new access door and air conditioning louvres.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Q3820/H/25/3367662

10-11 Queens Square, Northgate, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1DY

- 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 Banning Dental Group against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2024/0584/ADV, dated 16 October 2024, was refused on 31 March 2025.
 - The advertisement proposed is the display of 1 no. high-level fascia sign and 1 no. projecting sign.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed in relation to the 1 no. high-level fascia sign.
2. Appeal B is part allowed and express consent is granted for the display of 1 no. projecting sign at 10-11 Queens Square, Northgate, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1DY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2024/0584/ADV, dated 16 October 2024, subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Preliminary Matter

3. The shopfront alterations and advertisement displays have been installed.

Main Issues

4. For Appeal A the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on the character and appearance of the Queens Square and The Broadway Conservation Area (the CA). For Appeal B the main issue is the effect of the advertisement displays on the visual amenity of the area, including the effect on the character and appearance of the CA.

Reasons

5. The changes relate to No 10/11, a ground floor shop unit on the northern side of Queens Square, an important space within the central shopping and commercial

district built in the 1950s to serve the new town and now designated as a CA for its historic and architectural interest. The unit lies within a continuous three/four storey building frontage with shop units at ground level and other uses above, the shop units protected from the elements by a projecting canopy over the pavement. The buildings on the southern side of the square are similar¹. As the Council's CA Appraisal makes clear, despite some new additions, notably the Pavilion Building, these design features characterise the central area which remains an important example of modernist post-war architecture.

6. The shop unit frontages are characterised by low stall risers and extensive glazing, but also consistent depth fascias below the projecting canopy where the primary signage for the businesses is located. Whilst there is some variation along the frontages², the thin strip of louvres instead of a fascia below the projecting canopy in the case of the appeal building forms an unduly inconsistent feature out of character with the overall run of units which include the standard depth fascias of Starbucks Coffee & Poundland on one side and Tapi Carpets & Rush Hair on the other. The appellant argues that louvres are essential for many Class E uses but this is not explained. There is no objection to the relocation of the door.
7. In relation to the advertisement displays, there is no objection to the projecting 'Banning Dentist' sign which is similar in size and style to many in the square. This part of Appeal B can be allowed. However, the high-level fascia sign with 'Banning Dental Group' lettering and logos on a grey ground, 7.4 m wide and 0.655 m high, displayed on the front edge of the projecting canopy, obscures the white timber finish which characterises the canopy edge on both sides of Queens Square as far as The Broadway and along the north side of Queensway up to The Pavement. This is an integral design feature of the original 1950s modernist town centre which contributes to its architectural and historic interest and warrants preservation.
8. There are some other unfortunate examples of advertising on the projecting canopy edge including Rush Hair nearby, Merkur Slots, Greggs and Ultimate Craft further along and others on the southern side of the square. No evidence is provided as to whether these have express consent or whether discontinuance action is being taken. However, the presence of these does not justify the display of further signage that harms the character and appearance of the shopping precinct.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons the shopfront alterations cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the high-level fascia sign to its visual amenity in conflict with Policies CL2, DD1, HA1 and HA2 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2024. These ensure development respects and enhances existing character and distinctiveness and conserves and enhances the key features and significance of heritage assets. These changes also conflict with the legislative duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. Appeal A and part of Appeal B should therefore be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ From No 30 westwards.

² Such as the Peacocks premises opposite.