



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by **A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/Z/25/3374579

190 Muswell Hill Broadway London N10 3SA

- 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 Creature Comfort Vets Ltd against the decision of The London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/2011.
 - The advertisement proposed is Halo illuminated fascia signs and non-illuminated projecting signs to ground floor shopfronts.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and express consent granted for the Installation of halo illuminated fascia signs and non-illuminated projecting signs to ground floor shopfront in accordance with application Ref HGY/2025/2011. 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 Matter

2. The appeal site falls within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area (MHCA) and, having regard to the duty set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have defined the main issue accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the signage on the character and appearance of the MHCA.

Reasons

4. The signage which is the subject of this appeal has been installed and comprises two fascia signs and two associated projecting signs set within the two established shopfronts¹ located each side of the central entrance which provides access to the upper floors of the same building². Fitting between the existing console brackets and with black marble pilasters and other shopfront features retained, the fascia panels occupy a narrow horizontal slot with modestly-sized³ halo-lit lettering centrally placed. The projecting signs are located at the right-hand end of each fascia and project approximately 60cm.

¹ 'west' and 'east' shopfronts

² identified as 192-202 Muswell Hill Bdy.

³ Submitted plans indicate a height of 19cm.

5. This part of the MHCA is characterised by the substantial and finely-detailed late Victorian or Edwardian buildings of three or four storeys which define the intensively used public realm of Muswell Hill Broadway. Residential uses predominate on upper floors and commercial premises, principally retail⁴ units, at ground floor level, are fronted by wide pavements. There is a broad consistency in the street scene which derives from a rhythmic framework of ground floor retail units set between traditionally framed shopfronts, successfully accommodating shopfronts of various designs and colours.
6. The Council object to the colour scheme and state that the application of a metal fascia to the west unit would obscure important classical features. However, the area covered by the fascia was previously an entablature which has been subject to different signage regimes over time leaving neither a smooth nor consistent surface upon which to apply individual lettering. Plainly the metal background panel is necessary to conceal wiring and such an approach seems to me to be entirely consistent with the treatment of other premises nearby as is the use of illuminated lettering or small projecting signs, several of these employing a strong or strident colour as a background. Examples include an estate agency adjacent to the appeal site, together with the Nationwide and Vodafone premises opposite.
7. Whilst the difference between the detail of the two shopfronts (the eastern unit being constructed for bank use) may in narrow heritage terms seem to justify differing signage treatment in the way suggested by the Council, this would be to introduce an inconsistency with negligible heritage benefit. To have differing signage for the same premises would be visually confusing. Overall the signage is of a high standard, and is appropriately sensitive to the setting.
8. I therefore conclude the signage does not unacceptably detriment the visual amenity of the street scene, and consequently there would be no conflict with Policies DM3 or DM8 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) (DMDPD) which supports the grant of permission for shopfront signage providing it would not cause clutter, a loss of amenity or adversely affect the character and appearance of a conservation area. The signage has preserved the character and appearance of the MHCA such that, for the reasons set out and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal should succeed subject to the five standard conditions.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

⁴ With other Class E uses