



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 January 2026

by **A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th February 2026

Appeal A: APP/J2210/H/25/3375502

36-37 High Street, Canterbury CT1 2RY

- 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 Harsh Panchal of White Horse Realty Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application reference is CA/25/01069.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'the Arora family logo – the group that own the building'.
-

Appeal B: APP/J2210/Y/25/3375590

36-37 High Street, Canterbury CT1 2RY

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Harsh Panchal of White Horse Realty against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application reference is CA/25/01074.
 - The works are described as 'proposed erection of sign on façade of building.'
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As Appeal A relates to a refusal to grant express consent for an advertisement, I have had regard to Section 3(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations). This limits my considerations to those relating to amenity and public safety. Section 3(2) of the Regulations and the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirm that factors relevant to amenity include the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. Regard does not need to be had to the development plan. I have taken relevant policies into account as a material consideration. However, they have not, by themselves, been determinative for Appeal A.
4. As the appeal site lies within a conservation area and relates to two listed buildings, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

5. The Council raises no concerns in relation to public safety or residential amenity. Based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I see no reason to take a contrary view to the Council on these matters.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the advertisements on amenity, including whether the proposal preserves Grade II listed buildings, known as '36, High Street' (Ref: 1260869) and '37, High Street' (1240754) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess, and whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

7. 'Amenity' as defined in the PPG, is usually understood to mean the effect on visual and aural amenity in the immediate neighbourhood of an advertisement. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) acknowledges that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
8. '36, High Street' is a timber-framed, Grade II listed building, which dates back to the 16th century. It is two storeys high and has a plastered finish. The listed building features an oriel window on the first floor and a traditional three light mullion window on the floor above, which is sited within the gable end. A modern shopfront is present on the ground floor. This listed building forms part of a group of historic buildings, which are sited along the High Street.
9. Based on my site visit and the evidence before me, I find that the listed building's special interest, insofar as is relevant to these appeals is derived from its historic and architectural interests as an illustration of 16th century architecture. Important contributors in these regards are the building's age, its surviving historic fabric, use of traditional materials, its pleasing architectural style and the positive contribution that it makes to the group of historic buildings.
10. '37, High Street' is a timber-framed, Grade II listed building, which dates back to the 17th century and was restored in the early 19th century. It is two storeys high, features a front gable and has a plastered finish. The listed building has a curved bay window at first floor level and a small window within its gable. The building has a modern shop front, which is constructed of timber and is traditional in its design.
11. From the evidence available to me and my site visit, I consider that the special interest and significance of '37, High Street' is largely derived from its architectural and historic interests, as an illustration of architecture from the 17th century. Important contributors in these regards, which are pertinent to these appeals include the presence of traditional materials, its surviving historic fabric, its architectural composition and the positive contribution that it makes to the group of historic buildings on the High Street.
12. The appeal site lies within the Canterbury City Centre Conservation Area (CA). The CA is centred around the cathedral and contains a multitude of high quality historic buildings. The significance of the CA insofar as it relates to these appeals is derived from its medieval street pattern, the prevalence of traditional materials and the presence of high quality, historic architecture from various periods.

13. Policy HE9 of the Canterbury District Local Plan adopted July 2017 (the Local Plan) seeks to ensure advertisements within CAs and on, or affecting, listed buildings, are kept to a minimum in order to maintain the character and appearance of CAs and to avoid harm to the fabric, character or setting of listed buildings. Policy HE9 advises that when a building is listed, the Council will grant advertisement consent or listed building consent for painted timber fascia advertisements and traditional hanging signs. The retail units on the appeal properties have painted fascia signs. One has a blue and white colour scheme and the other, white and pink.
14. The proposal seeks to provide two new, circular shaped advertisements, which would be located at first floor level on the front of each building. The advertisements would feature the logo of the family that owns the buildings and would be black and gold in colour and made of composite aluminium. Given the buildings' back edge of pavement location and its siting within the Primary Shopping Area, the proposed advertisements by reason of their siting, colour scheme and materiality would be highly prominent from the public realm.
15. The appellant argues that the Council's Shopfront Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2020 encourages the application of gold or gold-coloured material for advertisements and does not preclude advertisements at first floor level. In respect to signs for upper floor businesses, the SPD recommends the provision of a brass or bronze plate at the side of the entrance door or gilt lettering, which can be applied directly to windows or fanlights. Neither are proposed in this appeal.
16. The SPD advises that corporate colour schemes will generally be acceptable. However, the SPD clearly states that any colour scheme should not conflict with the building or its setting. The SPD also advises that the use of aluminium is unsuitable for historic buildings as it is difficult to sensitively integrate into the appearance of the building and the street.
17. I appreciate that the proposed advertisements are smaller than other advertisements found on the listed buildings and in the locality. They would also have a limited projection, be non-illuminated and would not obscure any architectural detailing on the buildings. Nonetheless, I find that the proposed advertisements by reason of their modern materiality and colour scheme would harmfully discord with the traditional materials found on the listed buildings and typically found within the CA, and the light-coloured plaster to which they would be fixed. While space would be retained around the buildings, the proposal would result in additional visual clutter.
18. The appellant argues that the proposed advertisements would be less intrusive than the existing advertisements on the building¹. Although the consented scheme utilises a bright colour, the advertisement is hand painted onto the fascia and does not utilise a modern material. It is therefore materially different to the appeal scheme before me.
19. I observed other modern advertisements in the locality of various designs, materials and colours. Full details of the circumstances of the other advertisements are not before me and I therefore give them limited weight in my decision. Nevertheless, the modern advertisements demonstrate the harm that such advertisements can cause to the historic environment. I do not find that the presence of modern

¹ Application ref: CA/23/01633

advertisements in the locality provides justification for the harm that I have identified to amenity.

20. The appellant considers that the Council's SPD has been misapplied, as reference to a 'proliferation of signs' falls within a section relating to projecting and hanging signs, which are not proposed in this appeal. Nevertheless, in this case, I find that the proposed advertisements by reason of their materiality, colour scheme and siting would harm the amenity of the area and fail to preserve the special interest of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the CA.

Public benefits and heritage balance

21. The Regulations require that I exercise my powers with regards to amenity and public safety only. The benefits therefore cannot be taken into consideration in my decision for Appeal A, but are relevant for Appeal B.
22. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 advises that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should require clear and convincing justification. Given the nature and extent of the proposal, I find the harm to be less than substantial at the lower end of the scale. However, this should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection and is of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the appeal scheme, including where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
23. The appellant has drawn my attention to Paragraph 85 of the Framework, which among other things states that 'significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity'. In this case, the advertisements are not related to the businesses that operate from the buildings but would help to promote and market the owner of the buildings. I do not find that the proposed advertisements would enhance the vitality of the existing businesses on site any further than the advertisements that are already present on the buildings. While the proposal would provide additional visibility of the family business, there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm that I have identified nor any compelling evidence why this is the only option in order to achieve the appellant's objectives. I therefore give this argument limited weight in my decision.
24. Overall, there would be limited public benefits from the appeal scheme. Consequently, in attributing considerable importance and weight to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, I find that there would be insufficient public benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh this harm.
25. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of the area and would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed buildings and the significance of the CA. As a result, Appeal B fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies of the Framework. Although not determinative for Appeal A, I have had regard to Policies DBE3, HE1, HE4, HE5, HE6, HE8, HE9 and HE10 of the Local Plan. These policies among other things require that within CAs and on, or affecting listed buildings, advertisements will be kept to a minimum and that proposals protect, conserve and

enhance the historic environment and the contribution it makes to local distinctiveness and sense of place.

Other Matters

26. I have had regard to the standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations but do not find that they would overcome the harm that I have identified to amenity.

Conclusion

27. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, both Appeals A and B are dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR