



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026

by N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/H/25/3375268

52 High Street, Halstead CO9 2JB

- 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 Kunal Thakker against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01721/ADV.
 - The advertisement proposed is the retention of 1no externally illuminated fascia sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (the Regulations) require that applications for the display of advertisements are considered in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, insofar as they are material, and any other relevant factors.
3. As the site lies within a conservation area, I have also had regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the LBCA). Whilst the duty under Section 66 of the Act does not apply to advertisement consents, the Regulations state that factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural, or similar interest.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity, having regard to its siting within the Halstead Town Centre Conservation Area (HTCCA) and in proximity to nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

5. The building on which the fascia sign has been installed is a largely two storey building, albeit with a large gable element at roof level. The appeal relates to a ground floor commercial unit occupied by 'Tooth Club' with the signage being made up of the same name. The building lies within the HTCCA and, while the appeal building itself is not listed, it is in proximity to a number of buildings which are. These include the Royal Oak Public House which is immediately next door to the site, 60-62 High Street, 65-67 High Street and 75 High Street. These are all Grade II listed.

6. The HTCCA, in this area, largely follows the High Street and features numerous examples of traditional timber framed buildings and the use of tiled roofs. There are further examples of more modern infill ranging from circa 1920/30s buildings with art deco and arts and crafts references to mid-to-late 20th century developments. Despite the variety of buildings, the form and structure of the more traditional elements of the High Street are discernible. The significance of the HTCCA derives from the architectural and historic interest of the area's buildings and their layout and pattern of development which contribute to the historic townscape.
7. The Royal Oak is a circa 17th century timber-framed and plastered building under tiled roof. 60-62 High Street is a part two storey, part three storey building with a tiled and slate roof with sash windows. 57 High Street is a two storey building with large sash windows to the upper floor and parapet roof to the front. Number 75 is a three storey building featuring pilasters and other decorative elements. The significance of these listed buildings is largely derived from their age, materials and architectural details. This is in addition to their group value as part of the HTCCA.
8. The building at the appeal site has complimentary proportions, albeit much of these are obscured by modern additions and alterations at ground floor and part of the first floor level. Despite these alterations, the retained elements of the building to the upper floor(s) and its scale and proportions mean it makes a small, but positive, contribution to the HTCCA.
9. The signage to shops along the High Street in the vicinity ranges in quality from examples of individual lettering which are well integrated with the structures of buildings to some overly large modern sign boards on modern shop fronts. There is nevertheless a fairly unifying feature in that there are typically very limited levels of illumination. Those examples that do exist are externally illuminated with light cast onto the signage as opposed to being internally illuminated or featuring illuminated elements.
10. Conversely, the sign here features letters which are illuminated by multiple individual and exposed bulbs. To either side of the lettering are backlit teeth. This draws attention to the glossy finish of the lettering in its' fairly striking rose gold colour which projects from the fascia board. In combination, the colour, features and, most significantly, illumination make the signage overly strident by comparison to surrounding signage and in the context of this historic setting.
11. I do appreciate that the signage is not dissimilar to other examples cited by the appellant. However, there are important differences in that this proposal incorporates sizes, colour, features and levels of illumination that are not present at any of the nominated examples, nor to any other premises that I was able to observe at my site visit.
12. I have noted the appellant's references to the National Planning Policy Framework and weighing any harm to the heritage asset(s) against the public benefit. However, considering advertisement consent appeals within a conservation area, the question of less than substantial or substantial harm does not arise, as the policy only applies to the heritage-related consent regimes under the LBCA. Even if I were to factor this into account, I am not persuaded that the proposal does enhance the commercial viability of the High Street, improve legibility or contribute

to an attractive environment. Indeed, my conclusions are that the proposal would have an adverse impact on these factors when considered from a public standpoint.

13. The signage at the appeal site appears stark and garish when compared to others locally. The advert, within the setting of the listed buildings and HTCCA, negatively detracts from their special interest and therefore this would not be preserved. The proposal would be harmful to the amenity of the area and thus conflicts with policies SP7, LPP47, LPP52, LPP53, LPP55, LPP56 and LPP57 of the Braintree District Local Plan and the Regulations.

Conclusion

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

N Bowden

INSPECTOR