



Appeal Decision

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 Ref: APP/J2210/Z/25/3375505

32 - 33 High Street, Canterbury, Kent 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/25/01073.
 - The advertisement proposed is 'the Arora family logo – the group that owns the building'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirm that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. 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 this appeal.
3. 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 Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the advertisement on amenity.

Reasons

5. '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 PPG advises that the local characteristics of an area are relevant when assessing amenity, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. The Framework acknowledges that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.
6. 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 this appeal is derived

from its medieval street pattern, the prevalence of traditional materials and the presence of high quality, historic architecture from various periods. Advertisements within the CA are typically restrained and restricted to single fascia signs and projecting or hanging signs.

7. The appeal site is adjacent to a Grade II listed building, which is known as 'County Hotel' (1258464). County Hotel is a late medieval, timber-framed building, which was re-fronted in the early 20th century. It is three storeys high. The ground floor is finished in stone. The upper floors feature applied timber with plaster infill. The building has three projecting bay windows, which go through both the upper storeys and have gables above.
8. Based on my site visit and the evidence before me, I find that the listed building's special interest, insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from its historic and architectural interests as an illustration of a late medieval, timber-framed building. Important contributors in these regards are its surviving historic fabric, including its timber frame, the presence of traditional materials and its pleasing architectural style and design.
9. On the opposite side of the road is a Grade II listed building, which is known as 'Public Library and Museum at Beaney Institute' (Ref: 1085027). This listed building was built in 1897 by A. H. Campbell and is two storeys high, with a basement. It has a brick ground floor and a timber framed first floor, with intricate mosaic detailing. The building contains a number of decorative architectural features, including carved bargeboards, quatrefoil ornaments and terra cotta roundels of female figures representing Art and Science.
10. From the evidence available to me and my site visit, I consider that the special interest and significance of the 'Public Library and Museum at Beaney Institute' is primarily derived from its architectural and historic interests, as an illustration of municipal architecture from the late 19th century. Important contributors in these regards, which are pertinent to this appeal include the building's grand stature, its elaborate architectural detailing and use of traditional materials.
11. The appeal property is a modern, three storey commercial building, which has a dummy pitched roof. The building has four projecting bay windows, which extend through both the upper storeys. It has a painted brick finish, with tile hanging beneath the fenestration. The appeal property has a modern shopfront.
12. The proposal seeks to provide a new, non-illuminated advertisement at ground floor level on the front of the building. The proposed advertisement would be made of composite aluminium and would feature a gold design on a black background. It would not obscure any architectural features on the facade of the building and would have a limited projection.
13. The appellant has provided details of an approved scheme¹ for a non-illuminated fascia sign that is shown to extend across the front of the appeal property. While full details of the consented scheme are not before me, I observed on my site visit that the retail unit has now been subdivided, with space for two smaller fascia signs². Accordingly, it is unlikely that the consented advertisement would ever be implemented. Nevertheless, it was for a single advertisement only. I appreciate that

¹ Application ref: CA/24/02195

² Application ref: CA/25/00352

the proposed advertisement would be smaller than the consented scheme. However, the proposal would fill a gap between two fascia signs, which would cause visual clutter on the front of the building.

14. In this case, I do not find that the proposed colour scheme would appear incongruous on this modern building. However, the proposed use of composite aluminium would fail to be sympathetic with the historic environment in which the appeal site sits. The proposal would also result in additional visual clutter on the building. Overall, I find that the proposal would harm the amenity of the area and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA and the setting of nearby listed buildings.
15. While I observed other modern advertisements in the locality of various designs, materials and colours, these demonstrate the harm that such advertisements can cause to the historic environment. I do not find that they provide justification for the proposal.
16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the advertisement is harmful to amenity. Although not determinative, I have had regard to Policies DBE3, HE1, HE6, HE9 and HE10 of the Canterbury District Local Plan adopted July 2017. 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

17. I have had regard to the standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations and I find that they would not overcome the harm that I have identified to amenity.
18. 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.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR