



---

## 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/25/3375479**

#### **23 St George's Street, Canterbury, Kent CT1 2JT**

- 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 Carnby Investments Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
  - The application reference is CA/25/01064.
  - The advertisement is described as 'the Arora family logo – the group that owns the building'.
- 

### **Appeal B: APP/J2210/Y/25/3375586**

#### **23 St George's Street, Canterbury, Kent CT1 2JT**

- 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 Carnby Investments Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
  - The application reference is CA/25/01077.
  - The works relate to the 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 a listed building, 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.
6. While both main parties refer to the advertisement as being ‘retrospective’, it was not in situ at the time of my site visit.

### **Main Issues**

7. The Council’s reason for refusal refers to harm to the setting of listed buildings. However, the Council has not specifically highlighted any listed buildings (excluding the appeal property) that would be affected by the proposal.
8. Accordingly, I find that the main issues are: the effect of the advertisement on amenity, including whether the proposal preserves a Grade II listed building, known as ‘23, St George’s Street’ (Ref: 1273515) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area.

### **Reasoning**

9. ‘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.
10. ‘23, St George’s Street’ is a Grade II listed building, which dates back to the 1950s. The building occupies a prominent corner plot. It comprises of two distinct sections. The rear part is higher in height and predominantly consists of red brickwork and fenestration. The front element features a distinctive zigzag roof formation, which has a copper covering. The building features columns, which are finished with mosaic cladding. According to the listing description, the building is a rare example of a small-architect designed shop from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.
11. 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 a small architect-designed shop from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. The building’s contemporary design, its striking roof formation and presence of high quality materials make important contributions in these regards.
12. The appeal site lies within the Canterbury City Centre Conservation Area (CA) and the World Heritage Buffer Zone. 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 the multitude of high quality historic buildings of various architectural designs and periods and the prevalence of traditional materials.
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.

14. The appeal site lies within the Primary Shopping Area. Given the building's back edge of pavement location, it is highly prominent from the public realm. There are a number of advertisements on the lower part of the building, which are large in size. The planning history shows that consent was recently granted for two non-illuminated fascia signs and one non-illuminated projecting sign<sup>1</sup>. Full details of the other advertisements are not before me and I therefore give them limited weight in my decision.
15. The proposed advertisement would be made of composite aluminium and would be rectangular in shape, measuring 1200mm x 600mm. It would feature the logo of the family that own the building and would be black and gold in colour. The proposal would be sited on the flank wall of the building, which with the exception of fenestration is largely uninterrupted.
16. The Council's Shopfront Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2020 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. I appreciate that the proposed advertisement is smaller than other advertisements found on the listed building, has limited projection and is also non-illuminated. I also do not find that the proposed colour scheme would appear out of keeping on this mid-20<sup>th</sup> century building. Nevertheless, the proposal utilises a modern material, which I find harmfully discords with the historic environment in which the appeal property is situated. I appreciate that this section of the building is free from advertisements and ample space would be retained around the advertisement. However, the proposal would result in new signage on the flank elevation of the building, which in combination with the existing signage on the building would result in significant visual clutter.
17. 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 advertisements in the locality provides justification for the harm that I have identified to amenity.
18. 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 proposal by reason of its materiality and siting would cause additional visual clutter which would harm the amenity of the area and fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA.

#### *Public benefits and heritage balance*

19. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Application ref: CA/24/00179

20. 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.
21. 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 advertisement is not related to the business that operates from the building but would help to promote and market the owner of the building. I do not find that the proposed advertisement would enhance the vitality of the existing business on site any further than the advertisements that are already present on the building. 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.
22. 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.
23. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the advertisement would be harmful to the amenity of the area and would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building 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**

24. 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**

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

*A James*

INSPECTOR