



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/25/3375488

24 St Margaret's Street, Canterbury, Kent CT1 2TH

- 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 St Margaret Realty Ltd against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application reference is CA/25/01065.
 - The advertisement proposed is described as 'the Arora family logo – the group that own 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 high quality, historic architecture from various periods and the prevalence of traditional materials. Advertisements within the CA and particularly on nearby listed buildings are generally traditional in design and are typically restricted to fascia signs or hanging/projecting signs.

7. St Margaret's Street itself contains a vast array of historic buildings from various periods, which provides great visual interest and denotes the historic evolution of the city over the centuries. The appeal property is a grand building, with a double height retail frontage, with large pillars. The first floor is finished in red brick and features traditional sash windows, with horns. The building by reason of its architectural design, use of traditional materials and grand stature makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
8. Adjoining the appeal property is '25A St Margaret's Street, 26, St Margaret's Street, 25, St Margaret's Street' (Ref: 1242079), which is a timber-framed, Grade II listed building. This listed building dates back to the 18th century and was originally built as a Pilgrim's hostel. It is three storeys high, with an attic and has jettied first and second floors. The first floor features three cantered bays and has a plastered finish. Traditional sash windows are present on the first and second floors. While the building has a later shopfront, advertisements on the building are minimalistic in nature.
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 this appeal is derived from its historic and architectural interests as an illustration of an 18th century former Pilgrim's hostel. Important contributors in these regards are its surviving historic fabric, including its timber frame and jettied frontage, the presence of traditional materials and its pleasing architectural style and design.
10. Opposite the appeal site is '27-29, St Margaret's Street' (Ref: 1241920), which is a Grade II listed building that dates back to the late 18th century. This listed building is three storeys high. The majority of this small terrace is finished in stucco; however, the central unit is painted brick. The terrace features decorative quoins. No. 27 has a modern shopfront, whereas Nos 28 and 29 have late 19th century shopfronts with panel risers. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal, I find that the listed building's special interest is derived from its historic and architectural interests as an illustration of a terrace from the late 18th century. The building's architectural design and detailing and presence of traditional shopfronts and traditional materials make important contributions in these regards.
11. The proposal seeks to provide a new advertisement, which would be fixed at ground floor level to the side elevation of the building. The proposed advertisement would be rectangular in shape and made from composite aluminium. It would be black, with a gold design, which represents the logo of the family that own the building.
12. 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. However, the SPD relates specifically to bronze plates or gilt lettering (to be applied directly to windows or fanlights), which is not the case in this appeal. While the SPD advises that corporate colour schemes will generally be acceptable, the SPD is clear that any colour scheme should not conflict with the building or the setting.

13. The proposal would be non-illuminated and would be sited on the side of the building, which helps to minimise its impact on the street scene. However, views of the advertisement would be clearly visible from the street as one approaches the building. In such views, the proposal by reason of its modern materiality and its colour scheme would harmfully discord with the traditional palette of materials found on the host building and the historic environment in which the appeal property is sited.
14. 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. I appreciate that the proposal would not obscure any architectural features and uninterrupted space would be retained around the advertisement. However, the appeal property already features a large fascia advertisement and projecting sign. I find that the proposal would result in additional visual clutter and would conflict with the character of the area, where advertisements are generally of a restrained nature. The proposal would also harmfully discord with the historic environment in which the appeal property is sited and would fail to preserve the setting of the nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance of the CA.
15. The appellant has drawn my attention to a neighbouring building, which has a greater number of advertisements than the appeal property. Full details of the circumstances of the other advertisements are not before me and I therefore give them limited weight in my decision. Nevertheless, 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. I do not find that the standard conditions would 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