
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/25/3375496

15 - 16 The Parade, Canterbury CT1 2SH

- 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 Sloane Realty Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application reference is CA/25/01067.
 - 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.
4. While both main parties refer to the advertisements as being retrospective, they were not present at the time of my site visit.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements on amenity.

Reasons

6. ‘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.

7. 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 high quality, historic architecture from various periods.
8. The appeal site is located in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. '12, The Parade' (Ref: 1260402) is a Grade II listed building of medieval origins. It was refaced in the 18th century and is finished in painted brick. The building is three storeys high and has a Victorian shopfront, which features four fluted columns and scrolled stall risers. The building also features traditional fenestration.
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 medieval architecture that has evolved over the centuries. The building's ornate Victorian shopfront, with its simplistic painted advertisement, its traditional materials and fenestration and charming architectural design make positive contributions in these regards.
10. '13, The Parade' (Ref: 1260381) is another Grade II listed building, which is sited a short distance away from the appeal site. It is also of medieval origins and was refaced in the 18th century. It is three storeys high and has a stuccoed finish. It features traditional fenestration and has a timber shopfront, with stallrisers. It has a painted fascia sign and a small projecting sign. Nos. 12 and 13, The Parade form part of a group of historic buildings.
11. Pertinent to this appeal, I find that the listed building's special interest is principally derived from its architectural and historic interests as an illustration of a medieval building, which was refaced in the 18th century. The building's surviving historic fabric, presence of traditional materials and pleasing architectural design make important contributions in these regards.
12. The appeal property is a three storey, brick built building, which features modern shopfronts. No. 16 has a modern, three storey projection, which is painted green and matches its shopfront. It has applied lettering to its fascias, gold lettering on its awnings, a small projecting sign at first floor level and some menu boxes, which are fixed to the building. The appellant has provided details of the consented scheme¹, which, also shows lettering on the windows and outdoor planters. No. 15 has a black shopfront, with colourful lettering applied to its fascia.
13. The proposal seeks to provide a circular advertisement above the existing fascia sign at No. 15. A rectangular shaped advertisement is proposed on the façade of No. 16, which would be sited between the first and second floor levels. Both advertisements would be made of composite aluminium and would feature a gold design on a black background. The proposed advertisements would not obscure any architectural features on the building and would have limited projection. The proposed advertisements would be non-illuminated, which helps to reduce their visual impact during the hours of darkness. In this case, I do not find that the proposed colour scheme would appear incongruous on this building, where black and gold are already present.

¹ Application ref: CA/24/00850

14. I observed that advertisements within the wider CA are typically restrained and on the whole are restricted to fascia signs and projecting or hanging signs. No. 16 already has a large number of advertisements when compared to other premises in the CA. However, I do not find that this provides justification for further advertisements on the building.
15. Although, uninterrupted space would be retained on the building's facades, I find that the proposal would result in additional visual clutter on the building, particularly on No. 16 which already has a proliferation of advertisements. The proposed advertisement on No. 16 would harmfully interrupt a relatively unbroken area of brickwork. The advertisement on No. 15 would be sited directly above the existing fascia sign. Both advertisements would result in additional visual clutter.
16. The proposal would also utilise a modern material, which would fail to reflect the historic character and amenity of the area. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the amenity of the area and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Given the siting of the proposed advertisements and the intervening built form, I do not find that the proposed advertisements would harm the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
17. While I observed a variety of modern advertisements in the locality of various colours, designs, sizes and materials, these demonstrate the harm that can be caused by such advertisements to the historic environment. Full details of the other advertisements are not before me and I give them limited weight in my decision. Nonetheless, I do not find that the presence of modern advertisements in the locality provides justification for the proposal.
18. The appellant considers that the Council's Shopfront Design Supplementary Planning Document 2020 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, I have found that the proposal would result in additional visual clutter and would harm the amenity of the area.
19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the advertisements are 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 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

20. I have had regard to the standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations. Nevertheless, these conditions would not overcome the harm that I have identified to amenity.
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.

Conclusion

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

A James

INSPECTOR