



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/25/3375500

8 - 9 Parade, Canterbury, Kent CT1 2SG

- 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 Zest Realty Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application reference is CA/25/01068.
 - The advertisement is described as 'the Arora family logo – the group that own the building'.
-

Appeal B: APP/J2210/Y/25/3375589

Unit 2, 8 - 9 Parade, Canterbury, Kent CT1 2SG

- 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 Zest Realty Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application reference is CA/25/01075.
 - The works are described as '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 two listed buildings, 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 (with the exception of the appeal properties) that would be affected by the proposal. Accordingly, I find that the main issues are:
 - the effect of the advertisement on amenity, including whether the proposal preserves Grade II listed buildings, known as '8, The Parade' (Ref: 1260483) and '9, The Parade' (Ref: 1241509) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess; and,
 - whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

8. '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.
9. '8, The Parade' and '9, The Parade' (Nos 8 and 9) are Grade II listed buildings, which date back to around the 16th or 17th century. They are timber framed and have a plastered finish and a tiled roof. Nos 8 and 9 are three storeys high, with accommodation in the roof. Both listed buildings have modern shopfronts, which are of a traditional design and utilise traditional materials. Both Nos 8 and 9 have jettied first and second floors, which feature traditional timber sash windows.
10. Based on my site visit and the evidence before me, I find that the listed buildings' special interest, insofar as is relevant to these appeals is derived from their historic and architectural interests as illustrations of architecture from around the 16th or 17th century. The buildings' surviving historic fabric, use of traditional materials and their pleasing architectural style and design make important contributions in these regards.
11. 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 these appeals is derived from its medieval street pattern, the prevalence of traditional materials and the presence of high quality, historic architecture from various periods.
12. 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.

13. The appeal site lies within the Primary Shopping Area. Given the buildings' back edge of pavement location, they are highly prominent from the public realm. The existing advertisements on the listed buildings are minimalistic in nature and consist primarily of dark coloured lettering on the fascias, with a hanging sign on each building.
14. The proposed advertisement would be fixed to a wooden panel, which forms part of the modern shopfront. Accordingly, it would not impact any historic fabric or obscure any features on the façade. The proposed advertisement would be made of composite aluminium and would be circular in shape. It would feature the logo of the family that own the building and would be black and gold in colour.
15. 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. Nevertheless, I observed that black and gold are both colours that are found within this part of the CA. Given the advertisement would be set against a black back drop, I do not find that the proposed colour scheme would appear out of character in this location.
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 would be smaller than other advertisements found on the listed buildings, has limited projection and is also non-illuminated, which helps to minimise its visual appearance. Nevertheless, the proposal utilises a modern material, which would harmfully discord with the traditional materials found on the listed buildings and would fail to integrate well within the historic environment in which the appeal site is located. The proposal would also be sited close to existing advertisements and would create visual clutter.
17. 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, 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 special interest of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the CA.
18. While I observed a variety of advertisements in the locality, full details of the other advertisements are not before me and I therefore 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.
19. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the amenity of the area. The proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed buildings, known as '8, The Parade' and '9, The Parade' and the character and appearance of the CA.

Public benefits and heritage balance

20. 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.
21. 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.
22. 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 advertisements are not related to the businesses that operate from the buildings but would help to promote and market the owner of the buildings. I do not find that the proposed advertisements would enhance the vitality of the existing businesses on site any further than the advertisements that are already present on the buildings. 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.
23. 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.
24. 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 buildings 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

25. 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

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

A James

INSPECTOR