



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2026

by J Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/Z/25/3375465

41 St George's Street, Canterbury, Kent CT1 2LE

- 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 Canterbury Estates Limited against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref is CA/25/01063.
 - 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 description in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development as set out in the decision notice has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the description given on the original application form. I do not consider that this has prejudiced any of the parties and I have proceeded with the appeal on this basis.
3. The application form stated that the advertisements were already in place. Nevertheless, the signs were not in place at the time of my visit. In any event, I have considered the proposal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a part two-storey, part three-storey building fronting St George's Street. The building occupies a prominent position close to a large roundabout on Upper Bridge Street/Lower Bridge Street (the A28). The site is within the Canterbury City Centre Conservation Area (CA). Although interspersed with modern buildings, including at the site, the CA partly derives its significance from the historic development focussed on the cathedral. Historic buildings, including St George's Tower and the city walls, create an attractive approach to the city centre.

6. Signage is prevalent in the area given the city centre location, where there is a considerable number of commercial premises. Advertisements in the area typically comprise fascia signage between ground and first floor level. Signs in the upper floors of buildings fronting St George's Street are limited and primarily consist of hanging signs.
7. The proposal is for two fascia signs on the upper floors of the building. One of the signs would be centrally positioned above the row of first floor windows within the elevation fronting St George's Street. The other sign would be sited at first floor level on the side elevation of the three-storey element of the building, which is set back from St George's Street.
8. While of a modest size, the proposal would introduce signage in an incongruous position on the upper floors of the building where signage is typically scarce. The siting and form of the signage would be at odds with the prevailing position and type of signage on the upper floor elevations of buildings in the area. Moreover, the position of the signs above the existing fascia signage at the site would lead to an unacceptable and unnecessary proliferation of signage on the building.
9. The site comprises a modern building of limited architectural merit. However, the site is within a prominent location forming an entrance into the city centre. Accordingly, the discordant positioning of the signage would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the CA.
10. The Shopfront Design Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD) encourages signs for upper floor businesses to comprise discreet lettering applied directly to windows. The SPD states that the most appropriate signage for professional businesses in former domestic buildings is a brass or bronze plate at the side of the entrance door or gilt lettering applied directly to windows or fanlights. The proposed signs would have a gold colour akin to gilt lettering, but would be fascia signs attached to the elevations of the building. While non-compliance with the SPD may not always lead to significant harm, it nonetheless provides guidance in respect of the design of shopfronts in the area.
11. The proposed signs would define the ownership of the building, which may assist in the growth of the business. While the business has invested in, and adapted, the existing building, there is no substantive evidence before me that the advertisements would be an integral part of this. In any event, Regulation 3 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) does not allow for considerations beyond the scope of amenity and public safety.
12. The signs would cause harm to the visual appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that the advertisements would have a harmful effect on amenity and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. I have taken into account policies DBE3, HE1, HE6, HE9 and HE10 of the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017, which seek to protect amenity and so are material in this case. Given I have concluded that the sign would harm amenity, the proposal conflicts with these policies.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the advertisement would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

J Pearce

INSPECTOR