



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2026

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/F/24/3354105

9 Parade, PLYMOUTH, PL1 2JL

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended (the Act).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Christopher Macpherson against a listed building enforcement notice issued by Plymouth City Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 16 September 2024.
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is affixing of signage above the entrance of a grade II listed building the unauthorised signage has white text and blue and gold graphics on a black background and reads 'I MV AGUSTA I PLYMOUTH'.
 - The requirements of the notices are (i) Remove signage on the south elevation of the building which fronts on to Parade. (ii) Remove any mechanical fixings which have been installed to accommodate the acrylic box signage with aluminium back.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 1 month.
 - The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1)(c), (e), (f) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld. Listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I noticed the appeal sign had been removed and replaced by a much more appropriate version. It would also seem the business has changed hands. However, the appeal has not been withdrawn and I shall deal with the sign that was subject to the notice and the appeal.

The appeal on Ground (f)

3. The Council deny the notice was missing important information on how to appeal, but whatever the truth of the matter, the appellant was able to appeal and it seems was helped by the Council when he rang to ask for advice. For this ground to succeed not only does the service of the notice have to be defective in some way, but that defect has to have caused prejudice to the appellant. That clearly is not the case here and the appeal on ground (f) fails.

The Appeal on Grounds (c) and (e)

4. The appeal building stands within the dock/marina complex in the heart of Plymouth's waterside, where the quays are lined with predominantly historic and attractive buildings. No9 is no exception and was once a warehouse and still

retains a number of historic features on its front façade. Consequently, the design of the signage on that façade is important. The appeal sign was acrylic, had a curved front and modern style lettering. Judging from the photographs I agree with the Council that it looked out of place and harmed the significance of the listed building. There was absolutely no reason why a more appropriate sign could not have been used.

5. I note there are some modern and indeed garish signs around the waterfront, but they are in the minority and several are under active investigation by the Council. Other poor-quality signs do not set a precedent for the appeal sign. The appeals on grounds (c) and (e) fail, there clearly has been a contravention of the Act and listed building consent should not be granted for the sign.
6. Since the appeal was made a new version of the NPPF has been issued, but the treatment of heritage assets in policies HE5 and 6 does not change my view on this appeal. There has been harm to the significance of the asset that although modest still carries great weight and there are no public benefits to offset that harm.

Conclusion

7. I shall dismiss the appeal and uphold the notice.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR