Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2015

by SM Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 June 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/H/14/2229600 16-20 The Square, Clun, Craven Arms, SY7 8JA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Blakemore Design and Shopfitting Ltd against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref 14/03424/ADV, dated 22 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2014.
- The advertisement proposed is 2 replacement fascia signs to front elevation, 2 replacement commodity boards to either side of entrance door, and 1 fascia sign above the door within the entrance porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The advertisements have been installed and therefore I am determining this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the advertisements upon the character and appearance of the area and the building to which they are attached.

Reasons

- 4. The site is within the Clun Conservation Area and has Grade II Listed Buildings (the Buffalo Head Hotel and 10, 12 (The White Horse Inn) and 14) opposite both principal elevations.
- 5. The signs are powder coated aluminium which are very smooth and flat in profile and have a plain and stark appearance. The long strip of bright white across the length of the fascia coupled with the red and white signs on either side of, and above, the door, even without illumination, look at odds with the traditional stone building to which they are attached. Moreover, they are inconsistent with other shop signage in the conservation area which tends to be of painted timber.
- 6. The signs are therefore incongruous with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This incongruity is exacerbated by their prominence as the building stands at the end of the street which makes the signage dominant within views from High Street towards The Square. In addition, the effect of the signs is compounded by several other signs on the building that are not

- subject of this appeal. The overall impression is that of visual clutter and even the internal sign can be seen with the door open.
- 7. The signs are also seen within the context of the adjacent listed buildings and therefore they impinge upon, and are detrimental to the setting of these historic buildings.
- 8. I note the appellant's comments that there were similar signs in place previously but this does not provide justification for another set of harmful signs. I also acknowledge the appellant's argument that the signs are easy to maintain so they would look better for longer but as I have already determined that they look unsuitable, a prolonged life from easy maintenance does not weigh in their favour. I also note the appellant's comments in respect of difficulties in applying alternative types of signage to the stone but I have little detail of these difficulties and as the other businesses in the conservation area have managed to use appropriate signage I am unconvinced that an alternative solution cannot be found.
- 9. The Council has drawn my attention to Policies CS6 and CS7 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework, Adopted Core Strategy, 2011 which seek to preserve local distinctiveness and heritage assets. Whilst I have taken these policies into account as material considerations, the powers to control advertisements under the Regulations may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Consequently, in my determination of the appeal, the Council's policies are not decisive. I am also conscious that paragraph 67 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the appearance of the built and natural environment.
- 10. For the above reasons I conclude that the advertisements harm the character and appearance of the area and the building to which they are attached and the appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR