



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2010

by **David Leeming**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
25 March 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/09/2116526

115-119 Camden High Street, London NW1 7JS

- 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 Sports Direct against the decision of Camden London Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2009/4200/A, dated 26 August 2009, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2009.
- The advertisements under appeal are 6 logo trays to first floor windows.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the visual impact of the appeal signs on the premises and within the Camden Town Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The location of the site within a designated conservation area means that there is a duty on the decision maker to have regard to the requirement in legislation to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. The appeal signs are displayed on the upper part of the building, in locations not designed to display signage, where they wholly obscure the upper windows. By doing so they thus materially change the appearance of the building and are out of place on it. Because of the visual harm they cause to the building, I consider that they similarly have a harmful impact within the surroundings, despite the commercial nature of the locality and the presence of some other high level signage.
4. The appellants consider the windows need to be obscured to maintain staff privacy. However, as the Council say, obscure glazing would have the same effect without the harm caused by the presence of the signs. I accept that the fascia signage is obscured in some views by a nearby traffic sign across the pavement. However, this fact does not provide justification for the display of signs that clearly have a harmful impact.
5. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Leeming

INSPECTOR
