



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2009

by Terry Emm

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:
6 April 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/08/2083413

Sushi-So, 43 Endell Street, London WC2H 9BA

- 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 Pinnacles UK Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2008/0246/A, dated 4 January 2008, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2008.
- The advertisements proposed are a non-illuminated projecting sign (sign A) to be positioned on the Endell Street elevation, and a non-illuminated wall mounted sign (sign B) to be positioned on the Shorts Garden elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and consent granted for a non-illuminated projecting sign (sign A) to be positioned on the Endell Street elevation, and a non-illuminated wall mounted sign (sign B) to be positioned on the Shorts Garden elevation, as applied for and subject to paragraph 3 below. The consent is for 5 years from the date of this decision and is subject to the five standard conditions set out in the Regulations.

Reasons

2. I consider the main issue to be the visual impact of the proposed signs on the host premises and the streetscape in general.
3. At the time of my inspection the signs were being displayed but not in accordance with the submitted plans or in the position displayed at the time the application was considered by the Council. I shall therefore consider the appeal proposals on the basis of the signs as in situ at the time of my inspection ie 24 March 2009.
4. The appeal site is a Sushi bar situated on the corner of Endell Street and Short Gardens. Both are narrow streets in mainly commercial use with a number of restaurants and other food outlets with office or residential use on the upper floors. The appeal premises are part of a modern infill within a mainly Victorian street vista and are stepped back from the building line.
5. Because of the host building's stepped back position sign A is located at fascia level on the adjacent business (Frame Set & Match). It was originally positioned at a lower level and adjacent to another projecting sign which has now been moved to the other end of the fascia. In my view this overcomes the

Council's primary objections. I consider the sign to be in keeping with the locality and other signs in the area.

6. Sign B is a wall mounted sign measuring roughly 1.53m high x 1m wide. It has a modern "cartoon" look. The sign has been lowered to overcome the Council's objection to its earlier position where it obscured the wall's decorative brick string course. The Council say that a location below the brick banding would be acceptable. I agree that this would be a satisfactory position for the sign.
7. I consider that the signs would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the display of the signs would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity.

Terry Emm

Inspector