
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2014

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI AIEMA

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

Decision date: 6 August 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/14/2218987

12 Choices Snack Bar, Leather Lane, London, EC1N 7SS

- 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 Mr Dan Houghton of Chilango against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2013/6417/A, dated 24 September 2013, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2014.
 - The advertisement proposed are letter fascia signage and projecting sign.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposed description on the application form refers to physical changes to the shop frontage. This is the subject of another appeal which will be dealt with separately (ref: APP/X5210/H/14/2218989). For the avoidance of doubt, both parties have dealt with this appeal as an application for advertisement consent, and I have dealt with it on this basis.
3. My site visit confirmed that the development applied for has already been undertaken. However, it is clear from appendix 1 of the Grounds of Appeal that the 'original' shop front included a metal framed glazed frontage, with signage and awning above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the signage on the visual amenity of the locality, including the effect on the Hatton Garden Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), at Paragraph 67, provides that advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety. The Council has drawn my attention to the policies they consider to be relevant to this appeal and I have taken them into account as a material consideration. However, the Council's policies have not been decisive in themselves to the outcome of this appeal.
6. The appeal site is located on Leather Lane, which is a pedestrian only highway, and is situated within a mid-terrace position in a parade. The advertisements have already been erected and are *in situ*. In terms of the terrace, this

appears to be of post-war construction and is located in the Hatton Garden Conservation Area. Within this part of the conservation area there are a variety of both retail and sandwich type uses, although the frontages and signage are relatively uniform.

7. It is clear from the submitted photos, the fascia signage was located within the fascia board area, whereas in the submitted scheme the large lettering extends below the fascia board, which blurs the distinction between the fascia and shop frontage. Moreover, the sign itself is highly visible within the wider street scene and is visually discordant compared to other signs within the locality which are typically contained within the fascia board areas. In terms of the projecting sign, the designs of this is unusual when compared with others nearby, and when both signs are illuminated at night this visual juxtaposition would be heightened. Accordingly, both the projecting sign and fascia signs would be at odds with the character of the building and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
8. Whilst I note that the appellant points to the fact that physically the signage is not substantially larger than the previous 'Choices' sign, the harm to the significance of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, whilst less than substantial, would not be outweighed by this benefit.
9. For the reasons given above, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is unacceptable on amenity grounds, and as such the appeal should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR