
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2015

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25/11/2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/Z/15/3132539
387 Kentish Town Road, London NW5 2TJ

- 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 Ms Katy Moore, Top to Toe, against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
 - The application Ref 2015/1657/A, dated 20 March 2015, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2015.
 - The description of the proposed advertisements on the application forms are "name of company and phone number".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of the proposed advertisements as highlighted above, the Council described the proposal within its decision notice as "Display of 2 x non-illuminated banner signs (flat plastic) to front elevation at first and second floor levels (Retrospective)". I consider this to be a more accurate description of the proposal, I noted that the signs are in position on the subject building, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the signs upon amenity.
4. The appeal site comprises a hair and beauty salon, situated within a three storey building it is highly visible within the street. The ground floor shop front is located against the back edge of the pedestrian footway, with the first floor set back from the road and in line with the adjoining terrace within which it forms part. The majority of commercial properties within the area have signage, but this tends to be restricted to shop front fascia level, consequently the signage proposed would be as odds with the prevailing character of the locality.
5. Whilst not listed in its own right, the subject building is atypical of the London vernacular. With the signs both being of a significant height and width, emblazoned above the first and second floor windows respectively, I find that they detract from the architectural form of the building above ground floor level. I consider that by virtue of their size and position that the signs would

not only be visually obtrusive and harmful to the appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, but would also detract from the setting of the adjoining listed building, The Bull and Gate Public House at 389 Kentish Town Road.

6. I appreciate that the business has been within Kentish Town for over thirty years and that the landlord had no objections to the installation of the signs. I also acknowledge that Camden may have a constant flow of new shops opening and that it is necessary for the appellant to advertise her business as best she can. However, this does not outweigh the harm that the advertisements have upon the character and appearance of the area in general.
7. The Council has referred to policies set out within the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies, as well as their Camden Planning Guidance 2011 (as amended). Whilst not decisive, I have had regard to Policy CS14 which, amongst other things, requires development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character; as well as Policies DP24 and DP25 which also seek high quality design and protecting the setting of listed buildings. The advertisements are sited above fascia level, and by virtue of their siting, are a dominant feature within their urban setting.
8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed as the signs are detrimental to the interests of amenity.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR