Appeal Decisions

Site visits made on 9 and 10 November 2009

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:
23 November 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/H/09/2108134 (Appeal A)
43 Warwick Street, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 3DQ

- 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 K Zaman against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/09/0190/ADV, dated 3 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2009.
- The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated projecting box sign.

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/H/09/2108138 (Appeal B)
43 Warwick Street, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 3DQ

- 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 K Zaman against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref WB/09/0191/ADV, dated 3 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2009.
- The advertisement proposed is an internally illuminated fascia sign.

Preliminary Matters

1. In reaching my decision on the appeals I have taken into account the information contained in drawing 1497.2/01, copies of which were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate after the date of my site visit.

2. I note that the application forms state that both appeal signs are in place. However, at the time of my site visits only the fascia sign was being displayed.

3. I visited the site after dark on 9 November and during daylight hours on the following day.

Decision

4. I dismiss the appeals.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in both appeals is the visual impact of the appeal signs on the shopfront and within the surroundings, having regard to the location of the site within the South Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

Appeal A

6. The projecting box sign would be located on the pilaster adjacent to the eastern side of the restaurant fascia. It would have a somewhat bulky, box-like design and would project forward from a bracket, to about a metre from the pilaster. The sign would be positioned just below the decorative console bracket and adjacent to detailing on the pilaster of the adjoining listed building to the east. Its modern form and appearance would contrast noticeably with these traditional shopfront features. Its presence would also partly obscure views of the detailing on the listed building in views from the west. Although there are a few other examples of projecting signs along the street, for the most part these are discreet, in keeping with the generally restrained and traditional appearances of the frontages.

7. In my view, because of its siting, modern form and degree of projection, the proposed projecting sign, whilst in muted colours and with limited illumination, would appear as an obtrusive and incongruous feature on the frontage and within this particular street scene.

Appeal B

8. The fascia sign has a depth of 1.2m. The submitted photograph of the frontage before the sign's erection (Appendix 3 of the Council's statement) indicates that the previous fascia sign was less deep. The appeal sign is fitted to a canted fascia backing panel and projects noticeably forward from it. This element of projection is further emphasised by the applied and somewhat bulky capital letters reading ZAMAN. The modern form and appearance of the sign is seen in stark contrast to the ornate and fine detailing on the frontage of the adjoining listed building. I accept that the sign is also seen in general association with the modern-style signs on the two adjacent fascias to the west. However, these are similarly untypical of the generally restrained signage in this street and, in any event, are not noticeably bulky.

9. I acknowledge that, aside from the prominent, bright illumination emitted from the overhead strip light – which does not form part of the appeal proposal – the illumination of the fascia is restrained, as is its background colour. Even so, I consider that, because of its overall depth, bulk and forward projection, the fascia sign appears as an awkward and top heavy feature on the frontage and is out of keeping within the surrounding street scene.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, I find that both signs are detrimental to visual amenity; that they are incompatible with the Conservation Area status of the street; and that they also detract from the setting of the adjoining listed building. I therefore conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

David Leeming

INSPECTOR