DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0319-26**	**Applicant:**	**Blendly Hair Studio**
Proposal:	2 Fascia Signs & 3 Barbers Poles - Retrospective		
Location:	1 New Road Spalding Lincolnshire		
Terminal Date:	15th June 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

01	Spatial Strategy
02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment
33	Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	1
HIGHWAYS & SUDS SUPPORT	0	0	0	1
SPALDING & DISTRICT CIVIC SOCIETY	1	0	0	0
SHDC INTERNAL	0	0	0	1

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This application seeks advertisement consent for the erection of two fascia signs and three barber poles at 1 New Road, Spalding. The application is made retrospectively.

Each barber pole has been placed 3.05m from ground level. Each has a height of 500mm, project 210mm from the frontage. They have a diameter of 150mm. Each pole is constructed of a metal cap, with a clear plastic outer case. They feature a black and white barber pole design. They are internally illuminated at a luminance of 900cd/sqm.

Fascia Sign 1 measure 5450mm (width) by 400mm (height). It is constructed of black aluminium. In pale yellow the words "hair" and "studio" flank the internally illuminated "BLENDLY". The internally illuminated letters change colour at regular intervals. This would also be illuminated at 900cd/sqm. Fascia Sign 2 features the same design, but measure 4350mm by 400mm instead.

Site Description

The site is within the town centre boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is within the Conservation Area and the Primary Shopping Area of Spalding.

The unit is at the junction of New Road, Hall Place and Chapel Lane, facing towards New Road. It is a reasonably attractive three storey building, painted cream.

Relevant History

H16-0164-08 - Adv - Proposed two illuminated fascia signs - Refused 28/02/08. Decision upheld at appeal.

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Cllr Sheers

Provided the signage and barber poles are in keeping with the ambition to get the town looking more smarter and more appealing and the signage and barber poles are of a suitable colour and size then I have no objection

Spalding and District Civic Society

We wish to register our objection to this proposal.

Site Location

The site is in a prominent location in the Town Centre and Spalding conservation area. The building itself is unlisted, but within proximity to several listed buildings:-
3-5 New Road - grade II
39 New Road - grade II
Punch Bowl Public House - grade II
The Black Swan Public House - grade II
The building is of a unique design with prominent timber framed windows and was occupied by Arthur Beales, cycle maker from 1891. Photographic archives show that the building has not been changed significantly from the time when it was occupied by that business. Newspaper advertisements between 1879 and 1891 show that the premises were occupied by Cordley Jackson, Butcher (1879) and J.R Reedman. Flower Seedsman (1887,1888). No evidence of any redevelopment of the site can be identified suggesting that the building can reasonably classed as a non-designated
heritage asset.

The basic shop frontage including mouldings are traditional in nature and in keeping with the conservation area

Planning History

H16-0300-07 Change of use from A1 (shop) to A2 (Financial and Professional Services) - Approved
H16-0164-08 Proposed two illuminated fascia signs - Refused. Appealed under APP/A2525/J/08/2082796 dismissed
H16-0328-15 Change of use of office and retail shop to sunbed salon to include spray tanning - Approve

Reasons for our objection

Class 4 of the Control of Advertisement Regulations 2007 covering the display of outdoor advertisements with either internally illuminated letters or characters on an unilluminated background or lit by 'halo' illumination, does not apply to conservation areas without consent. In this case we feel that consent should be refused.

Policy 25 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan requires that the Planning Authority ensures that changes to premises have regard to the significance of heritage assets and the special interests of the Conservation Areas and their settings

Policy 29 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan requires that proposals affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting. Proposals should assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape. The proposal does not do that. Indeed, it includes a proposal for three internally illuminated Barber's poles which do have a negative impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Spalding Conservation area

The policy also requires where a development proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset (whether designated or non-designated), including any contribution made to its setting, it should be informed by proportionate historic environment assessments and evaluations (such as heritage impact assessments, desk-based appraisals, field evaluation and historic building reports) that:
1. identify all heritage assets likely to be affected by the proposal;
2. explain the nature and degree of any effect on elements that contribute to their significance and demonstrating how, in order of preference, any harm will be avoided, minimised or mitigated;
3. provide a clear explanation and justification for the proposal in order for the harm to be weighed against public benefits; and
4. demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to secure the long term use of the asset

No such assessment has been produced.
Furthermore, the proposal seems to be inconsistent with the principles set out in the Spalding Shopfront Design Guide which is the subject of consultation.
Therefore, we urge that the application be refused, that all backlit illuminated signage is removed and that the applicant be asked to work with the authority's conservation team to arrive at a more acceptable solution that would enhance the frontage.

Conservation Officer

I write to confirm my objections to this proposal.
The design of the signage itself is relatively attractive and a definite improvement over the former signage on the property. However, the raised lettering utilises Internal or Halo illumination, which also upon visual inspection of the site, is lit in bright primary colours (at the time of the visit, the backlighting was bright green). In general, internal or halo illumination are not considered to be appropriate forms of shopfront lighting in a conservation area setting, particularly not for properties which retain a relatively traditional shopfront. This is exacerbated as an effect by the RGB colour capability of the proposed lighting which exaggerate the appearance of the proposal as being non-traditional and alien in appearance to the relatively traditional nature of sign lighting elsewhere in the conservation area.

Without an exceptional justification, it is my stance that the proposed lighting does cause a form of harm to the setting of the conservation area and as such, fails the test set forth by Policy 29,

Section B(5) of the SELLP

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, no letters of representation have been received.

Key Planning Considerations

Evaluation

Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 states local planning authorities shall exercise its powers under these Regulations in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material; and any other relevant factors.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area and Heritage and Conservation

Policy Context - Design

Section 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", states that the "creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve" and as such, it is generally accepted that good design plays a key role towards sustainable development.

Paragraph 135, contained within Section 12 of the NPPF, states that new development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area (including beyond the short term) and should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. This goes on to establish that it is important that new development should be of the highest quality, to enhance and reinforce good design characteristics, and that decisions must have regard towards the impact that the proposed development would have on local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting such as topography, street patterns, building lines, boundary treatment and through scale and massing. Developments should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, among other considerations.

Paragraph 141 of the NPPF states: "The quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. A separate consent process within the planning system controls the display of advertisements, which should be operated in a way which is simple, efficient and effective. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts."

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character

of the area is not compromised.

Policy Context - Heritage

The site is within Spalding Conservation Area, within a line of sight of numerous Grade II listed buildings.

In respect of any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, through Section 72 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

In assessing proposals of this nature, the Local Planning Authority must also ensure special regard to preserving the Listed Buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act'). No harm should be caused with the historical assets and their surroundings requiring to be preserved or enhanced.

The NPPF expresses the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets; advising that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

Section 16 of the NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".

Paragraph 220 expands upon this, in relation to Conservation Areas, stating:
"Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 214 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 215, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole"

Policy 29 (The Historic Environment) states amongst other matters that the distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced, in keeping with the policies in the NPPF. Development proposals will be expected to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy 29 is broken into five interrelated sections, with parts A, and B relevant here.

Policy 29A, relating to listed buildings, states: "Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

Policy 29B, relating to conservation areas, states: "Proposals within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a Conservation Area should preserve (and enhance or reinforce, as appropriate) features that contribute positively to the area's character, appearance and setting. Proposals should:
1. Retain buildings/groups of buildings, existing street patterns, historic building lines and ground surfaces;
2. Retain architectural details that contribute to the character and appearance of the area;
3. Where relevant and practical, remove features which are incompatible with the Conservation Area;
4. Retain and reinforce local distinctiveness with reference to height, massing, scale, form, materials and plot widths of the existing built environment;
5. Assess, and mitigate against, any negative impact the proposal might have on the townscape, roofscape, skyline and landscape;"

To this end, all proposals in the Conservation Area or which affect listed buildings should preserve or enhance their settings.

Assessment

The signage occupies a prominent position within the area, due to its visibility along New Street. The unit is also visible from 24 Hall Place, 39 New Road and 3-5 New Road, all of which are Grade II listed. Therefore, the impacts of any advertisements would be more acutely felt.

Taken in isolation of the illumination, the sign is distinctly modern. However, it would not significantly conflict with the character of the area. The "hair studio" colouring reflects the pale yellow of the wider shopfront, creating a cohesive design. The "BLENDLY" lettering is not overly prominent and does not immediately conflict with the wider character of the area. Comparable designs are present within the wider area.

The barber poles, whilst unique in their black and white design, are not inherently harmful, when considered in isolation of their illumination. When the illumination is considered, there is a fundamental conflict with the nature of the Conservation Area.

The use of internal illumination would fundamentally conflict with the Conservation Area. Its use is non-vernacular and detracts from the appearance of the area. The use of RGB colour further detracts from the appearance, being a unique and distinctly modern element which conflicts with the established historic character. This effect is exacerbated by the brightness proposed, which is in excess of the limited illuminated signage in the wider area.

As the proposal would be contrary to Policy 29 of the SELLP, regardless of the assessment of harm against Section 16 of the NPPF, the proposal would be unacceptable. Nevertheless, in line with Paragraphs 212, 215 and 220 of the NPPF, less than substantial harm has been identified.

On this basis, less than substantial harm has been identified, in line with Paragraphs 212 and 220 of the NPPF. In these circumstances, Paragraph 215 is relevant, which states:
"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use".

The proposal represents an advertisement which would not impact upon the viable use of an asset. Therefore, the proposal should be assessed against the public benefits from this proposal. As an advertisement for a private business, there would be no public benefits.

As such, the advertisements cause less than substantial harm, with no outweighing benefit. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and would be contrary to Policies 2,3 and 29 of the SELLP and Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF.

Impacts Upon Resident Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that development should create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policies 2 and 3 of SELLP sets out that residential amenity and the relationship to existing development and land uses is a main consideration when making planning decisions.

While the signage is bright, it is not so bright as to have a significant detrimental impact upon residential amenity.

As detailed above, the scale and design of the proposal is considered to have no significant or unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties or land users, when also taking account of the conditions recommended. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Section 12 of the NPPF and Policies 2 and 3 of the Local Plan in terms of impact upon residential amenity.

Highway Safety

Section 9 of the NPPF is titled 'Promoting sustainable transport'. Within this, Paragraph 116 advises that "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios".

In respect of highway matters, Policy 2 details that proposals requiring planning permission for

development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to access and vehicle generation. Policy 3 details that development proposals will demonstrate how accessibility by a choice of travel modes including the provision of public transport, public rights of way and cycle ways will be secured, where they are relevant to the proposal. Policy 33 further reinforces the need for developments to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport.

The signage would have no significant impact upon highway safety.

The proposal would therefore be acceptable and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Policies 2, 3, and 33 of the SELLP, as well as Section 9 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance

Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 states local planning authorities shall exercise its powers under these Regulations in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material; and any other relevant factors.

The use of internal illumination, in particular illumination of varying colour, would inherently conflict with the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore constitute less than substantial harm to the area, without any public benefit.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:
A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).
C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based

on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered to conflict with Policies 2, 3, and 29 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the harm of the proposal; therefore, the planning balance is against the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be refused under Delegated Authority.