

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR - PLANNING, PUBLIC PROTECTION AND GOVERNANCE**

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2016/1008/ADV  
**Location:** KFC, Comet Way, Hatfield, AL10 9TF  
**Proposal:** Application for a mixture of the installation, retention and moving of 4no non-illuminate free standing signs, 1no non-illuminated wall mounted sign, 3no non-illuminated lamp post signs, 4no illuminated free standing signs and 1no estate sign  
**Officer:** Mr S Dicocco

**Recommendation:** Granted

<b>Context</b>				
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The site contains two listed buildings, the Gatehouse and the main building (staff mess offices) which currently holds a fast food restaurant use.</p> <p>The proposal is for advertisement consent. The proposal includes some advertisement retention, some movement of existing advertisements as well as the installation of new advertisements.</p> <p>Sign 1 retains the existing free standing structure in the existing location with new graphics. Sign 2 is for a new menu unit post sign to replace an existing sign. Sign 3 retains the existing free standing structure in the existing location with new graphics. Sign 4 retains the existing structure in the existing location (the advertisement consent has expired (but not been discontinued)). Sign 5 retains the existing free standing structure in the existing location with new graphics. Sign 6 retains the existing speaker post to be put in a new location. Sign 7 would be two new free standing illuminated post signs located at angles to the entrance to the drive through. Sign 8 is for the retention of a wall mounted disclaimer sign (never been granted advertisement consent). Sign 9 is the installation of three lamp post signs spread on sign posts close to the boundary of the site. The Estate Sign and Banner Signs originally applied for have been removed from the application.</p>			
<b>Constraints</b>	<p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Staff mess offices 1934 by Geoffrey Monro for</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Gatehouse to aeroplane makers.1934 by Geoffrey</p> <p>PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD)</p> <p>Ward6 - Hatfield Central</p> <p>Ward6 - Hatfield Villages</p>			
<b>Relevant history</b>	<p>Application Number: S6/2006/1130/AD      Decision: Granted      Decision Date: 16 October 2006</p> <p>Proposal: Erection and display of 4m high internally illuminated pylon sign, display of miscellaneous internally illuminated signs, including menu - board and directional signs.</p>			
<b>Consultations</b>				
<b>Neighbour</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support: 0</td> <td>Object: 0</td> <td>Other: 0</td> </tr> </table>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0		

<b>representations</b>			
<b>Publicity</b>	Site Notice Display Date: 14 June 2016 Site Notice Expiry Date: 5 July 2016		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	None		
<b>Town Council</b>	<i>"Members are concerned that work has already commenced prior to Listed Building consent being granted"</i>		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	<p>1. Councillor Lynne Sparks – No response</p> <p>2. Councillor Howard Morgan – No response</p> <p>3. Councillor Duncan Bell – No response</p> <p>4. Hertfordshire Transport Programmes &amp; Strategy – No objections</p> <p>5. Andrew Robley – Comments –  <i>"Sign 1-OK  Sign 2-This doorway sign at over 2 metres high would be very prominent and unacceptable.  Sign 3 –This is described as existing but I note that it does not appear on Google Streetview and so it may not have approval. If not, Unacceptable.  Sign 4- This is existing and probably reasonable as the main warning for approaching drivers.  Sign 5- Relatively innocuous- OK  Sign 6- Sign 6 is the speaker post and necessary and acceptable  Sign 7 Pretty awful but presumably necessary. However, in this case better to retain in white rather than RAL 7022 due to relationship with the white building.  2 are shown. There should be only one and it should be at right angles to the front façade of the building.  Sign 8 Acceptable  Sign 9- These are multiple garish KFC signs on existing lighting columns. Unnecessary repetition and Unacceptable.  Estate Sign – Unnecessary and repetitious. People will be well aware that this is a KFC by the time they get to here.  Banner Sign – Hopefully this existing sign does not have prior planning consent- If not it is unacceptable and should be removed."</i></p>		
<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Design Guidance			
<b>Main Issues</b>			
<b>Is the advertisement within a conservation area?</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be conserved or enhanced?</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <b>Comment</b> (if applicable): The impact of the advertisements on the heritage asset both on-site and nearby does fall within the remit of the amenity considerations. The advertisements should not visually dominate the heritage assets, and should be in scale and in-keeping with the buildings. Following the consultee response from the conservation officer, signs 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8 are acceptable in terms of their impact on amenity.  In regards the objection to sign 2, the site currently holds express consent (expired but not discontinued) for two similar signs in this location at 2.4m in height. Accordingly, replacing the two signs with one sign at over 2m in height would not adversely impact amenity.  Sign 3 does hold express consent (expired but not discontinued) and as such, no objection is made			

in terms of amenity.

Turning to signs 7 (2no), the signs free standing surrounding structure would be in-keeping with the other signs proposed, as well as the window frames of the existing building. It is not considered that sign 7 (2no) would have an unacceptable impact on amenity.

The Estate Sign is a minimal sign to be located within an existing Estate Sign board. The changing of the content of this existing sign to an alternative design is not considered harmful to the amenity of the area or the significance of the heritage asset.

Following the conservation officer comments, the number of lamp post signs have been reduced from six to three. It is considered that the three lamp post signs, spread evenly along the boundary of the site would not visually dominate the building. The Banner Signs have been removed from the proposal, resulting in what is considered a benefit for the conservation of the heritage asset. The existing fascia signs hold express consent which has expired but not been discontinued.

All proposed, existing and retained signs would not over dominate or detract from the host building, or surrounding historic buildings. The re-painting of the free standing sign structures to match the side doors and window frames of the host building would not be detrimental. The majority of the signs proposed are for use internally within the site. The remaining signs that would be highly visible from the street scene are not considered to create a cluttered appearance

**Would the advertisement reflect the character of the area?**

Yes  No

**Comment** (if applicable): The signs would not be out of keeping with the character of the area in terms of advertisements, with specific regards to the nearby Galleria as well as the adjoining car sales site.

**Would the advertisement reflect the character of the building?**

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable): See above.

**Would the advertisement maintain public safety?** (e.g. safety of people; obscure or hinder traffic sign/ railway signal etc.; or hinder security or surveillance device or device measuring vehicle speed)

Yes  No

**Comment** (if applicable): Hertfordshire County Council as Highways Authority have been consulted and have no objection to the proposed signs in terms of public safety.

**Conclusion**

It is considered that the signs proposed would be designed and positioned as to maintain the significance of the heritage asset. The signs proposed would relate to and respect the character, scale and design of the street scene. The signage, taken as a whole within the site, would not result in visual clutter so as to result in harm to the character of the area or visual rhythm of the street scene. Subject to conditions relating to the method of illumination, it is considered that the proposed advertisements would not harm amenity or public safety. Accordingly, the proposed signs accord with the National Planning Policy Guidance 2012, as well as Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the Supplementary Design Guidance Statement of Council Policy 2005.

**Conditions:**

1. Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a clean and tidy condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

**REASON:** To comply with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) in the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.

2. Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a safe condition.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) in the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.

3. Where an advertisement is required under these Regulations to be removed, the removal shall be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) in the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.

4. No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site or any other person with an interest in the site entitled to grant permission.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) in the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.

5. No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to obscure, or hinder the ready interpretation of, any road traffic sign, railway signal or aid to navigation by water or air, or so as otherwise to render hazardous the use of any highway, railway, waterway or aerodrome (civil or military).

REASON: To comply with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) in the interests of highway safety and visual amenity.

6. This consent does not authorise any flashing, intermittent or recurring form of illumination.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

7. The intensity of the illumination of the illuminated signs permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 250.00cd/m.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenity and highway safety of the area in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

#### DRAWING NUMBERS

8. The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details:

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
2542/G120		Existing Site Plan	23 May 2016

2542/G210		Existing Plans and Elevations	23 May 2016
2542/G211	B	Proposed Plans and Elevations	4 August 2016
2542/G121	E	Proposed Site Plan	4 August 2016
2542/G012	A	Site Location and Block Plan	2 June 2016

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.

1. POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

The decision has been made taking into account, where practicable and appropriate the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and material planning considerations do not justify a decision contrary to the development plan (see Officer's report which can be viewed on the Council's website or inspected at these offices).

**Determined By:**

Mr C Carter  
19 May 2017