

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/0557/LB
Location: Eight Bells 2 Park Street Hatfield AL9 5AX
Proposal: Installation of non illuminated 1x fascia sign, 1x post mounted sign, 2x painted mural signs, 1x vinyl wall mounted sign, 2x wall mounted signs and 1x lockable poster case and three gold lanterns and two upward facing LED floodlights to facilitate signs
Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/0557/LB

Context	
Site and Application description	The application building is a Grade II listed public house and is considered to date from the seventeenth century. The public house is within Old Hatfield Conservation Area and occupies a prominent position on the corner of Park Street and Fore Street.
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	CA - Conservation Area: HATF; - Distance: 0 LBC - LISTED BUILDING Large house of early C18. Now house and office. - Distance: 11.69 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. C17 and earlier timber frame, 1 bay wide. - Distance: 20.98 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House (formerly a pair known as Nos 15 and 17). - Distance: 24.45 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Mid-late C18. Painted brick. Slate - Distance: 36.53 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, formerly butchers shop. Early C19. - Distance: 41.47 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C17 painted brick front, probably to - Distance: 46.09 LBC - LISTED BUILDING Terrace of houses. C18 red brick casing, prob. - Distance: 0.01 LBC - LISTED BUILDING Also included 15/196. - Distance: 0 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair, left one now part of public house. - Distance: 0 LBC - LISTED BUILDING Formerly the Rose & Crown Inn. Prob C15. Timber - Distance: 5.85 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House and shop. Prob C17 timber frame. Late C19 - Distance: 9.88 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Early C19 red brick front to earlier - Distance: 15.65 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18 or early C19 red brick front. - Distance: 25.56 LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair. Red brick front, prob Late C18. C17 - Distance: 42.25

	<p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Houses and shop. C17 timbr frame. Long range - Distance: 5.76</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. C15 probable origin. A timber framed hall - Distance: 23.15</p> <p>LBC - NULL Signpost on pavement in front of 2 Park Street, Old Hatfield - Distance: 0.06</p> <p>PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0</p> <p>Wards - Hatfield East - Distance: 0</p> <p>A4HD - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0</p> <p>HHAA - Hatfield Heritage Assessment Area(Old Hatfield Historic Core CA) - Distance: 0</p>
<p>Relevant planning history</p>	<p>Application Number: E6/1972/4019/ Decision: Granted Decision Date: 06 November 1972 Proposal: Store building and garage</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1984/0612/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 27 December 1984 Proposal: Repair/rebuild existing second floor gable</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1990/0223/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 14 May 1990 Proposal: Internal alterations; erection of new signs and lighting; redecoration including the painting of the external walls</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1990/7014/AD Decision: Granted Decision Date: 14 May 1990 Proposal: Erection of externally illuminated signs</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1996/0721/AD Decision: Granted Decision Date: 16 January 1997 Proposal: Installation of externally illuminated fascia, wall and post signs</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1996/0737/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 16 January 1997 Proposal: Addition of signage and lighting to front elevation</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/0287/FULL Decision: Decision Date: Proposal: Erection of timber posts with lighting, alterations to existing pergola roof, installation of planter troughs to replace existing gate and erection of close board fenced gate and posts.</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/0288/LB Decision: Decision Date: Proposal: Erection of timber posts with lighting, alterations to existing pergola roof, installation of planter troughs to replace existing gate and erection of close</p>

	<p>board fenced gate and posts. Internal installation of hard flooring and carpet on ground floor with existing timber floor to be lightly sanded, alteration of hearth to stone slab, installation of first floor fire resistant wall, and installation of first floor fire doors.</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/0557/LB Decision: Decision Date: Proposal: Installation of non-illuminated 1x fascia sign, 1x post mounted sign, 2x painted mural signs, 1x vinyl wall mounted sign, 2x wall mounted signs and 1x lockable poster case and three gold lanterns and two upward facing LED floodlights to facilitate signs</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 6 April 2021 Site Notice Expiry Date: 27 April 2021 Press Advert Display Date: 24 March 2021 Press Advert Expiry Date: 16 April 2021		
Summary of neighbour responses	None received		
Consultees and responses	Hatfield Town Council – no response HCC Historic Environment Advisor – no comment Conservation Consultant - <i>The proposals are considered to result in 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of both the listed building and the Conservation Area and paragraph 196 of the NPPF should be applied. Paragraph 193 affords great weight to the conservation of heritage assets. Consideration should also be given to Sections 16 (2) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 under which local planning authorities should pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing listed buildings and their special interest, and the character or appearance of conservation areas.</i>		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SADM15			
Main Issues			
Impact on the character and setting of the listed building and adjoining listed buildings	Section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act states that the local planning authority shall have <i>“special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historical interest it possesses”</i> . The specific historic environment policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are contained within paragraphs 184-202. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states: <i>“In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;</i> b) <i>the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make</i> 		

to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF outlines 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 it should be given. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that where proposed development will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, Local Planning Authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm.

Where the harm is considered less than substantial Paragraph 196 states that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The NPPF therefore does allow for a degree of harm to a heritage asset in particular circumstances.

Draft Local Plan Policy SADM15 is similar in these aims, where successive small scale changes that lead to a cumulative loss or harm to the significance of the asset or historic environment should be avoided.

The submitted design and access statement outlines the concerns for using timber for proposed sign B. Timber is considered to respect and relate to the public house and the modern materials proposed in signs A (aluminium), B (Signblok), D (vinyl) and E (vinyl) are considered to be out of keeping and detract from the public house and wider area. The proposed materials for the sign F poster case have not been submitted and it is considered the use of timber would be appropriate for the proposed poster case. It is acknowledged that modern materials are currently featured on the external elevations but it is noted that these works may have been implemented without advert and/or listed building consent.

Signs C1 and C2 are proposed to be painted onto the front elevation that faces towards Fore Street. It is considered that the proposed paintings are too large and prominent in this location and detract from the wider area. It is unknown if the proposed 1226 date on proposed sign C1 is accurate and the statement in proposed sign C2 is not considered to be in keeping with the public house or streetscene.

In regards to the proposed replacement of lights (I) to illuminate signs C1 and C2, it is considered that both the existing and proposed lights represent an unattractive modern feature which is out of keeping with the public house. The replacement of the existing lights in this location will continue the incompatible appearance of the lights with the public house.

In regards to the replacement and repositioning of the lantern lights (H) it is considered that similar design and positioning of the proposed lantern lights would not detract from the public house, character of the area or the Old Hatfield Conservation Area.

The proposed signs A, B C1, C2, D, E, F and I are therefore considered to result in ‘less than substantial’ harm to the significance of both the listed building and the Old Hatfield Conservation Area and paragraph 196 of the NPPF should be applied. Where the harm is considered less than substantial paragraph 196 states that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

	<p>The design and access statement submitted with this application does not identify any public benefits. Consequently, it is considered that public benefits to outweigh the identified harm do not exist.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the proposed development would materially harm the character and significance of the Grade II Listed Building. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy SADM15 of the Welwyn Hatfield Draft Local Plan; Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
--	--

Conclusion

The proposed development would materially harm the character and significance of the Grade II Listed Building and the Old Hatfield Conservation Area and whilst this is considered to result in less than substantial harm, public benefits to outweigh the identified harm do not exist. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy SADM15 of the Welwyn Hatfield Draft Local Plan; the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would materially harm the character and significance of the Grade II Listed Building and the Old Hatfield Conservation Area and whilst this is considered to result in less than substantial harm, public benefits to outweigh the identified harm do not exist. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy SADM15 of the Welwyn Hatfield Draft Local Plan; the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
2816-105		Block Plan	22 February 2021
4		Existing Plans	23 February 2021
		Site Location Plan	10 March 2021
1	A	Proposed Plans	10 March 2021
2	A	Proposed Plans	10 March 2021
3	A	Proposed Plans	10 March 2021

1. POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

The decision has been made taking into account, where practicable and appropriate the requirements of paragraph 38 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 Mark Peacock
5 May 2021