

**From:** [Mark Peacock](#)  
**To:** [Planning](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Hatfield. KFC Former De Haviland Building, Comet Way.16/1007/FUL, 1008/ADV, 1089/LB  
**Date:** 06 August 2016 09:05:43

---

Please record comments from the Conservation Officer.

Kind regards

**Mark Peacock BA (Hons) MSc**  
**Senior Development Management Officer**  
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

Council Offices | The Campus | Welwyn Garden City | Hertfordshire | AL8 6AE  
Tel: 01707 35700 | Direct: 01707 357249 | email: [m.peacock@welhat.gov.uk](mailto:m.peacock@welhat.gov.uk) | website:  
[www.welhat.gov.uk](http://www.welhat.gov.uk)

**From:** Andrew Robley  
**Sent:** 05 August 2016 18:35  
**To:** Mark Peacock  
**Subject:** Hatfield. KFC Former De Haviland Building, Comet Way.16/1007/FUL, 1008/ADV, 1089/LB

Mark,

I am unclear as to whether some of the signs that they are seeking to retain have consent or not. Would you please check this out and let me know if necessary.

As it stands, I will comment on everything listed and if some of them have consent already you can disregard them.

The first thing to say is that there is already an over proliferation of signs and I would not want to recommend any more unless there was a commensurate loss of an existing approved one. This is a cool modernist building and very much understated and it is very easy to overpower.

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 can't see any changes on the building except for respraying windows, doors and spandrels the same colour green. This is Ok but the green must be exactly the same. However the "Drive Thru frames" would be sprayed an unacceptable red. On the building they must be the same green or if they must have a contrast, the grey RAL7022 they are using elsewhere.

The doors that are shown to be resprayed the same colour as at present would be better in the same green but if they already have consent in the darker colour it is reasonably acceptable.

The new bollards should be simple but good quality and painted in the same green.

In reaching these conclusions I have had regard to **NPPF 2012 , paras 7, 8, 9 , 131, 132, 134; The PPG 2014, Historic England- "Conservation Principles" and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 1 , Local Plan R25, D6 7.37 SPD- Advertisements; Emerging Core Strategy CS11; The Planning( listed buildings and Conservation Areas )Act 1990 .**

**I would assume that you could approve parts of the advert application.**

**LB consent only applies to stuff actually on or touching the building. Therefore you could condition the colours of the couple of items that are n an inappropriate colour.**

**Not sure it needs planning consent but this is one for you.**

Andrew