



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2011

by **Vincent Maher MA (Cantab) MCD MBA MRTPI**

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 August 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/H/11/2148838

Prezzo, 17-21 Fore Street, Hertford SG14 1DH

- 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 Prezzo PLC against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/10/1980/AD, dated 16 November 2010, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2011.
 - The advertisements proposed are two sets of face illuminated text reading PREZZO and one internally illuminated projection sign.
-

Preliminary matter

1. The advertisements that are the subject of this appeal are already in position.

Decision

2. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this case is the impact of the advertisements on the amenity of the area and, in particular, whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hertford Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a prominent building with frontages onto two roads in the historic core of the town within the wider Hertford Conservation Area. Shop signage in the town centre generally comprises carefully designed non illuminated or externally illuminated fascia signs that respect the historic shopfronts and buildings to which they are attached along with modest projecting or hanging signs. These features contribute to the overall high amenity value of the town centre.
5. The contrasting colour scheme of the advertisements relative to the host building, reinforced by the extent of illumination, present as a strongly dramatic sign that stands at odds with the prevailing muted signage locally. As such I find the advertisements represent insensitive additions in a prominent location in the streetscape that harm the amenity of this sensitive location and, in doing so, adversely affect the appearance of the Conservation Area.

Other matters and conclusions

6. In objecting to the proposal the Council has referred to Policy BH15 from the East Herts Local Plan Second Review. As Section 38(6) of the Planning and

Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 does not apply to applications for advertisement consent, this policy can only carry the weight of a material consideration. Compliance with this policy cannot be a decisive factor in my decision.

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Vincent Maher

INSPECTOR