



# Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 June 2009

**by Paul Jackson B Arch (Hons) RIBA**

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

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
10 June 2009**

---

## **Appeal A: APP/X5210/E/09/2094423**

### **68 Heath Street, Hampstead, London NW3 1DN**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr Sam Nijhara against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2008/4365/L, dated 3 July 2008, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2008.
- The works are new signage and new projecting signage to a restaurant.

---

## **Appeal B: APP/X5210/H/08/2091034**

### **68 Heath Street, Hampstead, London NW3 1DN**

- 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 Mr Sam Nijhara against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2008/3321/A, dated 3 July 2008, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2008.
- The advertisement is new signage and new projecting signage to a restaurant.

---

## **Preliminary matter**

1. The signage has been installed and I have considered the appeals on this basis.

## **Decisions**

2. For the reasons given below, the appeals are dismissed.

## **Main issues**

3. The main issues in this case are as follows:

### *APP/X5210/E/09/2094423*

- Whether the signage preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area; and
- The effect of the proposal on the architectural character and historic interest of the property, which is listed Grade II.

### *APP/X5210/H/08/2091034*

- The effect of the signage on visual amenity.
-

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a public house erected around 1898. It has a distinctive 'arts and crafts' architectural style with a granite and portland stone ground floor surmounted by 3 floors of banded brick and portland stone. The steeply pitched roof and symmetrical street elevation adds to its impressive appearance seen from the central area of Hampstead towards a curve at the top of Heath Street.
5. The central 'Megna' sign consists of cut lettering with a mainly flat shiny metallic finish mounted on a rudimentary welded metal frame resembling stainless steel. The projecting sign is made of metallic lettering mounted on blue plastic. Both signs are illuminated by tubular fittings above the signs.
6. I consider that the size of the lettering of the centrally mounted sign distracts from the architectural character of the building by largely obscuring the prominent console brackets above the arch. The lettering is also of a style and finish out of character with the design of the building. Moreover, the 3 horizontal bars supporting the lettering run in front of the strongly expressed vertical pilasters and the stone mouldings that decorate the frieze above the window, partially hiding these features. Looking up at the façade, the projecting tube lighting fitting obscures the cornice moulding that separates the ground floor stone treatment from the floors above. For these reasons, I consider that the central sign is an unsympathetic addition that diminishes the architectural character of the building. Due to its prominent location in the street, it also fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.
7. The projecting sign is not large but is of an unremarkable and common type which is unsympathetic with the architectural style of the listed building; similar signs can be found on many ordinary buildings in other places. In addition, on approaching from the north it hides a large part of the frieze on the narrow frontage. In my opinion, due to the materials used and the overall design, the sign is conspicuous and insensitive, undermining the special interest of the building.
8. I conclude that the signage detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area and the special architectural interest of the listed building. It harms the visual amenity of the area. As such it conflicts with the historic heritage protection aims and conservation of visual amenity objectives of policies B4, B6 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan of 2006.

*Paul Jackson*

INSPECTOR