



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2026

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd August 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/F/25/3359759

G P F Lewis Plc, Blue Court, 1 Church Lane, Kings Langley, WD4 8JP

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended (the Act).
 - The appeal is made by Miss Abbey Chandler (GPF Lewis) against a listed building enforcement notice issued by Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 24 January 2025.
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is without listed building consent and advertisement consent the installation of a projecting sign and 2 fascia signs.
 - The requirements of the notices are: For each of the items listed in the allegation, the following must be done; (1). Remove the projecting sign and the bracket. For avoidance of doubt this sign is shown in appendix 1. (2). Remove the fascia logo sign which is sited on the elevation that fronts the high Street, Kings Langley. For avoidance of doubt this sign is shown on appendix 2. (3). Remove the fascia logo sign which is sited on the elevation to the rear that fronts the carpark for the property. For avoidance of doubt this sign is shown on appendix 3. (4). Fill any holes arising from step 1 - 3 using lime-based mortar. (5). Remove any materials arising from steps 1, 2 and 3 above from site in their entirety.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 4 months.
 - The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1)(c) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the two fascia signs comprising lettering “gpflewis” and listed building consent is granted for the retention of both fascia signs at G P F Lewis Plc, Blue Court, 1 Church Lane, Kings Langley, WD4 8JP.
2. It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be varied by deleting Requirements 2 and 3.
3. The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld insofar as it relates to the projecting sign, and listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Preliminary Matters

4. The Appeal is made on ground (c), that there has been no contravention of the Act. The Act says (and I paraphrase) that consent shall be obtained for any works to a listed building that affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest. As will be seen below I consider that these works do affect the character of the listed building so ground (c) cannot succeed. However, as the Council have pointed out the appellant’s representations contain a hidden ground

(e), that consent should be granted because the works are not harmful. I shall deal with the appeal on that basis.

Reasons

5. Blue Court is an imposing brick classical villa from the 1830s on a prominent corner site as one enters Kings Langley. It was originally a residence but is now offices. Three signs have been fixed to the building, the lettering “gpflewis” on the eastern side and front façades and a projecting sign on the western side with the same lettering.
6. The Council are concerned that because this was once a residential use, any commercialisation, such as signage would be inherently harmful. I am not sure this is a valid concern, at least not as a general rule. Many listed dwellings now contain offices and similarly many commercial buildings have been converted into dwellings, there is no suggestion they should continue to be disguised as their former uses. The subtle lettering used on the two façades is low key and does not stand out as incongruous. The building as a whole still reads as a large villa that is now used as offices, which is what it is. Consequently, while the lettering has changed the façade no harm has been caused.
7. The projecting sign is a different matter. This stands out, particularly in views from the south. Compared to the size of the host building it is small and looks out of place, especially compared to the restrained elegance of the classical villa. There are no other projecting signs in the immediate vicinity and this adds unnecessary clutter to the side façade that does cause less than substantial harm. There would not seem to be any offsetting public benefits. In my view the projecting sign does not preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the character of the listed building.

Conclusion

8. I shall issue a split decision and grant consent for the two sets of lettering but refuse that for the projecting sign.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR