

ID Q4

1. Time limit for board display. 2. No ad hoc nailing posts to heritage conservation area building walls or timber frames. Boards to be fixed using a purpose made sign fixing method securely screwed. 3. Preferably all frequently let properties within a conservation area to be advertised with a single internal A4 size window sign. 4. Where adverts are displayed they must only refer to that particular property and not to any other property. 5. Dedicated council officer to be appointed to report infringements via email and if possible

111 telephone.

47 A complete eyesore in a historic part of the city. Needs addressing robustly.

A large part of Durham City conservation area is permanently blighted with rubbish bins, litter and vomit. The Letting boards just add to this. If you cared to look today, Friday, 3rd February you will see house after house with boards outside the them but most of those properties are already let with signed contracts for the next academic year, yet the boards remain. If those houses are not as yet let then it is a stark reminder that

56 Durham City conservation area is totally over supplied with HMO's

A problem which is probably more serious is the number of advertising boards placed on the footways which 74 can cause problems for the blind and wheelchair/pushchair users.

A study to establish how effective letting boards are would be useful and not difficult to conduct. The

113 University may even be persuaded to carry out such a study. They have the resources to do it

After many years of refusing to take these landlords on and support local residents, DCC have at long last decided, or appear to be taking overdue action. There have been many false dawns regarding DCC and this issue and far too much time has been wasted prevaricating over this issue. DCC should have more than sufficient evidence to implement option three as residents have been sending them evidence to support the

50 implementation of this ban for many years.

15 Any form of Regulation 7 Order would be an improvement.

As a city centre resident walking around I have observed the time of year estate agents erect letting boards (a massive range of agents and a massive amount of properties have done this before the agreed date - photographic evidence submitted to P. Glaister.) I have also done the same with let agreed signs (greater extension time than agreed in the code). Conclusions - 1. the boards are prolific, from most agents and a great blight on the appearance of the City. Durham sadly looks a mess! 2. Virtually all the agents flout the voluntary code. Following publication of the review in the press there was suddenly a rush of vans taking boards down demonstrating that agents do not bother to adhere to the voluntary agreement and only respond when there is public notice. It is disappointing that this is the case and there is a lack of care towards the appearance of the City. Please see my e mail to P. Glaister 9/1/17. 3. Modern students are very used to using the internet and could easily search electronic databases for properties without the need, use of resources and manpower costs of erecting boards. It is not uncommon for people to sell houses without erecting sale boards either, the use of them is not necessary. E databases could easily list relevant information of properties for student customers and be a useful source of this information for those collecting information for example number of properties exempt from council tax, numbers per household in properties and importantly a link person for each property should there be any issue such as poor

136 appearance of property.

As a lifetime resident in County Durham, and have worked all my working life in the City, I am acutely aware of the rapid decline in family occupation in the City itself. It has resulted in mass occupation by students in both single and HMO. The result is the visible stagnation of house image and quality; Durham City, in most inner City areas, looks shabby and run down. The regimented ranks of "To Let" boards reinforces the depressing look of the area, and its relative poverty. My view is that landlords student "To Let" boards should be banned in the interests of the residents, but importantly, in the interest of visitors and tourists to our City. I regularly take family and friends around our City, avoiding those terraces where these signs despoil the image of our City. Without exception, my visitors, from the south of England, Australia, Canada and the USA, comment on the look of the area, and of the effect of the University on the City landscape. There should be no need for boards, everything could be advertised online, with established Estate Agents or the University itself. In light of the conflict between the Authority, the University and Residents regarding Student
82 occupation, this is an ideal opportunity for DCC to support those resident in this now unacceptable situation.

As a long-time resident of Durham City I find there are problems with to let signs. My street and others around me are swamped with signs from late autumn time, unfortunately they remain far longer than they should, often the agents don't update and remove them when they should, and my street has also had boards or remnants of left in the street when weather conditions remove parts of them. Currently there are still 7 to let boards in my street of 17 houses, more than 4 months after being bombarded with to let signs. I have lived at my present address for over 20 years, there have been huge changes as we are swamped with Landlord/student properties and the street mess it brings , as a permanent and council tax paying resident I feel that myself and other residents are ignored and have now become invisible in the Durham
99 Council/Landlord/University triangle.

As an employee of the University and originating from Durham they are a blight on any vista ! everything should be pushed to online platforms, potentially using the Students' Union as a platform. my other big issue is pricing local residents out of the city center market, these properties are only ever filled 8 months if best
42 out of the year.

As one who lives next to a student house and in an area consisting of mainly student lets the area is blighted by student let boards. I chose to live in this estate as it is in a conservation area but that seems to be totally
19 irrelevant as far as boards are concerned

As there have been so many HMO's allowed in residential property in the city the boards which seem to be permanently there because of the length of time it takes for them to be taken down makes the city unsightly . Also Nevilles Cross bank looks like flag day at the moment every other house has a board it's seriously bad. Could I ask a question unrelated to the boards? As the HMO,s recieve the same services as homeowners I.e. Bin collections etc.do the landlords pay any contributions to general rates? They make so much money
117 cramming students into 3 bedroom houses. Do they pay anything?

At its meeting on 23rd JANUARY 2017 the NEVILLES CROSS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION [NXCA] noted the statement of consultation from DCC on Letting Boards and Regulation 7 in Durham City Conservation Area. It agreed that the voluntary code was not working and unanimously voted for Option 3 - that letting boards be banned altogether unless they get planning permission and that it supports the Council in approaching the Secretary of State to introduce an Regulation 7 direction to cover the Conservation Area. The NXCA also unanimously voted that DCC should seek to apply some local compulsory letting code, based on the current
40 ineffectual voluntary code seek for surrounding areas, such as Sheraton Park and Merryoaks.
137 Bank and treat as fly posting with Fixed penalty notices issued

Businesses should be allowed to advertise within the confines of the current law. It is not fair to take away an important method of advertising and risk local business (which are often small in scale i.e. one local landlord renting one house). Also, a law restricting premises advertising would amount to victimisation of one type of business i.e. shops, restaurants, pubs, bus stops etc...are allowed to display signs within the conservation area on an all year round basis. I live in Albert Street which has quite a number of student lets both on and around it. It is not the advertising boards which bring about unsightliness, it is instead the residents of the properties for example not cleaning windows, sweeping steps, leaving curtains drawn, leaving bins and other rubbish on the street. The To Lets signs are always neatly fixed, clean, well-maintained and removed once the property has been re-let. This is in line with other non-student properties which are bring let or sold. Therefore, I don't see why landlords who rent to students should be unduly victimised with regard to advertising. I see the current resident complaints as a desperate attempt to destroy the businesses of landlords, who they openly despise in comments they make at their resident meetings due to the fact the council, police and university seem unable to control the anti-social behaviour of student tenants.

Certain areas are worse than others and rubbish bins are constantly left in the streets for days after they have been emptied by the Council. Not only are they an eyesore but when knocked over they could cause a health hazard.

City of Durham Trust would also ask whether the (desired) ban could be extended to over all those parts covered by Article 4 Direction. -D. Pocock (Hon Sec)

Clearly the voluntary code does not work. The situation with the perennial display of letting boards has actually got worse in my view and these boards are a terrible blight on a UNESCO World Heritage recognised city!

DCC do not enforce obstructions on highways where there are currently restrictions, so why would I expect DCC to enforce restrictions on letting boards? Is this just going to apply to Durham City? If so why? Are other towns/villages not as important to DCC (e.g. Chester-le-Street)? Durham County is not just about Durham City, DCCC and Beamish Museum.

Dear Pamela RE: Letting Boards and Regulation 7 in Durham City Conservation Area. As councillors for Elvet and Gilesgate which covers the majority of Durham City centre the issue of the prevalence of letting boards disfiguring the appearance of residential streets has been a major concern for us and is an issue frequently raised by residents of our local communities. We were supportive of the Council in its attempts to reduce the excessive advertising involving the display of letting boards in the Durham City Conservation Area. However we did not believe that the introduction of the Voluntary Code was likely to resolve the issue of the detrimental impact on the character and amenity of our ward caused by letting boards. The Voluntary Code has proved difficult to enforce given continued breaches from some agents and landlords, and the limited ability for the Council to ensue with formal action. In view of this we would wish the Council to make an application to the Secretary of State for a Regulation 7 order to remove 'deemed consent' within the Historic City as limited by the extent of the Conservation Area. This would remove the current rights that agents and landlords have to display lettings boards without the need for consent, giving the council the power to decide whether boards should be allowed. The impact that letting boards are having on our ward and the wider Durham City centre is damaging to the appearance of our streets for residents and as important visitors. We also believe that to let boards are no longer an important marketing strategy for students to locate properties which will largely be done via the internet or the numerous student housing agents estate agents in the area. We support a Regulation 7 and believe that this will be supported by residents in our ward. Yours sincerely Cllrs David Freeman and Richard Ormerod Elvet and Gilesgate ward Durham County Council

Everyone uses the Internet these days, especially new students who may not live here yet.

For student lettings the internet should be sufficient in terms of advertising. There are far too many signs and the voluntary code is clearly not working. The position is only likely to worsen.

Given the Council's financial difficulties under the present government Option 2 seems certain to demand more staff time than is available.

Having the boards up all of the time (e.g. in Wanless Terrace) does look unsightly. However, I think there are more significant issues than this that should be tackled. For example, the advertising boards that litter the pavements (e.g. in claypath) which makes it hard for visually impaired or disabled users of the pavement to pass. Also the use of the pavement for parking.

How many people looking for a place to live go around looking for lettings and for-sale boards? Don't most people now use the internet? Or visit an estate agents office? Why then do agents continue to place their boards everywhere they can? Seems to me that these boards have more to do with advertising the agency itself than trying to sell or let a place. Living on a street dominated by these signs is depressing. A few boards are left lying around in gardens and back-lanes for months.

I am making this response on behalf of the Sidegate Residents' Association. I have not responded to questions 5 - 10 because I am not responding as an individual.

I am often in the city centre but have never felt that a letting board has adversely affected the ambiance. I can't believe that the lettings boards are commercially necessary as students must surely find most properties online these days. The boards mainly seem to be a competition between the agencies to show off how many properties they have and attract student custom. Students are pressured into signing up for the next year's accommodation very early in the academic year when freshers hardly know anyone else yet. The boards disfigure the streets and it would be good if they could be banned from areas outside the conservation area also.

I congratulate the Council on this initiative, and urge that ways are found of banning letting boards beyond the Conservation Area boundary to areas such as Nevilles Cross and Gilesgate.

I do find the term "To let to students" on boards discriminatory. It excludes genuine long term residents of the city and all but the young.

I do not see the need for these boards. Surely you search online or visit agents' offices.

I do not want the council to have to spend time enforcing awkward restrictions; the letting boards only create a panicked rush rather than meaningfully advertise accommodation: such information is online.

I don't see option 3 as being reasonable at all.

I have certainly noticed the increase of lettings boards on property over the past 12 months. It spoils the city and highlights the fact that the city is now the residence for students and all other residents have been pushed out.

I have noticed that many student houses have an A4 notice stuck on the inside of their front window, after the property has been let, to the effect 'House Taken 2017/2018'. These are either printed, presumably by the landlord/agent or sometimes handwritten - presumably by the tenant. These are presumably aimed at students still looking for accommodation, and as these notices seem to be on the increase, must be an effective means of communicating. Most students increasingly find available properties either via the internet, by word of mouth or walking around the student areas. Therefore, given the anecdotal success of A4 'House Taken' window signs, I suggest that 'To Let' signs are restricted to internal window notices as well. This would greatly reduce the negative visual impact, whilst still communicate the same, if not more, information, to prospective tenants.

I think all letting notices should be displayed online. There could be one website covering the whole of the conservation area, and possibly covering a larger area than this. All students these days use the internet on a daily basis. The website entries could include descriptions of the locations, so the students could thus compare various locations before actually visiting them. I personally think that no notices should be made available until the beginning of the second term of any academic year. First year students should not have to spend their very first term hunting for accommodation before they even know who will be the friends they wish to live with in their second year. Landlord and agents should remove their notices once a letting contact for any location has been agreed.

I think the lettings Boards are an eyesore. Some Landlords admit to leaving them up all year round even though the property is already let. Its not necessary to put boards up at all these days - I also have a letting property in Newcastle City where they are banned already and Landlords/Agents manage fine using the internet sites to advertise their properties to let. Jesmond in particular looks much better as a result of the
121 lettings board ban. Any 'half way' option would be impossible to enforce - must go for a complete ban.

I think you will find that it is the long established agents who generally abide by the voluntary rules. It is the new Agents and Landlords who have made their own boards who perhaps have no knowledge of the
127 voluntary rules or indeed just leave their boards up constantly for advertising purposes.

I worked in the University with students for over 30 years. Students living in rented properties tell those wanting to rent the following year about available properties. Landlords do not need to advertise other than properties they are letting for the first time. This could easily be done directly through the Colleges. No need
55 for agents boards.

I would like to add my dismay about these unsightly boards, which are unnecessary. These to-lets are mostly for students and they know where to find these properties. The strong winds we get can damage and send bits flying off of them. They make the streets look like they are unloved, which in turn results in the streets
97 being unloved. Please ban them!

17 If Option 3 not accepted then please go for Option 2 as the Voluntary Code has clearly failed.

i'm not sure letting boards are that important in letting out a property. Most students will use online
25 methods to find their property.

In addition to a ban of letting boards it would also be a good idea to apply council tax to the landlords of
11 student properties and to use some of these funds to target the associated anti-social behaviours in the city.

In addition to being a moderate eyesore, the current situation reinforces the current pressure on students (whom a large proportion of these boards are targeted at) to sign for houses early in the academic year. For over 7 years now I have seen that this causes many contracts to be rushed into, with students considering only a limited number of properties and only in the heart of the city, a contributing factor to the spiralling rents in the city centre. A ban on letting boards could therefore also form part of an effort to rebalance rental
59 prices across the wider city area, a much needed action.

In view of the failure to respect the existing voluntary scheme I feel the landlords have forfeited any right to further voluntary involvement and a complete ban is now necessary. There will be slippage if voluntary code
22 of any sort is allowed

129 Is all done online so why bother with boards which make the city streets look unsightly.

It could all be done online and students I feel would prefer to be able to browse through pictures of property facilities- rather than walk round the streets looking for boards. Also word of mouth from previous tenants is a common strategy. Boards left up too long and erected before reported date. Code not adhered to. Boards
89 do significantly spoil the appearance of the city.

It is clear to me that landlords have no intention of complying with a voluntary code - A Regulation 7 will
88 need strict enforcement until they get the message.

It is unfortunate that owners wishing or needing to advertise an individual property to let may be disadvantaged by a complete ban. It is regrettable that letting agents have disregarded any reasonable requests to limit the unsightly appearance of multiple unnecessary boards. There are alternative, more
79 acceptable ways of advertising properties to let.

It would be good if you could treat the cause rather than the symptom by restricting planning permission for
125 student lets, which are the main source of these signs.

its all mainly student accommodation within the said area and they can easily view letting ranges by going through the agents and websites or uni lettings. I think most people use online ways of searching for
122 properties like rightmove so is less of a need for physical signs these days.

Landlords leave these boards up over Christmas, leading to a potential security risk for the houses
81 themselves. The boards are essentially a 'please burgle this house!' sign.

Let by and sold by boards are just an advertisement for the agents and as such should be totally banned. For sale and to let boards whilst do serve a purpose in this day and age are totally superseded by the internet and again should be banned.

Letting boards are an eyesore and completely bring down the area. At the minute it feels like the city belongs to the university. Please I am urging you to consider the other areas of Durham plagued by to let boards, Nevilles cross, Gilesgate etc. It is not just the conservation area affected by this. We have to live next to a 6 bed HMO and it is bad enough the fact that the agent doesn't maintain gardens and property. A to let board would bring down the property and highlight the fact it is rented to students even more. Please do something for all residents in Durham.

Letting boards are an eyesore in the environment. They are completely unnecessary now that we have the Internet

Letting boards are no longer a significant means of arranging lettings: in this internet age they are pure advertising. They disfigure the City: visitors who were here for Lumiere were shocked at the number of boards. The voluntary code had been tried, and has failed repeatedly. There are so many agents and so many properties to let that even one board per agent results in streets with eight or more boards. A complete ban is the only solution that is fair to all parties.

Letting boards due to the amount of time they are left up are a blight in this community. I believe the only effective way to reduce the problem is to have a complete ban on their use in the city.

Lettings boards are an outdated eyesore in the internet age.

More and more letting boards are going up in the Durham City area. This attracts people taking photographs of properties and also advertises the fact that the students live in the properties. When it comes to selling properties people are put off when they know students are renting.

Most students will look for property via the internet or by going into the agents direct. The boards are more of an advertising medium for the agents.

Neither option 1 nor 2 would improve matters - it has to be 3. These boards are anyway redundant, since those wanting accommodation can always use the web in comfort or call at one of the landlords' agencies.

Does anyone wander the streets peering at lettings boards any longer? Their only purpose is to advertise the agencies' services by disfiguring neighbourhoods. High time they disappeared.

Option 1 has been tried and failed after a small number of estate agents initially broke the ban and then all others followed suit. Students definitely do not use the boards they're just advertising. The vast majority of marketing is now done via the internet

Option 1 has comprehensively failed, more so this year than in previous years. Option 2 will be very difficult to enforce: it is clear that currently letting agents are leaving "Let by" or "It's gone" notices up way beyond the two weeks allowed, helped by the fact that they can always claim that the paperwork has not yet been completed. Well maybe, in some cases, but not all of them. They will exploit similar ambiguities if option 2 is chosen. Option 3 is the only way, and it can't come soon enough. To-let boards are a twentieth century approach to letting property: these days students particularly and would-be tenants in general look on the internet. The to-let boards are essentially there to advertise the letting agents to prospective landlords, and to allow them to charge their clients for an unnecessary extra service.

Option 2 seems pointless as the present Voluntary Code is not working. I walk along a lot of Streets in Durham ie; Viaduct area and around the Bus Station and the number of these boards blight the character and appearance of the City Streets.

Option 3 is the only viable option. Landlords and Agencies will abuse any potential loophole. The Article 7 Regulation is a well defined and backed by legislation and case law. The area for enforcement needs to be extended beyond conservation area. South Road, Nevilles Cross Bank, A167 etc etc. are main arteries of the city which are blighted by these signs as much as the city centre.

Option 3 is the way the council must go. The voluntary code is obviously not working and neither would option 2. The landlords have themselves to blame for not ensuring that the boards are not a permanent fixture of their properties. They give an untidy and ugly appearance to the streets and roads of Durham, and particularly the conservation areas.

Student landlords have shown time and again that they have no concern for permanent residents, with noise, antisocial behaviour, rubbish, litter, and the way they have completely ignored the supposed voluntary code of practice. Legal enforcement is the only language they will understand.

The boards and many of the properties create a disgraceful site to visitors and residents both within the City and also its surrounding districts. An enforceable ban would be preferred, as most properties are now advertised on web sites, but it should be extended to the areas around the City, so improving the approaches.

The boards are erected mainly for the benefit of estate agents, and are usually left several weeks after a property is let to advertise the agent, rather than the house. Most actual advertising is done via internet sites. The boards are not necessary for the students, who use online methods. They are a free advertisement for the letting agents. If they want to advertise there are commercial means available to them : there is no need to deface the historic city area.

The boards spoil the environment and in this day and age with mobile phones and internet they seem unnecessary.

The City of Bath, also a World Heritage Site, has very strict control of letting and for sale signs, which is a significant enhancement of the period architecture. If Bath can do it- so can Durham.

The council need to support and encourage owner occupiers who will maintain their houses rather than let them go to ruin as so many HMO's are, this will bring more HMO's back into family use and improve run down areas, thus preserving Durham's character and providing a better image to visitors, with students catered for in purpose built complexes

The current voluntary code is clearly not working, so I do not see that there is any viable option but Option 3. I would also like to see some form of restriction put in place outside the Conservation Area, in particular Nevilles Cross, Merryoaks and Crossgate Moor, where this is also a problem.

The house next to mine was let out to 5 students, who took occupancy in September, 2016. Early in November, 2016, Rise agents put up a "To Let" sign. When I looked this up on their website, I discovered it was regarding the next let, for September 2017. The board was blown over in subsequent gales and was not replaced. Since most of the Durham students seem to rent for one year only, this would explain why "To Let" signs never seem to be taken down. A glance at the area near my home, Lowes Barn Bank/ Hastings Avenue reveals a proliferation of these unsightly boards - not to mention the recent "For Sale" notices which have now sprung up, as residents seek to escape from what estate agents are describing as a popular student area.

The huge and abnormal number of letting boards gives the impression that the whole city centre is generally 'to let' - which is resulting in the same fate of lack of investment suffered by many High Streets throughout the UK. It detracts from much needed investment of the type that will commercially re-vitalise this unique historic city and make it vibrant, rather than continuing to treat it as a University campus.

The letting boards appear to be an advertisement for the agent rather than for the property which are generally let by early December although the boards remain well into the New Year. The boards by Harringtons in particular seem to have no other purpose but advertising as they often just state that "It's Gone" in reference to the house.

The Letting Boards are unsightly and cheapen the look of the City and the World Heritage Site Area. They are not required as there is an adequate service/network of letting availability already supplied by the University and letting agents.

The letting boards ruin the look of the City from November onwards. A number of friends attending Lumiere commented that it looked as though the whole city was 'To Let.' The voluntary code has not worked and non compliance seems to have increased Year on Year. The target audience is young and digitally enabled so well able to use internet sites to find accommodation. I fully support a total ban.

The problem is that there are too many student lets in Durham. The planners need to approve fewer student houses. Local people are getting pushed out. Do something about it!

The students are well served by the online letting facilities available, the letting boards are totally unnecessary and damage the environment.

The vast majority of students use the Internet rather than checking To Let signs. My road became covered with the signs which is a major eyesore. Signs may still be appropriate for non-student properties however (if any still exist in the city centre!)

The voluntary code is completely ignored in my part of the city -- far worse than in previous years

There are a vast amount of letting boards which spoil our beautiful city

There is also an issue regarding illegal Estate Agent 'For Sale/To Let' signs (for non-HMO properties) that the Council needs to address e.g. multiple boards per property, signs mounted as a first indicator on land not belonging to the property (on principle roads or area frontages), and illegally worded signs (e.g. "It's Gone"). These blight the City just as much as student-related signs.

There is little need for letting boards in this day and age - people (particularly students) do not walk around looking for somewhere to live. Instead, houses are found through agencies or online. By their nature, lettings boards are designed to draw attention and as such detract from the beauty of the city.

There's certainly no issue with properties being let in the Durham peninsula area. We also have a plentiful supply of letting agent shops displaying advertising. I believe that a complete ban would not impact the ability of landlords to rent or sell properties.

These boards are an eyesore, especially in the streets that are very heavily 'studentified'. As a member of the university who deals with students, I can confirm that few students will need the boards to be aware of rental opportunities -- they use websites. Plus, I do find it offensive that many of these boards specify 'students only' and I wonder if this is legal. At the least it is annoying to local people further excluded.

These boards are not only an eyesore but also create a safety risk, with many boards being dislodged in high winds or being left up year round to deteriorate.

They are a blight to local residents and students alike. They pressurise freshers into signing sub-standard properties.

They are unsightly and advertise empty properties over the university holidays which could be a crime risk

This has been an ongoing problem and so much effort has gone into a reasonable solution/compromise with little success.

This should have been done years ago. These boards have been a blight on streets in the City for far too long. I fully support the implementation of option 3 as soon as possible.

VOLUNTARY CODE HAS NOT WORKED. SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF BOARDS IN STREETS WHICH HAVE A NEGATIVE VISUAL IMPACT. A PROPERTY SEARCH VIA THE INTERNET WOULD BE THE FIRST OPTION IF LOOKING TO RENT A PROPERTY. WALKING THE STREETS AND HAVING A LOOK AT TO LET BOARDS WOULD BE MY LAST OPTION.

Voluntary scheme has not worked. Durham is a beautiful historical city and these boards are a scourge; they are all that you see when walking around the city. I know for a fact they are erected on student houses when there is no need as there are tenants already in situ - they can be there for months they are there for spurious purposes and are completely unnecessary given the access people seeking accommodation have via the net and the numerous letting agents taking up space in the city. Please, please please ban them

completely.

We have lived in the Whinney Hill area for 30 years; the 'to-let' boards are ugly, far too numerous and in place for far too long each year. They disfigure the streets around our home year in, year out.

23 While I prefer option 3, if letting boards are permitted at all there should be no 'let by' boards

While this is not the most significant problem within the area, I regret the occasional proliferation of unsightly boards in neighbouring streets. This display does not befit a conservation area and seems

1 completely unnecessary in this day and age.

Whilst appreciating some form of control is necessary the compromised option 2 would best achieve this since the other options propose either do nothing or complete ban which would in my view be extreme and disproportionate to the scale of the actual harm created.

Whilst not an urgent problem, I believe enforcing a complete ban of letting boards is one of many minor and achievable steps toward improving Durham City's atmosphere. Additionally, banning letting boards may well reduce the chances of burglary whether there are tenants present or not, thereby reducing harm to persons and/or property. Even though my own residence is outside the conservation area, I think a total ban would help all residents within its remit. I look forward to additional consultations concerning aesthetic

62 enhancements of Durham's cityscape.

Whole streets of duplicate boards detract from the visual attraction of central Durham conservation area for visitors, residents and even students themselves. Online agent advertising is so common students can find out about properties available there. The proliferation of letting agency boards has been marked in the last 90 few years - so complete control is necessary.