

Date: **1/10/13** Your ref: **APP/X5210/H/13/2204799** Our ref: 2013/3799/A Contact: David Peres da Costa Direct line: 020 7974 5262 Email: david.peresdacosta@camden.gov.uk Validation & fast track team Regeneration and planning Culture & environment directorate London Borough of Camden Town Hall Argyle Street London WC1H 8EQ

Tel: 020 7974 5613 Fax: 020 7974 1680 planning@camden.gov.uk www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Mr Godfrey,

# Planning Appeal by Premier Inn (Hotels) Ltd Site at Clifton House, 101 Euston Road, London, NW1 2BB

# Appeal against refusal of advertisement consent for the display of an internally-illuminated projecting sign at 2nd to 3rd floor level (Euston Road elevation) to existing hotel at Clifton House, 101 Euston Road.

The Council's case for this appeal is largely set out in the officer's delegated report dated 15<sup>th</sup> August 2013. This details the site and surroundings, the site history and a consideration of the main issue: visual amenity. A copy of the report was sent with the questionnaire, along with relevant policies.

In addition to the information sent with the questionnaire I would be pleased if the Inspector could take into account the following information and comments, including photographs with annotated location plan, before deciding the appeal.

# Summary of issues

The appeal site is a 9 storey building on the south side of Euston Road. The building has recently been converted and extended and has retail on the ground floor with a hotel on 1<sup>st</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> floor with offices above.

The location of the sign, extending between the  $2^{nd}$  and  $3^{rd}$  floor, would appear visually obtrusive. The sign, measuring 5m x 1.25m, is disproportionately large for the purposes of way finding / identification. Given the size and location of the proposed sign, it would represent an unattractive addition to the host building where signage is at ground floor fascia level only. It would be detrimental to the appearance of the host property and harmful to the street scene.

# Status of Policies and Guidance

The London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework was formally adopted on the 8th November 2010. The policies of relevance to the appeal scheme as expressed in the reasons for refusal are: CS14 and DP24 (The full text of the relevant policies was sent with the questionnaire documents).

The Council also refers to supporting guidance documents: The Camden Planning Guidance has been subject to public consultation and was approved by the Council in December 2011. Of particular relevance is CPG 1, chapter 8.

With reference to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policies and guidance contained within Camden's LDF 2010 are up to date and fully accord with paragraphs 214 – 216 (Annex 1) of the NPPF and should therefore be given full weight in the decision of this appeal. The National Planning Policy Framework was adopted in April 2012 and states that development should be refused if the proposed development conflicts with the local plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. There are no material differences between the Council's policies and the NPPF in relation to this appeal.

# The Appellant's Ground of Appeal

The appellant's grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The size, location, projection and method of illumination of the proposed sign are considered to be wholly appropriate to the host building and surrounding street scene.
- The nature of hotel custom makes adequate signage more important. As many guests will be arriving for the first time, a connection with the main street approach is essential. Many hotels in the area including the Pullman, Ambassadors and Travelodge have signage above fascia level to enable easy identification of the building for guests. Signage at fascia level affords little help to those looking for the hotel from any distance. A projecting sign which is above fascia level is important in building identification. Due to the mixed use of Clifton House for retail, hotel and office uses, and the limited ground floor frontage, it will not be easily recognisable that the upper floors are in use for hotel accommodation. It is important that the sign is illuminated so that guests who arrive when it is dark are able to easily locate the hotel.
- The signs are directly comparable to similar proposals granted consent nearby including signs at the Pullman Hotel and Travelodge.

# The Council's comments on the grounds of appeal

The Council does not accept the appellant's assertions for the following reasons: (the order of the comments reflects the preceding order of the grounds of appeal)

- The full assessment is set out in the delegated report. It should be noted that the host property is characterised by signage at ground floor fascia level only. The size and location of the projecting sign is not respectful of the host property. The appearance of the host property would be harmed by the proposed sign which would be unduly prominent due to its excessive size, obtrusive location at 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level, internal illumination and its projecting character.
- The size is considered disproportionately large for the purpose of wayfinding and identification. It is not accepted that hotels are a special category of business which cannot function without oversized signage. It is unreasonable to suppose the average guest will be unable to locate the hotel without such an obtrusive sign. The size, location and prominence of the sign suggest that the purpose of the sign is greater than that required purely for identification.

Signs are required to respect the form, fabric, design and scale of the host building and setting. A mixed use building is not a justification for an illuminated sign which is obtrusively sized and sited. Likewise the hotel's limited ground floor frontage is not a justification for an excessively large, obtrusive sign.

• The sign is not directly comparable to the only two signs granted advertisement nearby and cited by the appellants.

### Pullman hotel

Advertisement consent (ref: 2012/0851/A) was granted 20<sup>th</sup> March 2012 for the display of 3x internally illuminated fascia signs, 1x internally illuminated projecting sign, 1x internally illuminated canopy sign and 1x non-illuminated entrance plaque to replace existing hotel signage at 100-110 Euston Road The officer's report notes that the proposed signs would replace existing signs of similar size. Although it is accepted that the consented internally illuminated projecting sign was larger than the original projecting sign, the fact that a sign was already in this high level position (7m above ground level) was evidently a factor in the decision. The high level fascia signs (19m above ground floor level) were originally granted consent (ref: AS9904739) in 1999. The policy context has clearly changed significantly in the last 14 years.

### Travelodge

Consent was granted 13<sup>th</sup> February 2008 for an internally illuminated sign (measuring 4.6m high, 1m wide, projecting 0.08m) located 6m above ground level on the curved corner of a building fronting Euston Square. The sign was on a blank curved elevation of the building (with no windows on the first 4 storeys of the curved elevation). Unlike the appeal site, the sign, whilst above fascia level, clearly integrates well

with the design of the host property. Moreover, this particular sign was not a projecting sign unlike the proposal which is the subject of this appeal.

## **Other Matters**

On the basis of information available and having regard to the entirety of the Council's submissions, including the content of this letter, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.

If any further clarification of the appeal submissions is required please do not hesitate to contact David Peres da Costa on the above direct dial number or email address.

Yours sincerely

David Peres da Costa Planning officer Culture and Environment Directorate