

Heron Place  
3 George Street  
London W1U 3QG

Tel: +44 (0)20 7563 1000  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7486 7796  
DX: 42701 Oxford Circus North

[www.brecher.co.uk](http://www.brecher.co.uk)

## Supporting statement

### Application for Advertisement Consent

#### 174 Camden High Street London NW1 0NE

#### 1. General Planning Considerations

DATE:

YOUR REF:

OUR REF:

- 1.1. Within the wider planning framework there are some controls specific to advertisements. Shroud/banner advertising falls under the definition of an advert requiring express planning consent from the LPA.

In making their decisions the two issues LPA's can consider are:

- the impacts on amenity (visual, aural in immediate neighbourhood)
- impact on public safety

- 1.2 LPA's can formulate their own specific policies indicating what detailed considerations they will take account of. These statements should not be the only decisive factor and each case should be considered on a site specific basis. Camden's own policies and guidance on shroud/banner advertisements is acceptance on a temporary basis where shielding works to a building.
- 1.3 NPPF policy aims to achieve sustainable development and positive improvement to the built and historic environment. Paragraph 67 states *"only advertisement which will clearly have an appreciable impact on a building or their surroundings should be subject to the LPA's detailed assessment."*
- 1.4 Paragraph 154 of Circular 03/2007 specifically relates to shrouds and large wrap advertisements and states *"that Buildings which are being renovated or are undergoing major structural work and which have scaffolding or netting round them may be potential temporary sites for shroud advertisements or large wrap advertisements covering the face, or most of the face, of the building. In all cases express consent will be required for these advertisements which can remain in place until the scaffolding or netting is removed. These advertisements should be considered on a site specific basis taking account of amenity and public safety issues."*

#### 2. Relevant site specific issues and considerations

- 2.1 With this application the only consideration in planning policy terms is that of impact on visual amenity as was the case regarding the original temporary consent as granted. This all needs to be considered fully in the context of the temporary nature of the application for 5 months only. The relevant planning considerations have to balance the benefit that the shroud obscures the

transitional state of repair of the building. From the history of the case public safety is not an issue for consideration.

- 2.2 The application is sought only for a further 5 month temporary period. The banner/shroud has been in situ for 1 year with the benefit of consent (Document 1) which is not a long period of time in the context of the refurbishment building works required.
- 2.3 Unfortunately there have been some set backs to the schedule of works/timetable from Titchfield Construction that was originally submitted in a letter dated 14th Feb 2011. (Document 2)) with the previous application (consent ref 2011/1728/A).
- 2.4 The main work that needs to be finished as confirmed by the landlord is the roof work as per the schedule of works. The estimate at the end of page.2 of the schedule for doing these works is roundabout 4 months. As with most building projects they rarely go entirely to schedule and other works have taken longer than expected. The Council were fully appraised by the planning agent last summer (Document 3) of the initial difficulties in erecting the scaffolding.
- 2.5 The contractors are now doing the preliminary checks on the roof and think they will have completed the necessary works as per the schedule, albeit later than originally envisaged. The contractors do think they will have completed the works within the period of extension applied for.
- 2.6 Titchfield, the Contractor states that as it's an old building it is not unusual for them to constantly be finding unanticipated problems and realistically they will need the scaffold in place for a further 5 months from the beginning of July 2011.
- 2.7 The works have been significantly hampered by the weather in particular lately the rain. This has not allowed the contractor to move ahead as originally planned especially with the roof works. The contractor and landlord have commented with the Olympics coming up there are not entirely sure of the implications of site access during this period.
- 2.8 The landlord has also confirmed that substantial refurbishment works have already been carried out and are continuing. The Council are aware of and acknowledge refurbishment works have taken place during the last year. Ongoing works to the building will be revealed when the scaffolding eventually comes down. These works will enhance the area and buildings appearance. The revenue generated from the lettings for the banner is contributing towards funding of these refurbishment works.
- 2.9 It is accepted that the shroud/banner is in a prominent position but this itself does not mean it's continuation for a temporary period of a few months is visually unacceptable in planning terms. The Council planning officer's report on 2011/1728/A on the approved temporary permission (Document 4) refers to the similarities between the scheme and the recent one at 187 Camden High Street, in particular in terms of the locality aspects of its prominent position, highly trafficked and pedestrianised street scene in a vibrant bustling commercial area. The Inspector in Appeal ref: APP/X5210/H/08/2091485 (Document 5) concluded at paragraph 6 that the shroud on that building "*would form an acceptable temporary addition to the townscape*". The Council quite properly considered how unreasonable it would have been to refuse to grant the first temporary permission at the application site in view of the Inspectors conclusions re number 187 Camden High Street. The same considerations need to be taken into account in respect of this application.

- 2.10** The shroud provides a facade imaging of the building underneath giving it the street visual context. The Inspector re the second appeal on 187 Camden High Street (APP/X5210/H10/2139181) (**Document 6**) at paragraph 3 of his decision letter wrote “*that the justification for the continued display would be that it enlivens the vista whilst works takes place*”. This point is equally applicable to 174 Camden High Street.
- 2.11** The site /property is within a prominent tourist location. The Worlds End pub on the ground floor of the building has a long history and is a landmark attracting visitors to the area. Refurbishment works were always envisaged taking place under the original temporary consent close to the start of the Olympics and in the busy summer tourist months. It is the applicant’s view that it will be visually better for the locality for the shroud to remain in situ incorporating the facade imaging, certainly during the Olympics and summer months, rather than to have the building unveiled in an uncompleted state of repair.

**Rachel Lee**

**Planning Solicitor**

**Brecher Solicitors**

**Acting as agent for the applicant**

**27.6.12**

**Supporting Statement accompanying list of documents**

**174 Camden High Street  
Advertisement Consent Application**

**Document 1** – 2011/1728/A Planning Decision dated 28 June 2011

**Document 2** – Letter to Mr Bridge from Titchfield Group re World's End Pub dated 14 February 2011

**Document 3** – Copy of e-mail correspondence with Camden Council dated 15 July 2011 and 29 July 2011

**Document 4** – Planning Officer (Ben Le Mare's) Delegated Report regarding application number 2011/1728/A.

**Document 5** – Appeal Decision for 187 Camden High Street, decision date: 30.03.11. (Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/H/08/2091485)

**Document 6** – Appeal Decision for 187 Camden High Street, decision date: 10.02.11. (Appeal Ref. APP/X5210/H10/2139181)