

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>12/01/2012</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	1. 15/12/2011; 2. 15/12/2011; 3. 22/12/2011
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Philip Niesing		1. 2011/5190/P; and 2. 2011/5191/A; 3. 2011/4630/L;		
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
281 KENTISH TOWN ROAD LONDON NW5 2JS		Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
1. Alterations to front facade involving 2x replacement CCTV cameras and 1x security alarm box to retail shop (Class A1); 2. Installation of 2x projecting signs and 2x external light fittings to retail shop (Class A1); and 3. Alterations to front facade involving 2x replacement CCTV cameras, 2x projecting signs, 2x external light fittings and 1x security alarm box to retail shop (Class A1).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		1. Grant planning permission; 2. Refuse advertisement consent; and 3. Refuse listed building consent		
<b>Application Type:</b>		1. Full Planning Permission 2. Listed Building Consent; and 3. Advertisement Consent		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>06</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	Site Notice 24/11/2011 until 15/12/2011 Press Notice 1/12/11 until 22/12/2011  No representations were received following public consultation.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	n/a					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the western side of Kentish Town Road, just north of Old Diary Mews. No. 281, the subject of this application, constitutes a three storey terraced property that dates from circa 1840 that has been extended at roof level by means of a mansard roof. The ground floor unit is in retail use (Class A1) and currently occupied by Dawson and Briant jewellers/pawnbroker, whilst the upper floors have been subdivided to form 3 flats.

Although the application site does not form part of a conservation area, the building was listed at Grade II in 1999, and features a good late 19<sup>th</sup> century shopfront. The site falls within Kentish Town town centre, which is characterised by a mix of build form, predominantly three storey in height, with commercial uses at ground floor level.

## Relevant History

1999 Planning permission and listed building consent were granted for the erection of a mansard roof and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor extensions (refs: PE9900348 and LE990895), which allowed the conversion of the upper floors into flats.

2010 A listed building enforcement notice was served on the property on 10/11/10 for unauthorised works to the building which included the installation of aluminium windows, alarm boxes, CCTV cameras and signage. The applicant appealed the notice but the inspector dismissed the appeal (ref: APP/X5210/F/10/2142955) for the following reasons:

Windows: The aluminium windows appear as obtrusive and visually harmful additions to this simple listed building, in contrast from the traditional appearance of a sash and case timber windows.

4x alarm boxes: The planning inspector allowed a centrally located alarm box, sited just below the historic black clock at first floor level, but considered the other three alarm boxes as obtrusive elements which detract from the window and historic shop frontage below, by reason of visual and untidy clutter.

2x CCTV Cameras: The planning inspector felt that the CCTV cameras exacerbate the visual clutter caused by the alarm boxes, in particular the grouping of elements fixed to the southern and northern end of the building, which are visually obtrusive and detracts from the historic shop frontage, sign and brickwork adjacent to the northern window. The inspector acknowledged the need for a CCTV system, but stated that 'these particular' cameras and their positions are most harmful to the character of the listed building.

2x Projecting box signs: The projecting box sign at ground floor level were considered 'completely alien when seen against the fine listed shopfront and historic traditional sign', which detracts markedly from the appearance of the building and is harmful to its historic character. The second projecting sign which was sited at first floor level was considered even more obtrusive than the ground floor projecting sign, given its size, location and modern design and appearance.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 Distribution of growth  
CS3 Other highly accessible areas  
CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development  
CS7 Promoting Camden's centres and shops  
CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards  
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage  
CS17 Making Camden a safer place

DP10 Helping and promoting small and independent shops  
DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction  
DP24 Securing high quality design  
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage  
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours  
DP30 Shopfronts

## Assessment

### Proposal

This application follows a Listed Building Enforcement Notice Appeal relating to unauthorised works to this listed building, involving the installation of aluminium windows, four alarm boxes, two CCTV cameras and two projecting signs. The planning inspector dismissed the appeal all grounds and refused to grant listed building consent for all elements, apart from a centrally located alarm box sited just below the historic black clock at first floor level. This particular alarm box has since been replaced. The officer's site visit confirmed that the following remedial works have been undertaken since the appeal outcome:

- The three unauthorised alarm boxes were removed from the building and the alarm box sited just below the black clock (allowed on appeal) appears to be different (slightly smaller) from the one the inspector saw; and
- The projecting sign at first floor level has been removed.

Both CCTV cameras and the projecting sign at ground floor level, below the pawnbroker sign are still in position and the unauthorised aluminium windows are also still in place.

The applicant now seeks planning permission, advertisement & listed building consent for two new projecting signs, 2no. replacement security cameras, the new alarm box and external lighting to illuminate the proposed signage. The aluminium windows which have been reinstated on the front façade do not form part of any of the above applications and the matter is therefore reported to enforcement.

### Amendments

The proposal originally included a third projecting sign at first floor level. However, following correspondence with the officers the applicant decided to reduce the number of signs by omitting this element from the scheme. Revised drawings were submitted.

### Impact on character and appearance of the area

#### Signage

The design of the signs themselves, provided they are painted timber, is considered appropriate, being a simple hanging panel mounted on steel brackets. Concerns were however raised by the Conservation and Urban Design team in respect of the positioning and total number of signs on the building, which would include the traditional pawnbroker sign site that is sited on the eastern side of the shopfront.

Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) seeks inter alia that signs relate well to the character, scale and architectural features of the building and respect their local context. It states in paragraph 7.14 that '*Properties should only have one main fascia sign and one ancillary projecting or hanging sign per street frontage, although two projecting signs may be appropriate in cases of large shopfronts stretching across two or more shop units. Too many adverts/signs on a property contribute to visual clutter and can detract from the appearance of the street scene.*'

The front façade of the building is relatively narrow, with a shop frontage of 5.6 metres, and it is not considered of adequate width to accommodate two projection signs without causing visual clutter to the detriment of the appearance of the streetscene. Moreover, the building is grade II listed and in accordance with PPS5, policy DP25(g) states that the Council will '*only grant consent for...or alterations... to a listed building where it considers that would not cause harm to the special interest of the building.*' It is considered that two projecting signs on this listed building are excessive and would contribute to visual clutter which would materially harm the special historical character and appearance of the listed building and the wider street scene. The impact of the proposed signage would further be exacerbated by the existing signage and other elements proposed on the front elevation, including two CCTV cameras, external lighting to illuminate the proposed projecting signs, a historic black clock at first floor level and a black alarm box sited below the clock.

The above view is considered to be in line with the planning inspectors' when deciding the enforcement appeal. Notwithstanding the designs of the proposed signs, which are an improvement to those considered by the inspector, two projecting signs on this listed building would not overcome the planning inspectors concerns relating to visual clutter and harm to this listed building.

The applicant is informed by means of an informative that the projecting sign on the right may be considered acceptable provided it is painted timber. Ideally if space permits the sign should be raised to fascia level without

it on the console bracket, in line with para 7.15 of the CPG.

### **Security cameras**

The two unauthorised CCTV cameras are still in position and the inspector referred to these as exacerbating the visual clutter on the building. Even though the inspector acknowledged the need for cameras on a jeweller store, it was considered that the particular cameras and their positions were “most harmful” to the listed building.

The proposal now involves replacement cameras, which would be much smaller bullet style cameras. These should have a significantly lesser impact on the building to the existing, and although no details were submitted with the current applications for their fixings (this could be dealt with by condition), the proposed replacement cameras are generally considered acceptable.

### **Alarm boxes**

The 3 unauthorised alarm boxes have been removed from the building (in line with the inspector's comments). It is noted that the proposed alarm box sited below the black clock is different from the one the inspector saw at the time of the appeal visit, nevertheless the proposed alarm box appears to be smaller than the previous one and is coloured black/dark blue which reduces its impact, and thus considered acceptable.

### **Light fittings**

Two small light fittings would be attached at first floor level to light the projecting signage. These would be small in size and coloured black and generally considered acceptable. However, since the proposed projecting sign on the left is considered excessive and unacceptable in visual terms, the light fitting proposed for its illumination sited between the traditional pawnbroker sign and the proposed CCTV camera would be pointless and cause unnecessary visual clutter. The applicant is that for the proposals to be acceptable the subject light fitting, i.e. the one on the left together with the projecting sign needs to be omitted.

### **Impact on amenity and highway safety**

The proposed advertisement signs, including the down lights would not be unduly dominant in the streetscene, disturb adjoining residents at night or cause safety hazards to drivers in accordance with the CPG1. In this respect the proposals are considered acceptable.

### **Conclusion**

The planning inspector concluded that the unauthorised alarm boxes, CCTV cameras, projecting box signs appear obtrusive and visually harmful to the historic character and appearance of this listed building. It is considered that the applicant has adequately address most of the Council's previous concerns as outlined in the Enforcement Notice and upheld by the Planning Inspector. However, the proposal includes two projecting signs, which would be sited below fascia level, on a single retail unit with not a particular wide frontage. This is contrary to the advice contained in Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design), which seeks that prevent visual cluttering resultant from too many adverts/signs on a property.

The subject building is also listed as grade II and it is considered that the proposal, particularly as a result of the number of signage and features on the front façade, would fail to preserve or enhance the special interest of this listed building. The proposal is therefore considered to be in conflict with the provisions of policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the LDF and should be refused.

### **Recommendation**

1. Grant planning permission;
2. Refuse advertisement consent; and
3. Refuse Listed building consent

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***