



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2007

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Date: 8 June 2007

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2034429**

**31-33 Monmouth Street, London, WC2H 9DD.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Kiely Rowan PLC against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application (Ref 2006/1830/P), dated 12 April 2006, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2006.
- The development proposed is described as "adding moulding and new signage to shopfront of 33 Monmouth Street to match 31 Monmouth Street also removing a non-bearing wall at a basement level to combine both units into one."

## Procedural Matters

1. I have determined this appeal on the basis of drawings numbered OK2/PL01 to 07, 08A, 09 and 13A together with an un-numbered site location plan and a sheet of record photographs, number OK2/PL10, being those considered by the Council when making its decision. A more accurate description of the proposal before me is the *installation of new shopfront at 33 Monmouth Street and creation of opening at basement level to link Nos. 31 and 33 Monmouth Street*. I have considered the appeal on the basis of this wording.
2. The appellant proposed alterations including an opening at basement level to link the two shop units, the installation of a new shopfront at 33 Monmouth Street, including a new door next to the walkway leading to Neal's Yard, and the replacement of the street door with a fixed panel. I saw that these works have been undertaken. None of the parties have raised issues relating to the works of alteration other than the replacement shopfront. As it is only the alterations to the shopfront that would impinge on the appearance of the conservation area I agree that the other alterations shown on the drawings are acceptable.

## Formal Decision

3. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the installation of new shopfront at 33 Monmouth Street and creation of opening at basement level to link Nos. 31 and 33 Monmouth Street at 31-33 Monmouth Street, London, WC2H 9DD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 2006/1830/P, dated 12 April 2006, and the plans submitted therewith.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the east side of Monmouth Street with the building backing on to an alley that leads on to Neal's Yard. The appeal relates

to the basement and ground floor levels of Nos. 31 and 33 which are in retail use. The building although not listed is within the Seven Dials Conservation Area. The shopfront of number 31 is noted in the Conservation Area statement as a "shopfront of merit". The appellant has, however, indicated that the present shopfront may not be the one referred to.

5. The local planning authority's concern in respect of the shopfront relates solely to the height of the stallriser. The lowest part of it I note from the evidence is approximately 0.350 metres high which would be 0.050 metres higher than the minimum height of 0.3 metres recommended in chapter 2.9 *Shopfronts* of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). Nevertheless, the Council do not consider that it is in keeping with the historic form of shopfronts within the streetscene and furthermore it detracts from that at No. 31 which is higher.
6. I saw that there are a variety of stallriser heights in this part of Monmouth Street the majority of which are much higher and of more traditional proportions. The new shopfront, including the entrance door, is divided into four sections. The stallriser of the section adjacent to No. 29 (which replaces the door) is higher than the middle two and of a similar height to the stallriser of the next shop, No. 29, and accordingly relates well to it.
7. Nos. 31 and 33 are operated by the same retailer and painted the same colour externally. However, as the two shopfronts are separated by the alleyway, they do not read as one. The design of the new shopfront does not therefore in my opinion detract from that of No. 31, the design and detailing of which stands clearly on its own individual merit.
8. There would appear to be some value, particularly as Nos. 31 and 33 are run by one retailer, for the two shopfronts to be uniform in design. However, there is equal worth in their being of a different design as this, in my opinion, helps maintain the appearance of smaller independent retail units that I noted is the retail character of the area.
9. The two middle sections of the new shopfront at No. 33 have relatively low stallrisers. However, I did not find the new shopfront to be so incongruous as to detract from the historic form of the shopfronts within the streetscene or be detrimental to the appearance of the adjoining property, No. 31, and the character and appearance of the conservation area. I find this proposal therefore to accord with the objectives of Policies S1/S2, B1, B3, B4 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and the guidance in the Council's shopfront SPG as they relate to the quality of development, and the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of conservation areas.
10. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised I have decided to allow this appeal.

*Philip Willmer*  
INSPECTOR