

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>22/08/2006</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>01/08/2006</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Elaine Quigley				2006/2430/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
56 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RG							
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		<b>Date:</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
The retention of the shop front of existing retail unit (Class A1)							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		To refuse planning permission (pass to enforcement).					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		1 letter of objection received from Flat 3, 62 Marchmont Street raises the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of character with the locality</li> <li>• Removal of stallriser alters the relationship of the shop to majority of shops in the neighbourhood both within and out of the conservation area</li> <li>• Shop front should be reinstated in appropriate materials to enhance the historical and architectural character of the area</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		None required					

### **Site Description**

The application site is located on the south of Tavistock Place and is an end of terrace property that is located within a small parade of four shops. The site comprises a four storey building and is occupied by a retail unit on the ground floor with residential flats above. The site is surrounded by a mix of commercial and residential properties. It is designated within a neighbourhood area and the central London area and is within a strategic viewing corridor from Primrose Hill to St Paul's. Opposite the site is the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

### **Relevant History**

A complaint was received by the Council on 30/03/2006 regarding the new shopfront (EN06/0235). Any enforcement action is being held in abeyance subject to the determination of the planning application.

### **Relevant policies**

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

#### **Replacement Unitary Development Plan (July 2006)**

S1 and S2 'Strategic policies', SD6 'Amenity for occupiers and neighbours', B1 'General design principles', R8B 'Removal and replacement of shopfronts', B4 'Shopfronts, adverts and signs', B7 'Conservation areas'.

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (July 2002)**

2.9 'Shopfronts'.

## Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the retention of the existing shopfront. The shopfront has been constructed using an aluminium frame. Two glass panels have been inserted that extend in height from the fascia to the ground level. The entrance door has been retained in a central position within the shopfront.

The main issues to consider are:

- The impact on the character and appearance of the building
- The impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene

### Impact on the character and appearance of the building

The retained shopfront is modern in terms of its design and materials however the existing building is early 19<sup>th</sup> century. The removal of the stallriser has resulted in the loss of part of the frame that visually supports the building. Although not a listed building or within a conservation area, this modern shopfront would not be considered acceptable as it does not relate to the period of the building or respect the traditional features associated with a more traditional shopfront of this type. An enlarged stallriser to match the design of the adjoining shopfront would be more appropriate. The installation of an aluminium frame would also be considered unacceptable. A traditional timber frame would be more sympathetic to the building.

### Impact on the character and appearance on the streetscene

The parade of shops on this part of Tavistock Place are similar in terms of retaining original shopfront features including the timber frame shopfront and uniform stallrisers. The proposal has resulted in the removal of these traditional features and has introduced modern components. The loss of the stallriser disrupts the rhythm, proportion and visual coherence of the small parade and would be considered unsympathetic.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be considered unacceptable in terms of the design and materials and would be recommended for refusal. As this is a retrospective application the case would be passed to the enforcement team to investigate the unauthorised shopfront.

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***