

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		07/01/2015	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		11/12/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Matthias Gentet				2014/6883/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
9 Colonnade London WC1N 1JA				Please refer to the draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Installation of a rolling security shutters to front elevation at ground floor level [Retrospective].							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse and of warn of Enforcement Action to be taken.					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	45	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	1
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		N/A					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		<p>Marchmont Association has submitted one objection. Main issues listed as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about the negative impact the proposed roller shutters have on this historic street. - The roller shutters create an impression of a locality under siege, which is detrimental to the appearance and feel of the conservation area. 					

Site Description

The site is located within a 19th century narrow cobbled mews with a consistent terrace of typical Victorian two-storey London stock brick mews properties, built to be subservient to the more substantial houses in Guilford Street and serve those larger Grade II Listed townhouses to the south in Guilford Street.

The site is at the east end of the mews and is looking onto a more recent development consisting of 2 three-storey residential blocks and lies within the Bloomsbury Conservation area.

Relevant History

Adjacent sites:

8800604 – (granted on 19/04/1989) - Change of use from garage to storage use within Class B8 - 3-5 The Colonnade.

9000379 – (granted on 22/11/1990) - Change of use from garage lock-up parking to B1/Studio use - Unit 3-5 The Colonnade.

9000380 – (granted on 22/11/1990) - Change of use from garage to use as a motor car maintenance workshop - Unit 27 The Colonnade.

9200053 – (granted on 17/09/1992 - The redevelopment of the site to provide 16 residential units - The Colonnade rear of 12-16 & 19-28 Bernard Street.

9270011 – (granted on 17/09/1992 - Demolition of all or part of the rear extensions to 12 13 14 15 16 19 20 21 22 23 & 24 Bernard Street - The Colonnade (north Side) and 12-28 Bernard Street.

9502022 – (refused on 21/03/1996) - The conversion of the Bernard Street properties from a house in multiple occupation to flats, to include some demolition, and the demolition of the rooms and garaging to the rear and the development of three mews houses - 25-28 Bernard Street, together with garages known as 2-10 The Colonnade.

2014/6297/INVALID - Installation of a rolling security shutters to front elevation at ground floor level [Retrospective] - 3, 5 & 7 Colonnade

2009/4658/P – (granted on 25/11/2009) - Alterations to roof including installation of rooflights and solar panels and alterations to front and rear façades in association with change of use from hospital staff accommodation and garages (Sui Generis) to 9 residential dwellinghouses (1 x 1-bedroom unit, 4 x 2-bed units and 4 x 3-bedroom unit) (Class C3) - 11 - 23 Colonnade.

2011/3226/P – (granted on 04/10/2011) - Amendments to planning permission dated 31/03/11 (ref. 2009/4658/P) for alterations in association with change of use from hospital staff accommodation and garages (Sui Generis) to 9 residential dwelling houses (Class C3), namely to reduce number of residential units from 9 to 8 (4 x 2-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom), alterations to position of windows, doors and rooflights - 11-23 Colonnade.

2012/0845/P – (granted on 04/04/2012) - Details pursuant to condition 3 (windows and doors) of planning permission granted on 31/03/11 (ref: 2009/4658/P) - 11-23 Colonnade.

2012/6019/P – (granted on 14/12/2012) - Details relating to partial discharge of condition 3 (external materials and windows/doors of units 19-23 only) of planning permission dated 31/03/11 (Ref: 2009/4658/P) - 11-23 Colonnade.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS17 – Making Camden a safer place

Development Policies

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

Camden Planning Guidance:

CPG1 – Design –Chap 7 (2013)

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)

Assessment

Introduction:

The proposal is for the retention of security metal shutters with shutter box at street level to the front elevation. The application has been made following an enforcement investigation.

The doors have also been replaced without planning permission having been sought nor granted. CCTVs (x2) have been installed on either side of the shutters, right below the shutter box level without planning consent. However, in view of their location, the distance in between and amount (2 only), both cameras would fall under permitted development and would not need to be included in this or further application.

It must also be noted that shutter box and metal shutters at 25 to 31 Colonnade have been installed without planning consent. These, however, having been in place for more than 4 years, are likely immune from enforcement action.

Proposal:

The metal shutters and shutter box were been installed in March-April 2012 to provide protection to the ground floor level which is used for the storage of equipment for films/photography/media/advertising purposes, following a series of breakings, without the proper consent having been sought nor granted.

The shutters measure around 3m in height x 5.4m in width (double) and 3m in height x 2.6m in width (single). The shutter box measures around 340mm x 340mm x 5.4m in length and is installed at fascia level and no higher than the fascia above the adjacent door, giving a levelled appearance to the façade at ground level. The shutters and shutter box are not painted.

Amenity:

The history of the site suggests that the ground level throughout the mews was used as garages/garage lock ups in the 1980s-1990s, and would have been the trend at various units within the mews.

Change of use from garages to studios/business and residential have been granted from 1990s at a

number of the units including most recently in 2009, providing 9 residential units at 11-23 Colonnade. For the latter, care has been taken to have the units sympathetically refurbished externally to retain the frontages' character of the original use as garages. The buildings make a positive contribution to the appearance and character of the street scape and conservation area.

The proposed shutter box, though levelled with the adjacent fascia, projects forward of the building line breaking the continuity of the flat fascias on all the elevations of the south side of the mews and is contrary to policy CS14 stating that *the council will ensure and will require development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character*, and contrary to Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 which clearly states *that shutter boxes should be discrete and should not project forward of the fascia or obscure any architectural features. They should be concealed wherever possible, for example set behind or within the fascia panel, the guide rails concealed within the frame of the shopfront and shutter should be close onto the stallriser.*

The metal shutters are split in two, with guide rails at each ends and one in the middle, to accommodate the length of the garage style doors measuring around 5.2m in width and is contrary to Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 clearly stating that *where an external shutter is proposed it may only be considered acceptable provided it is integrated into the shopfront in terms of design, materials and colour. External measures should avoid using solid roller shutters. This includes the 'pin-hole' versions that rely upon internal illumination for any transparent effect. These designs have negative environmental impacts including: obscuring the shopfront and hiding window displays, attracting graffiti, preventing natural surveillance, creating a hostile and unsafe appearance in streets and shopping centres and being visually unattractive.*

It is to be noted that the above policies refers to shutters on shopfronts. Although the frontage at the site address is not a typical shopfront, it is however a commercial premises frontage, be it for the storing of recording/film equipment.

The metal shutters are up during the day but down at the end of business hours and throughout the night which completely obscure the garage style wooden doors contrary to policy CS5 which states that *development meets particular consideration including protecting and enhancing the environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local community*, and contrary to policy CS14.

The proposal is incongruous and gives a cluttered appearance to the terrace mews by breaking the continuous frontages and historic streetscape. The shutters and shutter box, in terms of size, design and location are not appropriate nor sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host and adjacent buildings and have an harmful impact on the appearance and character of the conservation area and street scape.

The objections from the Marchmont Association – as listed the consultation section of this report - is re-enforcing the concerns of the negative impact of the shutters and shutter box on the conservation and surrounding area, and the streetscape as detailed above.

Safety:

Although the proposal in itself is as preventative measure to combat incidents of anti-social behaviour, the presence of external security shutters has a tendency to in fact encourage and/or attract such behaviour. Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 states that *“External measures should avoid using solid roller shutters. This includes the 'pin-hole' versions that rely upon internal illumination for any transparent effect. These designs have negative environmental impacts including:*

- *Attracting graffiti;*
- *Preventing natural surveillance;*

Recommendation:

The proposed roller shutters, by reason of their location, design and external appearance result in incongruous addition to the building which harms the character and appearance of the building and the wider Bloomsbury Conservation Area, contrary to the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework Core Strategy policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework Development Policies DP24 (Securing high quality design), DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage).

The application is therefore recommended for refusal with warning of enforcement action to be taken to have the shutters and shutter box removed.

Serve an enforcement notice.

That the Head of Legal Services be instructed to issue an **Enforcement Notice** under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended to remove the solid roller shutter and officers be authorised in the event of non-compliance, to commence legal proceedings under Section 179 or other appropriate power and/or take direct action under Section 178 in order to secure the cessation of the breach of planning control

The Notice shall allege the following breach of planning control:

Installation of a rolling security shutters to front elevation at ground floor level [Retrospective].

WHAT YOU ARE REQUIRED TO DO:

1. Removal of roller shutter and roller shutter box
2. Make good any damage, caused to the elevation, by the fixing of the shutters and shutter box

PERIOD OF COMPLIANCE

The Notice shall require that rolling security shutters be removed within a period of 4 months of the Notice taking effect.

REASONS WHY THE COUNCIL CONSIDER IT EXPEDIENT TO ISSUE THE NOTICE.

The proposed roller shutters, by reason of their location, design and external appearance result in an incongruous addition to the building which harms the character and appearance of the building and the wider Bloomsbury Conservation Area, contrary to the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework Core Strategy policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework Development Policies DP24 (Securing high quality design), DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage).