

28/11/15

NOTE

Dear Councillor Apat

10 HIGHGATE ROAD, NWS - 2015/6040/E
Retrospective application

- ✓ In view of the recent general enquiry re coordination of "planning and waste/recycling storage" with your Cabinet portfolio & KT Ward Councillor — you may wish to input on this application that is about to be determined.
- ✓ This is historically a typical example where small scale changes lead to future problems. A holistic approach to stop future violations occurring at this planning stage can be of invaluable help to enforcement teams and administrative efficiency.

Regards



54, NWS IDN

27 November 2015

Matthias Gentet
Planning Solutions Team, Development Management
Regeneration and Planning
London Borough of Camden
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

Dear Matthias Gentet

2015/6040/P, 10 Highgate Road, NW5
Retrospective application for new shopfront to **A1 Use Class** premises

Further to our telephone conversation, please take note of the following objections:

Application submission details:

Description: - Use Class A1

Change of Use:

There is no mention of a change of Use Class. The application is registered as **A1**. A previous application **2010/2228/P** for a proposed Use Class change to **A5 hot food take-away** was **refused**. It appears that the premises currently provide both hot food take away and hot food for consumption on the premises. Should this retrospective application not clarify/regulate its use? This is crucial in relation to assessing the provision for **Waste and Recycling Storage**. We note in this respect the application form item 7 box No and Yes ticked, and "as existing". If a Change of Use is needed then this application should be withdrawn and resubmitted, as it would not merely be a "new shopfront" application. Note: There have been similar uncoordinated planning applications in Kentish Town whereby subsequently enforcement has limited power to resolve, due to lack of clarity, when violations occur. A ground floor plan internal arrangement is needed to assess if **adequate space provision for such storage within the curtilage of the premises**, as per Council's policies, is provided. This application provides no such detail. There increasingly is a problem with refuse left out on the public pavement in this stretch of the road, often accumulating over days. The pavement here has substantial footfall at certain times of day and is located by the side of the southbound bus stop where passengers wait and alight. Similarly, does a **rear ventilation duct installation** need consent?

Submitted Drawings:

Drawing 586/1, noted as 'as-built' on the on-line application list, is actually labelled 'as existing'. Also both submitted drawings are undated, which often leads to archival reference confusion. The elevation does not show the original shopfront that was removed without consent. This is misleading, as there was a stallriser before. In a recent similar application in Kentish Town Road, the original configuration of the shopfront had to be submitted. Photos of the original shopfront were lodged a few years ago with a previous retrospective advert and/or solid shutter application; both refused and dismissed on Appeal.

Consultation:

Neighbouring details show a long list of notifications, all to properties on the same side, who have no view onto the building's front elevation. Those opposite in the listed terrace, mainly residential, with a direct view and more likely affected by the visual impact, also after dark, are not consulted.

Cont. . .

Objections and comments:

1. **Original shopfront:** The submitted drwg 586/1 labelled "existing" does not show the original shopfront, which was removed by the applicant without planning consent. This original shopfront had a stallriser. See above.
2. **Design:** Adjacent premises No 8 and the recent consent for no 6 Highgate Road (2014/3517/P) have, in the former and proposed in the latter, a timber shopfront with stallriser. It seems appropriate that this small unit should be designed in the context of its similarly sized neighbours, particularly in respect to the setting of the listed row of buildings opposite. Full glazing seems out of character within the scale and visual balance of Nos 6-10.
3. **Setting/context:** The premises sit across from a significant row of listed buildings and although the building itself is not in a conservation area, the unit's design should be viewed in this wider context, both during day and its impact after dark. The buildings opposite are primarily residential. The listed buildings start with The Bull and Gate PH; 1-7 Highgate Road; the Forum; and to/including the Church. Proposals are also in train to extend the footprint of the Kentish Town CA up into this part of Highgate Road. Highgate Road historically was the early route out of London to the North and is lined with early development, where many of the buildings are listed running from this point, right up and into Highgate Village.
4. **Fascia board and Projecting sign:** The fascia "as proposed" is shown reduced in height, but with a depth still bulky as it shows in drwg 586/2 section it still housing the shutter box(?). The projecting sign is not shown on the drawing, but we understand this is to be lowered to relate to the ground floor according to Council design policy.

Yours sincerely



E Howard
54 Twisden Road, NW5 1DN

cc Cllr Merik Apak