|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Delegated Report | Analysis sheet |  | Expiry Date:  | 1. 02/02/2017
2. N.A
 |
| N/A  | **Consultation Expiry Date:** | 1. 29/12/2016
2. N.A
 |
| Officer | Application Number |
| Anna Roe | 1. 2016/6241/L
2. 2016/6611/A
 |
| Application Address | Drawing Numbers |
| 43 Monmouth StreetLondonWC2H 9EW | Please refer to final decision notice. |
| PO 3/4  | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature |
|  |  |  |  |
| Proposal |
| A & B. Erection of three canvas awnings to the properties Monmouth Street frontage. |
| Recommendation: | Refuse Listed Building Consent1. Refuse Advertisement Consent
 |
| **Application Type:** | 1. Listed Building Consent
2. Advertisement Consent
 |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Draft Decision Notice |
| Informatives: |
| Consultations |
| Adjoining Occupiers:  | No. notified | **00** | No. of responses | **02** | No. of objections | **02** |
| Summary of consultation responses*(Officers response italicized):* | Site notice (republished) - Newspaper advertisement - The owner/occupier of 21 Mercer Street objected to the application on the following grounds: 1. Reduced amenity for pedestrians - The awnings are black and make the space under them very dark. They hang at quite a steep angle with the fronts not far above people’s heads. When the pub put them up without permission in the past I felt that I could not walk under them, and was pushed out towards the edge of the pavement. If there were bicycles parked on the rack then there was very little room left and I sometimes could not pass by. In the end I crossed the road rather than having to deal with all this. As I live very close by, this was sometimes several times a day. It is even more unfair to disabled people like my parents, who both walk with sticks and have to shuffle along with poor balance. They need all the clear pavement width that they can get, and should not be faced with trying to walk through a dark space under a black awning, filled with people drinking and smoking.
2. The awnings detract from the appearance of the historic building and particularly in its historic context. The awnings block out parts of the frontage of any building, which matters when the building has a lot of detail which would be broken up, as in this case.
 |
| Local groups comments: | The Covent Garden Community Association objected to the application on the following grounds:1. The Dials itself is a unique setting – the centre-piece of the conservation area – and the Crown is one of only two buildings whose scale remains the same as c. 1693.
2. Proposed awning’s size and location would be an incongruous addition to the building.
3. This results in a visually unattractive appearance that is inappropriate in the Conservation Area, as it results in visual clutter and detracts from the area’s character.
4. The proposed awnings are also inappropriate for a listed building and would result in harm to the special interest of the building.
5. The awnings also result in the pavement below being commandeered for commercial use, with pedestrians believing they cannot walk under them. Further, when bicycles are parked at the adjacent racks, pedestrians have no choice but to walk under them, which is intimidating, in part because the awnings are low-hanging and extend well into the pavement and with vertical drinkers and smokers from the pub crowded under them.
 |
| Site Description  |
| The application site is the Crown Public House. The property is located in the Seven Dials Conservation Area and occupies a highly prominent position in the aforementioned Conservation Area fronting onto Seven Dials. The building is Grade II Listed and the current appearance is the result of a mid-19th century redesign by eminent theatre architects Finch Hill and Paraire. This includes a late 19th century glazed tile pub exterior at the ground floor level, with paired Corinthian pilasters rising from the first floor level with console bracketed cornices alternating with pedimented windows.  |
| Relevant History |
| 2007/1234/P - Installation of awning on the elevation fronting Monmouth Street to the existing pub (A4 Use). Refused 04/07/2007.2007/1236/L - Works associated with installation of awning on elevation fronting Monmouth Street to existing pub (A4 use). Refused 04/07/2007. 2016/5013/L - Replacement of existing signage, lanterns and chalkboards. Granted 22/12/2016.2016/5012/A - Display of 3 x externally illuminated fascia and 2 x non-illuminated projecting signs. Granted 22/12/2016. 2016/2550/TC - 3 Tables and 12 Chairs, Monday to Sunday: 10:00 to 22:00, Renewal Application. Granted 13/02/2017. |
| Relevant policies |
| **Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as** **amended)****National Planning Policy Framework 2012** **The London Plan 2016****Transport for London Pedestrian Comfort Level Guidance for London 2010****Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010**CS1 Distribution of growthCS5 Managing the impact of growth and developmentCS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritageCS17 Making Camden a safer place **Camden Development Policies 2010** DP12 Supporting strong centres and managing the impact of food, drink, entertainment and other town centre usesDP24 Securing high quality design DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours DP30 Shopfronts**Camden Planning Guidance** CPG1 Design 2015, Chapter 2, 7, 8, 9.CPG6 Amenity 2013**Conservation Area Statement Seven Dials (Covent Garden), 1998****Draft Camden Local Plan 2015**D1 DesignD2 Heritage**Camden Streetscape Design Manual 2005** |
| Assessment |
| 1. **Proposal**
	1. The development proposals comprise the installation of three canvas black retractable awnings to the window openings between glazed brick pilasters on the western (Monmouth Street) elevation. The three awnings would all measure 2.25 metres deep by 3.35 metres, 1.60 metres and 1.40 metres wide respectively.
	2. The heritage statement makes reference to a removable black canvas barrier surrounding a seating area at street level, however there is no mention of this on the application form and it is not shown on the propose plans.
2. **Approval**

The Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 permits the Council to consider amenity and public safety matters in determining advertisement consent applications. The main issues in this application are:* The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building, the conservation area and the special interest of the listed building;
* Public safety
1. **Impact on the character and appearance of the building, the conservation area and the**

**special interest of the listed building*** 1. Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards for development; whilst Camden Planning Guidance for Design (CPG1) advises that good quality advertisements respect the architectural features of the host building and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
	2. Policy DP30 states that shopfronts form an essential part of the character and attractiveness of many areas in Camden, in particular its centres, and contribute to the creation of vibrant streets and public spaces. Camden seeks to protect existing shopfronts that make a highly significant contribution to the appearance of an area, for example through their architectural or historic merit. Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design), Chapter 7 (Shopfronts) states that retractable awnings should not obscure or otherwise damage the fascia and other important features of a shopfront or building.
	3. The existing façade is considered to be a well composed design and occupies a highly prominent position facing onto Seven Dials. By virtue of the listing, the building is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Seven Dials Conservation Area.
	4. The proposed retractable awning and external housing is considered to be unacceptable. The projecting blind boxes would add jarring clutter to the façade. The awning (when extended) would be a prominent feature and would heavily reduce views of the building, obscuring the capitals, in particular the slimmer central capital between the second and third pilasters, the transom lights and the freeze pattern between the fascia and the transform lights.
	5. The listed building and Seven Dials Conservation Area are designated heritage assets to which the proposal would cause harm counter to the development plan and the NPPF. The proposal would not reach the high hurdle of substantial harm; however, though less than substantial, the NPPF states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 134 of the Framework indicates that such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. The appellants have not identified any public benefits that would be sufficient to outweigh the harm.
	6. For the above reasons, the proposal would result in harm to the listed building and character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would conflict with the objective to conserve Camden’s heritage set out in CLDP Policy DP25 and in the NPPF.
1. **Public Safety**
	1. Policy DP21 requires development proposals to avoid disruption to the highway network, its function, causing harm to highway safety, hindering pedestrian movement and unnecessary clutter as well as addressing the needs of vulnerable users.
	2. Permission has previously been approved for an outside seating area in front of the pub on Monmouth Street (application ref. 2016/2550/TC dated the 13/02/2017).
	3. CPG1 chapter 7 states that canopies should be designed to ensure public safety incorporating a minimum of 2.3 metres between the bottom of the blind and the pavement and incorporating a minimum of 1 metre between the awning and the kerb edge.
	4. The Council’s Highway Department have reviewed the proposal and consider that the awning would not be hazardous to road users or pedestrians and is compliant with the above guidance. As such, there is no issue with the public safety aspect of this proposal.
2. **Conclusions**
* **Refuse listed building consent**
* **Refuse Advertisement Consent**
 |