

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	22/06/2017
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	02/06/2017
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Charlotte Meynell			2017/2487/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
Pavement outside 85 Chalk Farm Road London NW1 8AR			Refer to draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Installation of a telephone kiosk on the pavement.					
Recommendation(s):		Prior Approval Required – Approval Refused			
Application Type:		GPDO Prior Approval Determination			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	07	No. of objections	07
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed on 12/05/2017 and expired on 02/06/2017.					
	<p>Objections have been received from Flat 1, Stockholm Apartments, 86 Chalk Farm Road; 11 Stockholm Apartments, 86 Chalk Farm Road; Flat 5, 86 Chalk Farm Road; Flat 14, Stockholm Apartments, 86 Chalk Farm Road; Flat 4, 86 Chalk Farm Road; 2 Stockholm Apartments, 86 Chalk Farm Road; 32 Belsize Park Gardens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Location – The proposed telephone box would be located outside the front door of Stockholm Apartments, 86 Chalk Farm Road. It would be more appropriate if located on the opposite side of the road in the large pedestrian area outside Dominoes Pizza or outside a non-residential building nearby.• Anti-social behaviour – The proposal will create noise outside a residential property, encourage groups of people and potentially even drug dealing in an area that already suffers from noise and congregation of people late at night. The telephone box will attract vandalism, rough sleepers, and unnecessary foot traffic.• Heritage – The submitted information that the application is not within in conservation area and that there are no listed buildings in close proximity is factually inaccurate, as it is immediately opposite the Grade II listed Roundhouse.• Telephone usage – The proposal is unnecessary. There is already a phone box 50 yards down the road from the site; in this day and age everyone has mobile phones; if a telephone kiosk was not required in this area to date then it is certainly not needed now.• Advertising – It is simply an underhand way to display unnecessary advertising. We have enough street clutter. <p>Metropolitan Police – Designing Out Crime Officer objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed telephone kiosk may be abused for the purposes of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB);• It will cause a reduction in surveillance in the area. An offender may use this telephone kiosk to avoid CCTV or casual surveillance from other users of the street;• It would provide an opportunity for an offender to loiter in the area;• It may provide the opportunity for the posting of prostitute cards. <p>TfL objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scaled drawings have not been provided to show the exact position of the proposed new kiosk on the footway, the proposed distance from the kerbside, potential leftover remaining footway widths, and the spatial relationships with other street furniture and features in close proximity. The submitted drawings also fail to show how advertising would be orientated towards the highway. There is therefore insufficient information for TfL to assess the application in					

terms of highway safety, pedestrian and cyclist amenity, legibility and permeability, or fully understand how the installation of the proposed kiosk would impact TfL's assets, services, infrastructure and passenger experience.

Transport Strategy object as follows:

- In the absence of detailed design drawings that include dimensions of the proposed position of the new telephone box, it is unclear as to how wide the 'clear footway' width is once the proposed telephone box has been installed
- Any development that would result in a narrowing of the footway, whether this is from the telephone box causing a physical obstruction or from queues that may form as a result of the telephone box, will obstruct pedestrian movement and would therefore be contrary to policies DP21.
- Further to this, any new proposal that could hinder movement for wheelchair users (narrow footways) or interfere with the navigation for vulnerable road users, such as visually impaired users, will also be contrary to DP21.
- Any development that presents a safety risk will also be refused. If the proposed telephone box blocks sightlines, visibility splays, queueing distances and causes harm to highway safety the proposal would be contrary to policy DP21 and thus unacceptable.
- Street furniture, such as a telephone box, that is not seen as a benefit to highway users will be deemed as unacceptable. Given the infrequent use of telephone boxes it can be argued that instead of providing a service to the highway users, instead, they act only as a hindrance to pedestrian movement.
- The application is contrary to policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel), DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network), and DP16 (The transport implications of development), Camden Planning Guidance CPG7 (Transport) and Camden's Streetscape Design Manual. The application site is also situated in within the proposed Chalk Farm and Primrose Hill area-based scheme to improve the transport and public realm. The proposal is therefore deemed unacceptable.

The Council's Access Officer objects as follows:

There are a number of requirements for an accessible phone booth that need to be considered. These are all taken from BS8300 (current addition).

- A fold down seat (450mm to 520mm high) or a perch seat (650mm to 800mm high) should be provided for convenience of ambulant disabled people. Drop down arms should be provided for each seat.
- Telephone controls on accessible telephones for wheelchair users should be angled so they can be used by people when seated or when using a perch seat.
- Telephone controls should be located between 750mm and 1000mm above the floor.
- To benefit blind and partially sighted people, telephones should be selected which have well lit keypads, large embossed or raised numerals that contrasts visually with their background and a raised dot on the number '5'.
- Instructions for using telephones should be clear. They should be displayed in large easy-to-read typeface.

There should also be at least 1200, preferably 1800mm between the booth and any wall / girding opposite.

Site Description

The application site comprises of an area of the footway adjacent to 85 and 86 Chalk Farm Road, on the northern side of Chalk Farm Road. The site is directly adjacent to parking spaces which occupy part of the pavement to the south, and a bin to the south-east.

Although the site does not fall within a conservation area, it is located opposite the Regents Canal Conservation Area and the Roundhouse Theatre, which is a Grade II* listed building.

Relevant History

Site history:

None

Neighbouring sites:

100A Chalk Farm Road

2015/5363/P – Display of digital screen and non illuminated static poster panel to existing bus shelter no. 0107/0170. **Refused 22/01/2016. Appeal dismissed 06/06/2016**

Land adjacent to 1 Haverstock Hill

2017/1084/P – Installation of 1 x telephone box on pavement. **Prior Approval refused 05/04/2017**

Opp. Chalk Farm Station, Adelaide Road

2006/4003/P – Replace existing telephone kiosk with combined cash machine and payphone opposite Chalk Farm Station, Adelaide Road. **Planning permission refused 24/10/2006**

O/S 55-56 Chalk Farm Road

2017/2712/P – Erection of freestanding BT panel providing phone and Wi-Fi facilities with 2 x internally illuminated digital advertisements. **Full planning permission under consideration**

O/S 45-46 Chalk Farm Road

2017/0443/P – Erection of freestanding BT panel providing phone and Wi-Fi facilities, with 2 x internally illuminated digital advertisements following the removal of 1no. BT telephone kiosk. **Full planning permission under consideration**

44-45 Chalk Farm Road

2005/0605/P – Installation of a dual-purpose ATM/telephone kiosk. **Full planning permission refused 13/04/2005**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan 2016

TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London (2010)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 Distribution of growth

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS17 Making Camden a safer place

Development Policies

DP16 The transport implications of development

DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport

DP21 Development connecting to the highway network

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)

CPG7 Transport (2011)

Camden Streetscape Design Manual

Camden Local Plan

The Inspector's report on the Local Plan was published on 15 May 2017 and concludes that the plan is 'sound' subject to modifications being made to the Plan. While the determination of planning applications should continue to be made in accordance with the existing development plan until formal adoption, substantial weight may now be attached to the relevant policies of the emerging plan as a material consideration following publication of the Inspector's report, subject to any relevant recommended modifications in the Inspector's report.

A1 Managing the impact of development

C5 Safety and Security

C6 Access

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

G1 Delivery and location of growth

T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Confirmation is sought as to whether the installation of a telephone box would require prior approval under Part 24 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO. The order permits the Council to only consider matters of siting and appearance in determining GPDO prior approval applications. The potential impact on crime and public safety are relevant considerations under siting.

1.2 The box would measure 1.32m by 1.11m with an overall height of 2.45m, and would be located on the northern pedestrian footway along Chalk Farm Road, adjacent to 85-86 Chalk Farm Road.

1.3 It would have a powder coated metal frame with reinforced laminated glass on three sides, and a solar panel on the roof.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 Policies DP21 and A1 state that the Council will expect works affecting the highway network to address the needs of wheelchair users, people with sight impairments and other vulnerable users; to avoid causing harm to highway safety or hinder pedestrian movement and avoid unnecessary street clutter; and to contribute to the creation of high quality streets and public spaces. Policy CS11 paragraphs 11.8-11.12 and Policy T1 paragraphs 10.8-10.10 specifically detail the importance of encouraging more walking, and Policy DP21 paragraph 21.12 emphasises that it is important that development does not hinder pedestrian movement, and states that the Council will not support proposals that involve the provision of additional street furniture that is not of benefit to highway users.

2.2 Policies DP17 and T1 state that the Council will promote walking, cycling and public transport use and that development should make suitable provision for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport where appropriate, and paragraph 17.4 of Policy DP17 highlights that footpaths need to be wide enough for the number of people who will use them so they do not spill onto roads.

2.3 Paragraph 8.6 of CPG7 (Transport) seeks improvements to streets and spaces to ensure good quality access and circulation arrangements for all. Ensuring the following:

- Safety of vulnerable road users, including children, elderly people and people with mobility

difficulties, sight impairments and other disabilities;

- Maximising pedestrian accessibility and minimising journey times;
- Providing stretches of continuous public footways without public highway crossings;
- Linking to, maintaining, extending and improving the network pedestrian pathways;
- Providing a high quality environment in terms of appearance, design and construction, paying attention to Conservation Areas;
- Use of paving surfaces which enhance ease of movement for vulnerable road users; and,
- Avoiding street clutter and minimising the risk of pedestrian routes being obstructed or narrowed e.g. by pavement parking or by street furniture.

2.4 Policies CS17 and C5 require development to contribute to community safety and security, and paragraph 17.5 of Policy CS17 and paragraph 4.89 of Policy C5 states that the design of streets needs to be accessible, safe and uncluttered, with careful consideration given to the design and location of any street furniture or equipment. Paragraphs 9.26 and 9.27 of CPG1 (Design) advise that the proposed placement of a new phone box needs to be considered to ensure that it has a limited impact on the sightlines of the footway, and that the size of the box should be minimised to limit its impact on the streetscene and to decrease opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.

2.5 Camden's Streetscape Design manual – section 3.01 footway width states the following:

- “Clear footway” is not the distance from kerb to boundary wall, but the unobstructed pathway width within the footway;
- 1.8 metres – minimum width needed for two adults passing;
- 3 metres – minimum width for busy pedestrian street though greater widths are usually required;
- Keeping the footway width visually free of street furniture is also important, allowing clear sightlines along the street’.

3.0 Siting

3.1 The application site is located on a pavement measuring roughly 6.3m wide, although approximately 1.0m of the pavement width is occupied by parking spaces. This area of the footway experiences high pedestrian flows at peak times due to its location opposite the Roundhouse performing arts and concert venue.

3.2 Section 3.01 of Camden's Streetscape Design Manual requires a minimum unobstructed pathway width within the footway, known as the 'clear footway'. This guidance and Appendix B of TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, outlines the recommended minimum footway widths for different levels of pedestrian flows.

3.3 Policy DP21 paragraph 21.12 emphasises that it is important that development does not hinder pedestrian movement, and states that the Council will not support proposals that involve the provision of additional street furniture that is not of benefit to highway users. Given there is an existing telephone box approximately 67m south-east of the site along this side of Chalk Farm Road, there is not considered to be any benefit to highway users from this proposal. It is considered that the loss of any of the clear footway, would reduce pedestrian comfort, may lead to the discouragement of sustainable travel, and could have an impact on highway safety through interfering with signals, visual obstructions, visibility splays and leading to overcrowding. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS11, DP21, DP17, A1 and T1 and is considered unacceptable.

3.4 However, Camden's Streetscape Design Manual section 4.01, together with TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, states that street furniture should be placed a minimum of 0.45m back from the carriageway, therefore the proposal would result in the loss of a minimum of 1.8m of the footway. This would reduce the 'clear footway' to less than the minimum threshold, which would reduce

pedestrian comfort, may lead to the discouragement of sustainable travel, and could have an impact on highway safety through interfering with signals, visual obstructions, visibility splays and leading to overcrowding. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS11, DP21, DP17, A1 and T1 and is considered unacceptable.

3.5 As highlighted above, there is an existing telephone box in close proximity to the site and no justification has been submitted for the need to install a further one. Given the infrequent use of telephone boxes due to the prevalence of mobile phone use, it is considered that the proposed telephone box would act only as a hindrance to pedestrian movement, adding further clutter to the streetscene rather than providing a public service for the benefit of highways users, contrary to Policies DP21 and A1.

3.6 The application site is located within the project area of the proposed Chalk Farm and Primrose Hill scheme to improve transport and the public realm. The schemes aim to create a high quality place and improve pedestrian comfort and increase the safety of vulnerable road users through providing additional space for walking and cycling. The installation of a new telephone box in this location would add further street clutter to the streetscene, contrary to the aims of the proposed scheme, and the resulting reduction in the footway width may discourage active travel. The siting of the proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

4.0 Design and Appearance

4.1 Policies CS14 and D1 aim to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policies DP24 and D1 state that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, its contribution to the public realm, and its impact on wider views and vistas. Policies DP25 and D2 state that the Council will not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area, and that to preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will only grant permission for development that it considers would not harm the setting of a listed building.

4.2 The street furniture that presently exists on this section of the footway comprises necessary elements such as street trees, street lamps and bins which enhance the visual amenity of the area. It is considered that the introduction of a new telephone box to this relatively clear section of footway would severely degrade the visual amenity of the area through the creation of further unnecessary street clutter. Furthermore, due to its proposed location within close proximity to an existing telephone box, it is considered that the proposed development would add to the over-proliferation of such structures and severely degrade the visual amenity of the area through the creation of further unnecessary street clutter.

4.3 The proposed structure is considered to be a very poor design in terms of size, scale, massing and proposed materials, and is not an appropriate or acceptable addition in this location. It would be an obtrusive piece of street furniture in this location detracting from the streetscene. The powder coated metal frame and reinforced laminated glass incongruous design would provide an intrusive addition to the street. Consequently, the proposed kiosk would seriously affect the setting of the Grade II* listed Roundhouse Theatre and Regents Canal Conservation Area, and would thus result in a significant harm to the wider streetscene. As such, the proposal would fail to adhere to Policies CS14, DP24, DP25, D1 and D2.

4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) says that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. In this case there would be harm but it is considered that this would be less than substantial harm. In these circumstances the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals. As there is already an existing kiosk in close proximity to the site, there is not considered to be any public benefit from the provision of another kiosk in this location.

4.5 Policies DP29 and C6 require new buildings, spaces and facilities that the public may use to be

fully accessible to promote equality of opportunity. Although the proposed kiosk would allow for wheelchair users to 'access' the kiosk, this does not amount to the provision of a wheelchair accessible phone. The Council's Access Officer has highlighted that there are a number of requirements which need to be considered for an accessible phone booth, including the height of the telephone controls, which should be located between 0.75m and 1.0m above the floor. The telephone controls in the proposed kiosk would be located at a height of 1.5m above the floor, and so the proposed kiosk is considered unacceptable in terms of providing access for all, contrary to Policies DP29 and C6.

5.0 Anti-social behaviour

5.1 With regards to community safety matters, a number of issues have been raised by the Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor. In particular it has been noted that the siting of the proposal adjacent to an existing telephone box would further add to street clutter and safety issues in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour, through reducing sight lines and casual surveillance in the area, and providing a potential opportunity for an offender to loiter, contrary to Policies CS17 and C5 and CPG1 (Design).

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 The proposal would result in unacceptable street clutter, harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscape and the adjacent conservation area and Grade II* listed building, and to the detriment of pedestrian flows. The proposal, by virtue of its siting and appearance, is considered unacceptable.

7.0 Recommendation

7.1 Refuse Prior Approval