

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/08/2017</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>03/08/2017</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Charlotte Meynell			2017/3557/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Pavement outside 71 High Holborn Opposite 283-288 High Holborn London WC1V 6EA			Refer to draft decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Prior Approval Required – Approval Refused		
<b>Application Type:</b>		GPDO Prior Approval Determination		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p><u>A site notice was displayed on 12/07/2017 and expired on 02/08/2017.</u>  <u>A press notice was advertised on 13/07/2017 and expired on 03/08/2017.</u></p> <p>No responses were received from neighbours.</p> <p>Metropolitan Police – Designing Out Crime Officer objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed telephone kiosk may be abused for the purposes of crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) purposes;</li> <li>• CCTV and general surveillance may be obstructed by this kiosk;</li> <li>• The depth of the design may allow a person to deal in drugs, due to the reduction in surveillance;</li> <li>• It may provide the opportunity for the display of prostitute cards;</li> <li>• The telephone kiosk may be used as a urinal.</li> </ul> <p>TfL objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is on the TLRN for which TfL is the highway authority and as such we are concerned about any proposal which could impact on the safety and capacity of the public carriageway and/or footway. TfL is also responsible for planning and securing the operation of bus services in the capital and most other public transport. In addition it plans and operates the cycle hire scheme and Cycle Superhighways, Quietways and other cycle routes. We are concerned about impacts on these transport services and infrastructure.</li> <li>• The submission is lacking in detail such that it is difficult to assess the acceptability of the kiosks in terms of siting and appearance. There is no photo montage with the site marked out nor are there drawings showing the kiosks in the context of the footway and carriageway and existing trees, street furniture, signs and so forth. Furthermore, there is no indication as to the orientation of the kiosk.</li> <li>• TfL would expect the siting of any kiosk to comply with our Streetscape design guidelines. The covering letter submitted suggests this is the case and there is at least 3.3m clear footway width (excluding any private forecourt) and there is a minimum of 0.45m set back from the carriageway. However it is not possible to check this and nor is it clear whether any account is taken of trees, street furniture etc. On this basis TfL would object to prior approval being given on the grounds of failure to demonstrate that the siting meets safety and comfort guidance.</li> <li>• TfL reminds the applicant and Council that the London Plan favours decluttering and simplifying the streetscape wherever possible (see policy 6.10) and this is also prioritised in TfL Streetscape Guidance (available from <a href="https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/streets-toolkit">https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/streets-toolkit</a>). In addition we note that all the kiosks are proposed for locations in which there are already a number of existing phone kiosks in close proximity. There has been no evidence</li> </ul>					

submitted as to the need for further provision of phone kiosks over and above those which exist already. We therefore also object to the principle of siting new phone kiosks in these parts of Camden.

Transport Strategy object as follows:

- The Council is committed to improving the public realm and pedestrian environment in order to encourage more sustainable travel. Camden are currently involved in a number of infrastructure schemes within the borough that seek to improve the streetscape and as part of that commitment, the Council will be reducing the amount of street clutter in order to create a high quality place that is inviting for pedestrians.
- The location of the proposed kiosk is beyond the existing street furniture zone, and as such would create an obstruction which would reduce the permeability of the environment and hinder pedestrian movement and desire lines, contrary to point c) of Policy T1. A reduction in pedestrian comfort can result in a less inviting environment and could in turn discourage active travel, and is therefore unacceptable.
- The proposed kiosk is located within an area which experiences high flows of pedestrian movement, and the minimum footway width should comply with the 'clear footway widths' as set out in TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance document. The proposed kiosk would not comply with this guidance and as such is deemed as unacceptable.
- The proposed kiosk would be located next to existing traffic signals which would be unacceptable since the presence of the telephone kiosk could create a visual obstruction, contrary to Policy T1 point c). The proposed site is close to an ATM and potential queue, and the presence of the telephone kiosk would result in a physical obstruction to pedestrians.
- Development wishing to alter the existing layout of the public highway must design for Camden's road hierarchy giving pedestrians and cyclists priority above all other users. Any introduction of unnecessary street furniture and thus the removal of a permeable pedestrian environment, is seen to have a detrimental effect on pedestrian movement, specifically for vulnerable road users. Interrupting continuous stretches of public footways and increasing pedestrian journey time is unacceptable. With respect to the above points the proposed telephone kiosk has been deemed as unacceptable and is recommended for refusal.
- Whilst the current proposal does not seek to introduce advertising at this stage, the potential for advertising on the rear panel of the kiosk raises concern. The Camden Streetscape Design Manual outlines advertising guidance that resists the introduction of commercial advertising. The proposal in that respect would be unacceptable as the suggested future use of the kiosk may be more for commercial advertising rather than for the benefit of the highway user.
- The application is contrary to policies T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) and A1 (Managing the impact of development), Camden's Streetscape Design Manual and TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance. The application 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).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Telephone controls should be located between 750mm and 1000mm above the floor.</li> <li>• 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'.</li> <li>• Instructions for using telephones should be clear. They should be displayed in large easy-to-read typeface.</li> </ul> <p>There should also be at least 1200mm, preferably 1800mm between the booth and any wall / guiding opposite.</p>
<p><b>Bloomsbury CAAC comments:</b></p>	<p>The Bloomsbury CAAC has objected on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On 07/04/2017 we received confirmation that the applications to change the use of existing telephone boxes (Traditional red K6 type) had been approved. These related to a total of 10 sites (8 x office pods and 2 x mobile phone repair kiosk shops). The reality is that most people now, old and young, use mobile phones – which is presumably the reason the traditional red phone boxes received planning permission earlier this year to be turned into new business opportunities. It would be utterly inconsistent for Camden to approve the current applications by Euro Payphone and any other telephone companies who wish to install telephone equipment on pavements in central London.</li> <li>• In terms of Camden's policy – the design of the current applications would be detrimental to the character and appearance of nearby properties, the wider area and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, contrary to policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy and policies DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Development Policies. Also DP26 as the telephone boxes will cause excess clutter on the pavement, impede access to passersby, and impact negatively on the quality of life of those who occupy adjacent properties.</li> </ul>

## Site Description

The application site comprises of an area of the footway adjacent to No. 71 High Holborn, on the northern side of High Holborn. There is no street furniture in the immediate vicinity of the site, although a pedestrian crossing, telecommunications cabinet, a street bench and a wheelchair accessible telephone kiosk are located on the same pavement between approximately 13-43m west of the site.

The site is part of Transport for London's (TfL's) Road Network (TLRN) and is situated within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The site is not adjacent to any listed buildings.

## Relevant History

### Site history:

**2009/1773/P** – Installation of telephone kiosk on the public highway. **Prior Approval refused 22/05/2009; Appeal allowed 04/05/2010**

### Neighbouring sites:

#### **Footway opposite 18 Hand Court**

**2009/438/P** – Installation on footway of a cycle hire docking station including a registration/payment terminal and maximum of 23 docking points for bicycles, in connection with the Transport for London Cycle Hire Scheme. **Full planning permission refused 14/12/2009**

#### **Bus Shelter outside Lincoln House, 296-302 High Holborn**

**2015/5199/A** – Installation of double-sided structure to existing bus shelter no.0107/0143 for display of digital screen and non illuminated static poster panel. **Advertisement consent refused 22/01/2016**

#### **Pavement outside Templar House, 81-87 High Holborn**

**2017/3555/P** – Installation of 1 x telephone kiosk on the pavement. **Prior Approval under consideration**

#### **O/S 81 High Holborn**

**2017/0451/P** – Erection of freestanding BT panel providing phone and Wi-Fi facilities, with 2 x internally illuminated digital advertisements following the removal of 2 no. BT telephone kiosks. **Full planning application under consideration**

**2017/0585/A** – Display of 2 x internally illuminated digital advertisement panels to freestanding BT panel. **Advertisement consent granted 15/05/2017**

#### **Adjacent to 80 High Holborn**

**2005/1388/P** – The replacement of an existing telephone kiosk with a combined ATM/Payphone kiosk. **Full planning permission refused 28/07/2005**

#### **Outside 247-261 High Holborn**

**2009/1772/P** – Installation of a telephone kiosk on the public highway. **Prior Approval refused 22/05/2009; Appeal dismissed 04/05/2010**

## Relevant policies

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

### **London Plan 2016**

### **TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London (2010)**

### **Camden Local Plan 2017**

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

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (2015)  
CPG7 Transport (2011)

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)

Camden Streetscape Design Manual

## **Assessment**

### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Confirmation is sought as to whether the installation of a telephone kiosk 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 kiosk would measure 1.32m by 1.11m with an overall height of 2.45m, and would be located on the northern pedestrian footway along High Holborn, adjacent to No. 71 High Holborn.

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 Policy A1 states that the Council will seek to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities, and that the Council will resist development that fails to adequately assess and address transport impacts affecting communities, occupiers, neighbours and the existing transport network. Paragraph 6.10 states that the Council will expect works affecting the highway network to consider highway safety, with a focus on vulnerable road users, including the provision of adequate sightlines for vehicles, and that development should address the needs of vulnerable or disabled users. Furthermore, Policy T1 point e) states that the Council will seek to ensure that developments provide high quality footpaths and pavements that are wide enough for the number of people expected to use them, including features to assist vulnerable road users where appropriate, and paragraph 8.9 of CPG7 (Transport) highlights that footways should be wide enough for two people using wheelchairs, or prams, to pass each other.

2.2 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’.

2.3 All development affecting footways in Camden is also expected to comply with Appendix B of Transport for London's (TfL's) Pedestrian Comfort Guidance, which notes that active and high flow locations must provide a minimum 2.2m and 3.3m of 'clear footway width' (respectively) for the safe and comfortable movement of pedestrians.

2.4 Policy T1 states that the Council will promote sustainable transport choices by prioritising walking, cycling and public transport use and that development should ensure that sustainable transport will be the primary means of travel to and from the site. Policy T1 points a) and b) state that in order to

promote walking in the borough and improve the pedestrian environment, the Council will seek to ensure that developments improve the pedestrian environment by supporting high quality improvement works, and make improvements to the pedestrian environment including the provision of high quality safe road crossings where needed, seating, signage and landscaping.

2.5 Policy T1 (Public Transport) states that where appropriate, development will be required to provide for interchanging between different modes of transport including facilities to make interchange easy and convenient for all users and maintain passenger comfort.

2.6 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.

2.7 Policy C5 requires development to contribute to community safety and security, 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 kiosk needs to be considered to ensure that it has a limited impact on the sightlines of the footway, and that the size of the kiosk should be minimised to limit its impact on the streetscene and to decrease opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.

### **3.0 Siting**

3.1 The application site is located on a pavement measuring roughly 5.0m wide. This area of the footway experiences very high pedestrian flows, particularly at peak times.

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 The footprint of the proposed telephone kiosk measures 1.32m by 1.11m. Detailed design drawings that include the orientation and exact proposed positioning of the new telephone kiosk on the pavement have not been submitted and so it is unclear as to how wide the 'clear footway' width would be once the proposed telephone kiosk has been installed. 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 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 A1 and T1 and is considered unacceptable.

3.4 Policy A1 emphasises that it is important that development balances the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities and ties into the existing transport network. Given there are already four existing telephone kiosks located within between 43m and 108m of the site, 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 A1 and T1 and is considered unacceptable.

3.5 There is an existing wheelchair accessible telephone kiosk located approximately 43m to the west of the site on the northern side of High Holborn, one existing telephone kiosk approximately 108m to the north of the site on the western side of Bedford Row, and two further existing telephone kiosks situated on the southern side of High Holborn approximately 102m south-east of the site. No justification has been submitted for the need to install a further one. Given the infrequent use of telephone kiosks due to the prevalence of mobile phone use, it is considered that the proposed telephone kiosk 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 Policy A1.

#### **4.0 Design and Appearance**

4.1 Policy D1 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy D1 states 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. Policy D2 states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

4.2 This section of the footway is particularly clear of street furniture and it is considered that the introduction of a new telephone kiosk to this 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 43m from an existing telephone kiosk outside No. 71 High Holborn, 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 character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, and would thus result in a significant harm to the wider streetscene. As such, the proposal would fail to adhere to Policies 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 within 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 Policy C6 requires 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



Policy 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 on a clear section of the footway and adjacent to an existing telephone kiosk 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 Policy 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 Bloomsbury Conservation Area, 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