

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2020/0560/A

Case Officer:

Leela Muthoor

Application Address:

85 Jamestown Road

London

NW1 7DB

Proposal(s)

Display of 2 retractable awnings with logo and three external lanterns to Oval Road and Jamestown Road elevations.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	8	No. of objections	2
					No of support	6
Summary of representations	<u>Two letters of objection</u>					
(Officer response(s) in italics)	<p>A resident of St Martin's Almshouses, Bayham Street objected to the application on the following grounds:</p> <p>'I do not know if the planning laws allow automatic refusal of planning permission for a building already in receipt of an enforcement order until the conditions of the enforcement have been met. If this is within the law, then the application should be refused. If the laws does not allow for this per se I still am of the opinion that the planning permission should not be granted on the basis that to allow it would make a mockery of the enforcement order. As to the awnings and lights they detract from the streetscape. The lights are especially intrusive because of their bulk. If the lettering on the windows is</p>					

on the inside then I believe it does not need planning permission.'

A resident of Gilbey House objected to the application on the following grounds:

'1. Whilst I have no serious objections to the awnings themselves, they are not in the style of the building, nor do they serve any purpose except as an advertisement. This is a work-around of the rules that should not be allowed. If awnings are required for the purposes of reducing light inside the cafe then let them be without advertising. This is a residential street, not the High Street.

2. The lights are just ugly. There is no need for any lights on this corner, they do not enhance the building, or the streetscape. Plus I have concerns about even more light pollution in a densely populated residential area.

3. There are existing enforcement notices regarding works to this building, none of which have been addressed by the applicant. I would strongly recommend that this application is therefore put to one side until the applicant has remedied all the outstanding issues with the building. Apart from anything else, the applicant's track record for actually doing what has been approved must be doubted.

4. The drawings which accompany this application are not in line with the previously approved applications, in particular with regard to the fenestration on the upper levels. I have a concern that this has been done quite deliberately by the applicant in the hope that any approval granted now will, by inference, give approval to the rest of the building. Again, I strongly urge you not to proceed with this application until such time as further reference is made to the outstanding remedial issues.

There were six letters of support from residents of Jamestown Road, Regents Park Terrace, Oval Road and a business in Sharpleshall Street.

- The osteopath services and coffee shop contributes to the atmosphere of community in the area.
- It is a welcome independent business.
- Is valued by both people who work in the vicinity and who live there.
- Jamestown Rd is a mixture residential and office space and is also a mixture of architecture styles.
- The retractable fabric awnings would add an attractive feature.
- Awnings provide useful shade for external seating in all weather.
- Advertising in the form of a retractable awning is an appropriate and

subtle way of making them more visible to passers by.

Summary of comments

1. Awnings serve the dual purpose providing shade from sunlight and some shelter as well as providing a structure for advertising. Certain advertisements are controlled by legislation, policy and guidance. Awnings with logos are typical adverts: the proposed would not obscure the fascia or shopfront elements, and would be appropriate in position, would be canvas and incorporate a minimum of 2.3m between the bottom of the awning and pavement and a minimum of 1m between the awning and the kerb edge. As a result, the awnings would comply with CPG design guidance in terms of size, position, materials, depth of overall projection and being retractable.
2. The design of lantern light fittings is considered an appropriate addition to a building from this mid-nineteenth century period. The potential impact from light spill has been considered and a condition has been included in this decision to limit the level of illumination to 400 candela per square metre.
3. The enforcement action is related to the upper levels of the building which is not under the control of the applicant who leases the coffee shop. The planning decisions, appeal decisions and enforcement cases are being considered separately to this application.
4. The drawings initially submitted did not reflect the upper levels fenestration accurately. These have been amended to demonstrate the current fenestration (single pane, no vertical glazing bars). As stated above, the upper floors do not form a part of this application and an informative has been included in the decision to clarify this.

On balance, the proposals are considered to be appropriate in terms of their impact on amenity and public safety, and therefore should be granted permission.

Recommendation:- Grant advertisement consent