
From: Neil McDonald
Sent: 14 February 2022 13:21
To: [REDACTED] Planning Planning
Cc: CGCA Planning; Jenna Litherland
Subject: RE: 2021/6039/P - OBJECTION from Covent Garden Community Association

Hi Amanda,

Sorry you have been having trouble with the web portal again. I see that you have sent your objection to the Planning Inbox which should get it to the same place as via the web portal, but am also cc-ing the manager of the Fast Track Team in which this application is being dealt.

Regards,

Neil McDonald
Team Manager (South), Development Management

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 February 2022 00:51
To: Neil McDonald [REDACTED] Planning Planning [REDACTED]
Cc: CGCA Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: 2021/6039/P - OBJECTION from Covent Garden Community Association

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Neil,

We have been having trouble with the web portal again this weekend, so please find our objection below (and attached as a word document in case that's easier to process) rather than submitted online.

No planning officer was listed, so I'm sorry to have to bother you with it. Could you ask the appropriate officer to upload it to the portal under the application documents, please?

With thanks and good wishes,
- Amanda.

*Amanda Rigby
(Voluntary) Vice Chair and Exec. Member for Seven Dials area
Covent Garden Community Association*



Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) OBJECTS to application ref. 2021/6039/P for 18 Great Queen Street London WC2B 5DG - proposal to amend shop front to 2 bi fold doors and new double entrance doors all in a crittall style. A new wall fixed glass awning in a metal frame.)

We object to the floor-to-ceiling bi-fold doors that are proposed in lieu of windows, creating a near fully-opening shopfront. These are contrary to policy for amenity reasons in an area with residents living nearby (as referenced, for example, in paragraph 7.77 of Camden's Local Plan Policy D3 on shopfronts).

We acknowledge that the building is not itself historic, but neighbouring buildings are. We object to the loss of stall risers in the conservation area.

We have a neutral view on the use of metal in place of wood for the frame in this particular case, notwithstanding that section 6.16 of Camden's 2021 Planning Guidance on Design states that "traditional materials such as timber, stone and render will be the most appropriate for new shopfronts in conservation areas"; our position arises from the context of the shopfront on the ground floor of a modern building whose upper window frames are metal.

We would find similarly designed metal window frames, but with a stall riser, acceptable.

We object to the addition of a permanent glass canopy over the pavement. This type of Victorian architectural detail is not consistent with the context. More importantly, from a public amenity point of view, it implies that the space below is private. But the space is, in fact, public realm that pedestrians must feel free to walk along as normal pavement.

The premises have a retractable blind that is more than adequate to protect customers sitting at any tables & chairs that are consented for some of the space, subject to conditions on times of use and extent.

It should be noted that there is a row of disabled parking bays immediately outside the premises, so more than the usual 1.8 metre clear pavement width is required – hence, the additional extent of chairs shown in the applicant's drawing is not likely to be acceptable, but without measurements it is not possible to comment on that at this stage.



Virus-free. www.avast.com