

Minutes

Covent Garden Community Association

Planning Sub-Committee meeting held on Monday, 27 July 2015
at 17:30 at Covent Garden Community Centre (Shelton Room), 42 Earlham Street WC2H 9LA

www.CoventGarden.org.uk



TheCGCA



@TheCGCA

1. Attendance

1.1 Present: Elizabeth Bax, Robert Bent, Shirley Gray, Selwyn Hardy, Gary Hayes, Kester Robinson, Meredith Whitten; David Bieda and Anja Saunders present for presentation

1.2 Apologies received: Jo Weir, Rhu Weir, Richard Hills, Christina Smith

1.3 Comments received from: Rhu Weir, Christina Smith

2. Presentations: Ambassador's Theatre (5:30 p.m.); Capco (6:15 p.m.)

3. Planning Applications & Appeals

	Address & Application No.	Proposal	Comments
CAMDEN APPLICATIONS			
3.1	53 Shelton Street WC2H 9JU 2015/3713/L C3/Ashton Porter Architects (agent)	Replace all existing sashes with timber to match existing, with Slimlite glazing.	No objection Photo: https://goo.gl/foivrT Documents: http://goo.gl/JJ0gRh Note: Listed building
3.2	186 Drury Lane WC2B 5QD 2015/3097/P; 2015/3979/L D1/Revive Renovations (agent)	Installation of 2 x air conditioning units to the rear including the retention of 2 x ventilation skylights located on the roof of the existing rear extension in association with existing use as a barbering school.	The CGCA objects to this retrospective application and notes that the applicant was served with an enforcement notice due to unauthorised works on a listed building. In addition to harming the special architectural and historic interest of this listed building on Drury Lane, one of the most historic streets in the area, the air-conditioning units also harm the amenity of adjacent neighbours. As the applicant observes, there are a number of residents in the immediate vicinity, including directly above the barbering school. These residents have complained about noise and disturbance from the non-permitted units currently running. The applicant's noise report finds that the works can only meet Camden's minimum noise requirements if a number of mitigation options are followed. Mitigation measures should be required by condition, but only after the proposed new equipment meets minimum requirements on its own merits. Granting permission for equipment already deemed to exceed noise thresholds would mean that local residents would be reliant on the applicant to consistently maintain the equipment and its mitigation measures. By installing and operating the units without permission, the applicant has demonstrated a lack of adherence to Camden's policies and a lack of concern for neighbouring residents. Thus, Camden should not rely on the applicant's adherence to mitigation efforts to bring noise within an acceptable range. Photo: https://goo.gl/fVo9GR

			Documents: http://goo.gl/b4UVM1 Note: Listed building
3.3	21-31 New Oxford Street WC1A 1BA 2015/3783/P <i>Various/New Oxford Limited; Gerald Eve (agent)</i>	Details of ground movement analysis & associated mitigation measures as required by condition 23 of permission 2014/5946/P dated 30/03/2014 for refurbishment and extension of former postal sorting office.	No comment No photo Documents: http://goo.gl/V7Q9hk
3.4	St.Giles Circus site WC2 2015/3900/P <i>Various/Consolidated Developments Ltd.; Turley (agent)</i>	Minor material amendment of condition 2 (development to be constructed in accordance with the approved plans) of planning permission redevelopment 2012/5781/P dated 31 March 2015 namely for alterations to design and layout.	No objection No photo Documents: http://goo.gl/qLomkK
3.5	St Giles Hotel Bedford Avenue WC1B 3GH 2015/3210/A <i>St. Giles Hotel/JC Decaux UK Limited</i>	Display of 1x digital display screen (6.0 x 39.8 metres) to Tottenham Court Road elevation at 1st and 2nd floor level.	The CGCA supports the objections of the Bloomsbury Association and the Bloomsbury CAAC. This site lies just outside of the boundaries of Covent Garden, thus it has an influence on the perception that visitors to the area have. The CGCA strongly objects to the ruthless commercialisation of this high-profile site. The proposals are better suited to an area such as Piccadilly Circus, but not to the historic fabric of this area. Permitting this development would set a powerful precedent that would in effect irreversibly alter the character of one of the most historic areas of Central London, turning it into an excessively commercialised area with dire consequences for area residents and visitors. The CGCA notes that similar applications have been refused in the past; nothing in this latest application addresses the reasons for refusal and, thus, permission should be refused. No photo Documents: http://goo.gl/IYv4EI

WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS

3.6	12 Maiden Lane WC2E 7NA 15/05752/FULL <i>Big Easy/Maiden London Ltd.; Walsingham Planning (agent)</i>	Installation of external plant and equipment at first-floor level, roof level & extract ducts from second-floor level to roof level for ventilation and kitchen extraction of restaurant at No. 12 and air-conditioning of offices at No. 11 (amendments to what is currently installed on site).	The CGCA strongly objects to these retrospective proposals. The plant equipment would create an unacceptable loss of amenity for residents in neighbouring properties because of noise and vibration. The noise report provided indicates that the noise from the plant would not wholly comply with the Council's relevant planning policies (see S29 and S32 of the City Plan, and EV 6, 7 & 13 of the UDP). Given the established problems with noise and vibration at this location and the documented negative impact on residential amenity, the Council cannot permit these proposals and the excessive noise and disturbance that would result. The applicant has operated the restaurant for several years without permission for the plant equipment, and only sought permission after receiving an enforcement notice from the Council, based on complaints from local residents and the
-----	--	---	--

			<p>CGCA. Local residents have consistently complained about noise and disturbance and the visual impact from the unauthorised works. If permitted, these proposals would continue to bring distress to and harm the amenity of local residents, as they do not remedy the problems identified by residents and by Westminster officers.</p> <p>The CGCA also refutes the applicant's statement that the proposals should be permitted because the need for the restaurant adheres to the National Planning Policy Framework's call for sustainability. In particular, the NPPF specifies that for development to be considered sustainable, it must take into account economic, social and environmental dimensions; these must be considered together, not in isolation. The CGCA fails to see how the plant equipment, which has proven to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity, contributes positively to environmental or social sustainability of Covent Garden, a conservation area that has been largely residential for hundreds of years.</p> <p>Further, the CGCA refutes the applicant's statement that residents who live nearby must have "reasonable expectations" for "choosing to live there." The residents have the reasonable expectation that development will comply with the planning policies and guidance set forth by Westminster, regardless of if they move in before or after the restaurant. In this case, the proposals do not meet those standards and, thus, are not reasonable. The applicant chose to try to operate a restaurant of this type and size surrounded by residential, knowing it would be difficult to comply with noise regulations.</p> <p>Finally, the noise report refers to the business that the development will serve as a "major and successful restaurant." The CGCA notes that since opening, the restaurant has not complied with Westminster policies, having undertaken development without planning permission. Thus, the success of the restaurant has occurred without complying with the required rules and regulations.</p> <p>Photo: https://goo.gl/SdMUzG Documents: http://goo.gl/xJBpJ1</p>
3.7	37 Drury Lane WC2B 5RR 15/05205/FULL C3 /The Worshipful Company of Mercers; Deloitte (agent)	Replacement of existing windows at rear third floor level.	<p>No objection</p> <p>Photo: https://goo.gl/EyNqhf Documents: http://goo.gl/zZFSP0 Note: Listed building</p>
3.8	The Market 15/04951/LBC Various/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of a temporary public art installation within the South Market Building for the period from 19 August 2015 to 28 September 2015.	<p>No objection</p> <p>No photo</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/vbZFsh</p>
3.9	10-14 Bedford Street WC2E 9HD	Installation of a 2.4m high metal gateway to secure the passage	While the CGCA does not object to the idea of the gate, we are concerned about the impact the gate

	15/05475/FULL A3 & B1/Capco	adjacent 8 Bedford Court and rear of 10 Bedford Street.	could have on deliveries currently being made through this passage. Should deliveries no longer be able to access the passage, they would likely remain in Bedford Court, which would increase an already large number of delivery and servicing vehicles using Bedford Court. The CGCA also is concerned about access to the existing cycle parking stands that would fall behind the gate under these proposals. These two issues must be addressed, either in updated proposals or by strict conditions, before permission is granted. Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/syeVUE Note: Listed building
3.10	42 Maiden Lane WC2E 7LJ 15/05150/FULL B1/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Alterations to shopfront and door including removal of roller shutter and housing to main entrance, replacement of roller shutter to door, installation of new laminated glass and new limestone to steps, replacement of rear windows and minor external alterations.	No objection Photo: https://goo.gl/T1sra5 Documents: http://goo.gl/WkJCKM
3.11	32-33 Long Acre WC2E 9LA 15/05681/FULL B1/Lloyds Bank S.F. Nominees Limited; GL Hearn (agent)	External alterations to rear elevation at first, second and third floors and alterations to roof to create a mezzanine and roof terrace at fourth floor, all in conjunction with use of upper floors as three residential units (2x1-bed and 1x3-bed).	No objection Photo: https://goo.gl/Wkijil Documents: http://goo.gl/SGYrz3

4. Tables and Chairs

CAMDEN APPLICATIONS			
4.1	77 Kingsway WC2B 6SR 2015/4036/TC Café Rouge/Geoffrey Lake (agent)	9 tables, 36 chairs and 10 barriers.	Objection. The increase in the number of tables, chairs and barriers takes up too much space on the public highway, thus creating an obstacle for pedestrians, particularly those with wheelchairs or prams. The applicant should be permitted to continue with the current number of tables and chairs (8 tables, 32 chairs and 11 barriers). The pavement along Kingsway is wider than other places throughout Covent Garden, but this design was quite intentional, as a wider pavement is needed to accommodate the consistently high volume of pedestrians. The tables, chairs and barriers at this location, along with others on Kingsway, have essentially created a wall, which means pedestrians have significantly less space to in which to manoeuvre on Kingsway. Permitting incremental increases in the amount of street furniture, such as this proposal would, negates the benefits of having a larger pavement to accommodate larger volumes of pedestrians. Additionally, meeting the 1.8 metre minimum is not the only standard by which decisions to permit tables and chairs are made. The Council must also factor in pedestrian volumes. The "Pedestrian Comfort Guidance for London," published by the GLA, recommends total footway widths for different levels of pedestrian flow. For high-flow areas (greater than 1,200 people per hour), the recommended width is 5.3m; for active flow areas (600 to 1,200 people per hour), the recommended width is 4.2m. The CGCA also notes that the applicant has already increased the

			<p>number of tables, chairs and barriers in use, despite not yet having permission from the Council.</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/aNXgGO & https://goo.gl/k3r1HL</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/100469</p> <p>Note: Renewal. Change in use – previously 8 tables, 32 chairs & 11 barriers. No change in hours: M-TH 08:00-23:00; F&SA 08:00-23:30; SU 08:00-22:30. Applicant is already using increased number of T&CH.</p>
WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS			
4.2	<p>355 Strand WC2R OHS 15/04887/TCH</p> <p>Starbucks/Starbucks Coffee Co (UK) Ltd; Pegasus Planning Group Ltd. (agent)</p>	<p>Use of the public highway measuring 1.6m x 6.1m for the placing of three tables, six chairs and five plain barriers.</p>	<p>No objection, although the applicant says the barriers are plain when, in fact, one barrier has the company logo on it.</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/6HD2NE & https://goo.gl/P1Ygl2</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/5Dj54g</p> <p>Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours: M-SU 07:00-23:00.</p>
4.3	<p>22 Cranbourn Street WC2H 7AA 15/04694/TCH</p> <p>King of Falafel/Sidney Torrance & Co. (agent)</p>	<p>Use of the public highway for the placing of 2 tables and 4 chairs in an area measuring 0.75m x 3.3m.</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to the use of tables and chairs at this high-volume location next to Leicester Square station. As the attached photos illustrate, this location experiences some of the highest levels of footfall in all of Covent Garden. The use of tables and chairs – as well as the A-board that the applicant has set on the public highway without permission – creates an obstacle on the pavement. This is exacerbated by the applicant allowing customers to reposition chairs so they back into the pedestrian flow, further obstructing footfall.</p> <p>The CGCA also objects to the proposed hours, which are excessively late and would greatly harm residential amenity. The CGCA notes that the applicant has applied for these hours before, but they were refused because of the impact on neighbouring residents from noise and disturbance as set out in CS28 & CS31 of the Core Strategy and ENV6 and TACE11 of the UDP (see 12/03960/TCH).</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/saeYal, https://goo.gl/Q56hYC & https://goo.gl/4Fm3Hb</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/lwn736</p> <p>Note: Renewal. No change in use. Change in hours: Current: M-SU 10:00-23:00. Proposed: M-SA 09:00-03:00; SU 09:00-00:00. Applicant applied for proposed hours in 2012 (12/03960/TCH) but was refused.</p>

5. Other business

6. Next meetings & future presentations

6.1 10 August 2015

6.2 24 August 2015 (note that this meeting will take place at Dragon Hall)