

Minutes

Covent Garden Community Association

Planning Sub-Committee meeting held on Monday, 12 June 2017
at 6:30 p.m. at the Hospital Club, 24 Endell Street WC2H 9HQ

www.CoventGarden.org.uk  TheCGCA  @TheCGCA

1. Attendance

1.1 **Present:** Elizabeth Bax (chair); Shirley Gray; Selwyn Hardy; Gary Hayes; Amanda Rigby; Christina Smith; Brian Tienan; Jo Weir; Meredith Whitten

1.2 **Apologies received:** David Bieda, Jane French

1.3 **Comments received:**

2. **Presentations:** Theatre Royal (6:30 p.m.); Bow Street Magistrates Court (7:15 p.m.)

3. Planning Applications & Appeals

	Address & Application No.	Proposal	Comments
CAMDEN APPLICATIONS			
3.1	Parker House 25 Parker Street London WC2B 5PA 2017/2908/P <i>C3/Parker Street No.1 Limited; DP9</i>	Details of bird and bat nesting boxes required by condition 12 of planning permission 2012/6132/P as amended by 2016/2601/P dated 10/08/2016.	No objection. The CGCA supports the proposals to increase biodiversity in Covent Garden. Comments by 14-06-17 Photo: No photo Documents: https://goo.gl/Yhb48n
3.2	16A Neal's Yard WC2H 9DP 2017/2630/P <i>A3/Gundry and Ducker Ltd.; Gundry and Ducker Architecture (agent)</i>	Replacement shopfront.	The CGCA objects to the installation of an openable shopfront. Camden's planning policy says folding and openable shopfronts "will not generally be acceptable" (DP30.8). Also, see CS7; DP 30; CPG1 7.12. Folding and openable shopfronts detract from the character of the street and the Conservation Area, as well as the architectural integrity of the building. When open, they erode the appearance of the shopfront, creating a visual void, and can have a negative impact on local amenity, for example in terms of noise and disturbance. This has proven to be the case in Neal's Yard. Indeed, CPG1 7.12 says, "When open, they erode the appearance of the shopfront, creating a visual void, and can increase disturbance to neighbouring properties, <u>particularly in the case of food and drink premises</u> " (emphasis added). The applicant's argument that Neal's Yard historically had openable shopfronts is immaterial. The historic use of Neal's Yard, including the businesses in the photos the applicant disingenuously uses, was industrial and warehouse; they were not entertainment uses and most certainly not used late at night. The historic use did not include restaurants or takeaways. The argument that other shopfronts in Neal's Yard are openable also is irrelevant. In fact, other shopfronts exist in Neal's Yard that are not

			<p>openable. And, the shopfront of 16A Neal's Yard includes small window panes, a pattern repeated throughout this side of Neal's Yard and throughout Covent Garden, making it highly characteristic of the conservation area.</p> <p>As planning officers are aware, Neal's Yard is a residential area and residents have been besieged by efforts to turn the historic, industrial yard into a late-night entertainment hub. Permission for yet another openable shopfront, which goes against the Council's own policies and which has proven to exacerbate noise and disturbance for local residents, should not be granted.</p> <p>Comments by 15-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/q6LKet Documents: https://goo.gl/E2fNwB</p>
3.3	<p>151 Shaftesbury Avenue WC2H 8AL 2017/2354/P B1/<i>The Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd.; Orbit Architects (agent)</i></p>	<p>Alterations to the 5th floor terrace including new balustrading, new decking and new doors.</p>	<p>As drawings in the applicant's documents show (see Design & Access statement, p. 4 & 7), the terrace directly overlooks residents' flats in New Compton Street. These residents could be affected by overlooking, noise and disturbance. Given this, strict conditions must be included with any permission granted that protect the amenity of the many neighbouring residents. (<u>For precedent, see 2015/3681/P, dated 15-09-2015, for 179-199 Shaftesbury Avenue</u>).</p> <p>These conditions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the hours of use to normal business hours (08:00-21:00, Monday to Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays) (see CS5, DP26); • Specify that no live or recorded music shall be played on the premises in such a way as to be audible within any adjoining premises or on the adjoining highway (see CS5, DP26); and • Require obscure glass to be installed, to minimise overlooking of the adjacent residential flats (see CS5, DP26). <p>Comments by 16-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/cfLcMk (and see documents) Documents: https://goo.gl/GOCLbH</p>
3.4	<p>Land at St Giles Circus Site 126-136 Charing Cross Road London WC2H 8NJ 2017/3038/A N/A/<i>Consolidated Development Ltd.; Iceni Projects Ltd. (agent)</i></p>	<p>Temporary display of an internally illuminated LED digital display board (12m in width by 3m in height) facing Centre Point from 21/07/2017 to 31/07/2019.</p>	<p>Whilst the CGCA appreciates that the proposed digital display board has been greatly reduced in size, we continue to object to the commercial nature of the sign and the use of internal illumination for the advertisement, which is inappropriate given its proximity to several conservation areas, including Denmark Street, Bloomsbury and Seven Dials (Covent Garden) conservation areas.</p> <p>Internal illumination is inappropriate and unsympathetic in a conservation area, and conflicts with Westminster planning policy (see "Shopfronts, Blinds & Signs" SPG; "Advertisement Design Guidelines" SPG; and DES8). DES8-10.98 states</p>

			<p>that “Shop signs should be at fascia level and be externally illuminated. Internally illuminated box fascias and projecting signs are not normally appropriate in conservation areas.”</p> <p>Additionally, national guidance, as set forth in the Department of Communities & Local Government’s “Outdoor advertisements and signs: a guide for advertisers,” clearly states that Class 4 (illuminated advertisements) “does not extend to any premises in a Conservation” (p. 17).</p> <p>Comments by 22-06-17 Photo: No photo Documents: https://goo.gl/uyl7yv</p>
3.5	7 Denmark Street WC2H 8LZ 2017/3142/P & 2017/3191/L A4/B1/ <i>Consolidated Development Ltd.; Icen Projects Ltd. (agent)</i>	Partial demolition of single-storey rear elements (WCs); erection of additional storey (to create a first floor) to rear workshop building to create eating area for the existing bar (A4) use; bridge link and stairwell in rear yard; rear entrance and stairwell from Book Mews; associated external & internal alterations.	<p>Despite the slight modifications from the previous application, the CGCA continues to object to these proposals. The proposed additional storey and design of the rear mews building would result in an inappropriate increase in bulk/massing that harms the character and appearance of the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings, as well as adjacent mews buildings. Additionally, the increased space, which would extend an entertainment use (A4) would compound noise and disturbance. In particular, the CGCA is concerned about noise and light escaping from the proposed glass box design, and this would have a negative impact on residential amenity and the character of the conservation area. The windowed design of the additional storey also would have an impact on privacy for adjacent residents.</p> <p>Comments by 22-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/zhuzLL Documents: https://goo.gl/Rn6Z9r Note: Grade II listed building</p>
3.6	58 Kingsway WC2B 6DX 2017/2979/P A4 (All Bar One)/ <i>Mitchells & Butler; Fusion By Design (agent)</i>	Installation of 5x fixed canopies with integrated heaters and lighting, installation of 3x drinking shelves and associated decorative elevation works to A4 unit.	<p>Whilst the CGCA welcomes the proposed restoration works, we object to the installation of fixed canopies and drinking shelves.</p> <p>The proposed development would result in visual street clutter that detracts from the character of the building itself and the conservation area and that goes against Camden’s aim of reducing visual street clutter (see Streetscape Design Manual, Chapter 4). Such street clutter has a significantly adverse effect on the appearance of the streetscape and the amenity of the area.</p> <p>The drinking shelves would greatly increase the number of vertical drinkers, which would cause an obstruction at this high-traffic area. The location is at a corner near Holborn station and, as such, there are consistently large crowds at the crosswalk/traffic light directly in front of the building. Kingsway experiences exceptionally high footfall, which led the Council to widen the pavement. This public realm improvement was not meant to increase space for private businesses to extend</p>

			<p>their areas of use.</p> <p>The applicant already places street furniture on Kingsway. Adding vertical drinkers to this would create a further obstruction.</p> <p>Further, Remnant Street is much narrower than Kingsway. On the proposed plan, the applicant shows two large benches and four tables with eight chairs, but does not indicate any measurements, as less than the Council minimum of 1.8m would be left. Remnant Street experiences high footfall as well, with workers and students going between Holborn station, and the offices, school and open space around Lincoln's Inn.</p> <p>Comments by 23-06-17</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/1nvKp2 & https://goo.gl/SG7voZ</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/ZGyw98</p>
WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS			
3.7	<p>119 Long Acre WC2E 9PB 17/03899/FULL A1 (Levi's)/Levi Strauss Ltd.; Silver Birch Design Ltd. (agent)</p>	<p>Removal of condition 4 of planning permission dated 31-01-2017 (16/10745/FULL) namely, for retention of the glazed brick tile to the piers to the ground floor elevation.</p>	<p>The CGCA continues to object to the removal of the glazed-brick tile, which is in keeping with the character of the area, as the applicant's photos indicate. Whilst we recognise that the tiles are not original, they fit with neighbouring buildings much more so than the proposed stucco effect.</p> <p>Comments by 16-06-17</p> <p>Photo: https://goo.gl/pWScUW</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/XZCPX2</p> <p>Note: On 09-01-17 agenda.</p>
3.8	<p>36-37 Cranbourn Street WC2H 7AD 17/03562/FULL The Brewmaster/Greene King PLC; Walsingham Planning (agent)</p>	<p>Use of second and third floors for 8 guest rooms in association with the use of the existing public house at 37 Cranbourn Street (sui generis) and other associated works, including installation of two new air-conditioning condensers and a kitchen extract duct at roof level.</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to this application because the proposals are unclear in several areas, namely regarding use of the hotel rooms and access for hotel guests.</p> <p>Should the Council be minded to grant approval, a condition should be included that says the hotel rooms cannot be rented by the hour, as this would contradict WCC's policy UDP8.20 requiring hotels to be sensitive to the area.</p> <p>A condition also should be included that specifies that hotel guests do not have access to the pub after closing.</p> <p>Finally, the CGCA is concerned about guest access during hours when the pub is closed. Providing guests with a key is not a safe practice and could result in criminal activity at the hotel.</p> <p>Comments by 20-06-17</p> <p>Photo: See documents</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/AfVj4Q</p>
3.9	<p>21 The Market WC2E 8RD 17/04227/FULL A3 & A4/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)</p>	<p>Removal of modern fit out additions and existing metal balustrades, replacement of metal balustrades with new to match existing and the addition of new clear glass, fixed to the replaced metal</p>	<p>No objection</p> <p>Comments by 22-06-17</p> <p>Photo: See documents</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/VsSU9I</p> <p>Note: Grade II* listed building</p>

		balustrades at the first-floor terraces (known as north terrace and south terrace) of Unit 21.	
3.10	10 Upper St Martin's Lane WC2H 9FB 17/04000/FULL A3 (Cantina Laredo)/ <i>Oriole Restaurants Limited</i> ; <i>Robert Angell Design Intl (agent)</i>	Alterations to the existing shopfront.	<p>Whilst the CGCA has no objections to the shopfront alterations, we do object to the use of internal illumination, as this method of illumination is inappropriate and unsympathetic in a conservation area, and conflicts with Westminster planning policy (see "Shopfronts, Blinds & Signs" SPG; "Advertisement Design Guidelines" SPG; and DES8). DES8-10.98 states that "Shop signs should be at fascia level and be externally illuminated. Internally illuminated box fascias and projecting signs are not normally appropriate in conservation areas."</p> <p>Additionally, national guidance, as set forth in the Department of Communities & Local Government's "Outdoor advertisements and signs: a guide for advertisers," clearly states that Class 4 (illuminated advertisements) "does not extend to any premises in a Conservation" (p. 17).</p> <p>Although these proposals fall just outside the conservation area, the development would be visible from within the conservation area and, thus, would have a negative impact on the Covent Garden Conservation Area, which goes against Westminster's planning policy. DES9 states: "Development will not be permitted which, although not wholly or partly located within a designated conservation area, might nevertheless have a visibly adverse effect upon the area's recognised special character or appearance, including intrusiveness with respect to any recognised and recorded familiar local views into, out of, within or across the area." Further, 10.121 says: "Development outside but adjacent to conservation areas can have a significant impact on the setting of conservation areas. New development in such areas should take into account and respect the character and appearance of neighbouring conservation areas in order to safeguard their setting."</p> <p>Finally, all lighting should be required to be switched off at closing. This is to protect the amenity of adjacent residents at Wellington Court, namely from light pollution.</p> <p>Comments by 23-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/qkt8Aq Documents: https://goo.gl/S3kRTx</p>
3.11	1 Bedford Street WC2E 9HG 17/04385/FULL B1/ <i>Legal & General</i> ; <i>Gerald Eve (agent)</i>	Replacement shopfront.	<p>No objection</p> <p>Comments by 24-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/deotZ6 (and see documents) Documents: https://goo.gl/Zjqlbf Note: Withdrawn application on 27-03-17 agenda.</p>

			CGCA did not object.
3.12	440 Strand London WC2R 0QS 17/04381/FULL B1/ <i>The Royal Bank of Scotland; Michael Laird Architects (agent)</i>	Re-painting of external walls, conversion of a meeting room into WCs and Disabled WC and installation of 2no light fittings externally. (Linked application 17/04382/LBC)	No objection Comments by 27-06-17 Photo: See documents Documents: https://goo.gl/I9MaSu Note: Grade II listed building
3.13	132 Long Acre WC2E 9AA 17/03761/FULL A1/ <i>H&M; Quadrant Design (agent)</i>	Replacement of a double doors with glazed panels and framing at Long Arce/ Slingsby place corner and Slingsby place elevations.	Whilst the CGCA has no objections to the shopfront alterations, we do object to the use of internal illumination, as this method of illumination is inappropriate and unsympathetic in a conservation area, and conflicts with Westminster planning policy (see "Shopfronts, Blinds & Signs" SPG; "Advertisement Design Guidelines" SPG; and DES8). DES8-10.98 states that "Shop signs should be at fascia level and be externally illuminated. Internally illuminated box fascias and projecting signs are not normally appropriate in conservation areas." Additionally, national guidance, as set forth in the Department of Communities & Local Government's "Outdoor advertisements and signs: a guide for advertisers," clearly states that Class 4 (illuminated advertisements) "does not extend to any premises in a Conservation" (p. 17). Comments by 30-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/ne2jjX Documents: https://goo.gl/eVB0xx
3.14	1-4 King Street WC2E 8HH 17/03730/FULL <i>Oakley/Luxottica; Project Entity Ltd. (agent)</i>	Installation of a new set of double doors on the second arch on King Street, including internal alterations.	Whilst the CGCA does not object to the proposed alterations, we strongly suggest that new set of double doors, we do object to the doors being recessed. The entrance area, including the doors, should brought forward to be more flush with the building. Removing the recessed area would be to both the applicant's and the area's benefit, as it would help to minimise antisocial behaviour in the recessed area. We note that Westminster's UDP Policy DES1, para 10.22, says that recessed areas should be avoided. Comments by 30-06-17 Photo: See documents Documents: https://goo.gl/D42Mk3
3.15	17-19 Neal Street WC2H 9PU 17/04638/LBC <i>Doc Marten's/Airwair International Ltd.; Studio OL3 Ltd. (agent)</i>	Display of non-illuminated fascia signage measuring 500mm x 3790mm and non-illuminated hanging sign measuring 600mm x 600mm. Repainting the existing shopfront. Internal alterations.	No objection Comments by 04-07-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/PtDdRN Documents: https://goo.gl/PF5W0q Note: Grade II listed building

4. Tables and Chairs

CAMDEN APPLICATIONS

<p>4.1</p>	<p>36 Monmouth Street WC2H 9HB 2017/3017/TC Cure and Cut</p>	<p>3 Tables and 6 chairs on Monmouth Street 2 Picnic Benches (6 seating) and 1 Table on Tower Court</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to the proposed number and the proposed configuration of tables and chairs.</p> <p>Two tables, each with two chairs flush with the shopfront, is all the street furniture that should be permitted.</p> <p>When the previous tenant applied for tables and chairs, Camden did a site inspection and determined that placing street furniture in Tower Court should not be permitted due to blocking disabled access, noise and disturbance to residential amenity (as the photos show, residents' bedroom windows are directly above the proposed location).</p> <p>The CGCA also objects to the excessive number of tables and chairs proposed on the Monmouth Street elevation. Only two tables, each with two chairs against the shopfront, should be permitted. The third table and set of two chairs should not be permitted, as it would obstruct footfall at this high-volume location on Seven Dials.</p> <p>We note that the is the configuration that Camden approved for the restaurant next door (see 2016/3283/TC) – all street furniture must be flush with the shopfront. Note that the restaurant at 32-34 Monmouth has a much wider shopfront, which is the reason three tables and six chairs were permitted. Again, however, all tables and chairs are flush with the shopfront.</p> <p>The CGCA also questions the measurements shown on the applicant's drawing. Compared to drawings for previous tenants at this location, the current applicant's measurements are much more generous, indicating the pavement has somehow grown wider. The proposed measurements are, thus, unrealistic.</p> <p>Further, the applicant has shown complete disregard for local residents, including those directly above the café, and for the conservation area. As the attached photos show, the applicant has placed street furniture on the public highway despite not having permission and despite multiple residents complaining directly to the applicant, as well as to the council. This indicates an unwillingness to properly manage the street furniture.</p> <p>Finally, the proposed hours do not comply with Camden's tables and chairs guidance or the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy (2011), which specify that hours will not be allowed past 9 p.m., unless the site is located in "predominantly commercial street in the Central London Area," which Monmouth Street is not. (See Appendix 2 of Camden's "Tables & Chairs Guidance.") Permission for hours beyond this not only violates Camden's policy, but also is highly inappropriate in a residential area. Additionally, no premises at this location has been permitted hours past 21:00.</p> <p>Comments by 23-06-17</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/bSzAwL & https://goo.gl/JGle0n</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/lvixEz</p> <p>Note: New application. Proposed hours: M-TH 08:30-21:00; F-SA 08:30-23:00; SU 10:00 - 20:00.</p> <p>In 2015, 6 Tables and 12 Chairs (Tower Court- x4 tables, x8 chairs, x1 umbrellas and Monmouth Street x2 tables, x4 chairs) M-SA 08:00-21:00 and SU 10:00-21:00 was refused – see 2015/1612/TC).</p> <p>Previous tenant (Candy Cakes) had permission for 5 tables and</p>
------------	--	---	---

			10 chairs, with 1 table and 2 chairs only to be placed on Monmouth Street 4 tables and 8 chairs to be placed in Tower Court, M-SU 08:00-19:00 – see 2013/0850/TC).
WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS			
4.2	East Piazza The Market WC2E 8RA 17/04580/FULL Piazza/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Temporary use of part of the East Piazza, Covent Garden for planting from the RHS Chelsea Flower Show; external seating area for public use; external seating area with two bar stalls serving food and drink; and associated external furniture.	No objection Comments by 22-06-17 Photo: See documents Documents: https://goo.gl/DuAEp3 Note: Grade II listed building. Proposed hours: M-SU 13:00-20:00. Proposed for 29-06 through 01-10-17.
4.3	43 Drury Lane WC2B 5AJ 17/02390/FULL Barrafina/Barrafina Ltd.; GL Hearn (agent)	Use of an area of the public highway measuring 2.5m x 7.5m for the placing of four tables, eight chairs, two parasols and four planters.	No objection, however, the CGCA notes that the applicant continues to leave the servicing door in the Broad Court elevation open at all hours, causing music and other noise to disturb residents, whose bedroom windows are mere metres from the development. Given this, a condition should be included that specifies that the servicing door in Broad Court must remain closed. Comments by 16-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/ldmh5e Documents: https://goo.gl/yiSqbY Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours – street furniture can only be on the pavement M-SU 12.00-23:00, with tables, chairs and planters stacked away and not used by customers between 21:00 and 23.00. On 08-02-16 agenda.
4.4	22 Wellington Street WC2E 7DD 17/04105/TCH Champagne & Fromage /Monmouth Planning Ltd. (agent)	Use of an area of the public highway measuring 4.26m x 1.42m for placing of six chairs and three tables.	The CGCA objects to the use of any street furniture at this location because there is not enough space on the public highway. Whilst we appreciate the applicant's desire to have external seating, there simply is not space at this location on the public highway and the applicant was aware of this from previous Council decisions. Indeed, the Council has confirmed this in previous decisions. In 12/04429/TCH, the Council refused permission for street furniture, noting that "the principle of external tables and chairs outside your premises is not acceptable due to the proximity of the street furniture (telephone box and lamp post). The proposed tables and chairs would create a pinchpoint and cause an obstruction along the public highway." Nothing has changed to alter the Council's reasoning, namely the telephone box and lamp post are still in place. Indeed, as the attached photos show, the street furniture creates a pinchpoint making it difficult for pedestrians to pass, even without street furniture. The presence of tables and chairs at this location would greatly exacerbate this. Additionally, the pavement experiences consistently high footfall, including schoolchildren coming and going from the Lyceum Theatre. Footfall is so high that the Council recently extended the pavement along Wellington Street to accommodate the high volume. The CGCA notes that the Council has refused to permit other premises from expanding their use of tables and chairs simply because the pavement was widened; this is because extending the pavement was needed to accommodate pedestrians, not to expand entertainment uses along Wellington

			<p>Street.</p> <p>Clearances must require sufficient space on the pavement to allow pedestrians, wheelchair users, disabled people, the elderly and those with prams and buggies to pass along safely and easily, as well as take into account highway concerns and the space needed to use seating and tables, as well as not result in an impediment to street cleaning and rubbish collection (see “Westminster Way public realm strategy” SPG, para 46, p. 25; also see “Guidelines for the placing of tables and chairs on the highway” SPG).</p> <p>Comments by 16-06-17</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/D2QnCm & https://goo.gl/ODfR3b</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/mwLGgL</p> <p>Note: New application. No proposed hours listed.</p>
4.5	<p>24-25 Cranbourn Street WC2H 7AA 17/04082/TCH</p> <p>Spaghetti House/ <i>Berwin Leighton Paisner (agent)</i></p>	<p>Use of an area of the public highway measuring 1.0m X 16.0m for the placing 7 tables, 14 chairs and 4 plain banners.</p>	<p>Whilst the CGCA has no objection to the use of tables and chairs at this location, we continue to object to the positioning of furniture near the loading bay, as the pavement is too narrow in this location, which is a particular concern given the use of the loading bay and the consistently high volume of pedestrian traffic going to/coming from Leicester Square station.</p> <p>Comments by -06-17</p> <p>Photo: https://goo.gl/7o8sc8</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/cyXdZ8</p> <p>Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours: M-SU 10:00-23:00. On 09-05-16 agenda (see 16/02377/TCH).</p>
4.6	<p>1 Upper St Martin's Lane WC2H 9NY 17/04233/FULL</p> <p>Scarlet's/<i>Scarlet's</i>; <i>Bidwells (agent)</i></p>	<p>Use of two areas of the public highway measuring 1.19m x 5.1m on the Upper St Martin's Lane frontage and 1.6m x 4.6m on the Great Newport Street frontage for the placing of six tables and sixteen chairs with plain canvas barriers.</p>	<p>The Council specifies that, at a minimum, 2m clear width must be left between the edge of the chairs and the kerb or other obstructions. The CGCA notes that the Council specifies that 2m is a minimum and where footways are very crowded the Council's policy is for the clear zone to be much wider.</p> <p>The proposed tables and chairs are located in a high-traffic area where footways are very crowded. In particular, large crowds of pedestrians queue at the traffic light directly in front of the applicant's property, which is located at one of the busiest junctions in Covent Garden, where five roads meet. As such, the tables and chairs, as well as the vertical drinkers that gather around the street furniture, cause an obstruction on the public highway for the large number of pedestrians going between Covent Garden and Leicester Square and station. As a result, the 2m minimum clear width is not available for pedestrians to pass safely and pedestrians are regularly seen walking in the road because of a lack of space on the pavement.</p> <p>The CGCA objects to the proposed number of tables and chairs and configuration on the Great Newport Street elevation. Two chairs per table are proposed to back into the footfall. As stated in the “Westminster Way public realm strategy” SPG and “Guidelines for the placing of tables and chairs on the highway” SPG, tables and chairs create problems for pedestrians, particularly those with disabilities, because of obstruction of the public highway. This is particularly the case when chairs are placed in such a configuration that they back into the public highway, which reduces the clearance available for pedestrians, and particularly prams and wheelchairs, to safely pass. This can result in a health and safety issue if, in particular, pedestrians are forced to walk in the road.</p>

			<p>At a maximum, the applicant should be permitted to have two tables and four chairs, flush with the shopfront, on both the Great Newport Street and the Upper St. Martin's Lane elevations, for a total of four tables and eight chairs. This is a standard configuration for street furniture in Covent Garden.</p> <p>Additionally, a condition should be included that requires the applicant to ensure vertical drinkers do not create an obstruction on the public highway.</p> <p>Comments by 21-06-17</p> <p>Photos: https://goo.gl/q0srxH & https://goo.gl/kpFO1s</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/u6k9zq</p> <p>Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours. M-SU 11:00-23:00. On 23-05-16 agenda.</p>
4.7	<p>55 Long Acre London WC2E 9JL 17/03147/TCH A1 (Amorino)/H2C <i>Gelati Ltd.; The Yorkshire Maintenance Co (Hull) Ltd. (agent)</i></p>	<p>Use of an area of the public highway for placing 6 tables, 12 chairs and 3 barriers.</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to the excessive amount of street furniture proposed. The Council has consistently limited previous tenants to three tables, six chairs and six barriers, going back to 2008. (Note that previous applications for this location are listed as 55-56 Long Acre; see 08/04859/TCH through 14/00355/TCH.)</p> <p>As the attached photo shows, Hanover Place is a narrow, pedestrianised passageway, and the CGCA notes that there are residents directly above where the tables and chairs are proposed. Thus, they would be affected by noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Given this, the use of tables and chairs should be limited to three tables and six chairs.</p> <p>Comments by 28-06-17</p> <p>Photo: https://goo.gl/KrNFPS</p> <p>Documents: https://goo.gl/8S74tA</p> <p>Note: New application. Proposed hours: M-SU 11:00-23:00.</p> <p>Previous permission (for Starbucks) was three tables, six chairs and six barriers on the Hanover Place elevation, M-SA 08:00-22:30; SU 08:00-21:30 (see 14/00355/TCH). On 21-03-14 agenda; CGCA objected to earlier hours, which were granted.</p>
4.8	<p>45 Great Queen Street WC2B 5AA 17/04461/TCH A3 (Margot)/ <i>Margot Restaurant Ltd.; Monmouth Planning Ltd. (agent)</i></p>	<p>Use of an area of the public highway measuring 1.35m x 11.21m for the placing of 5 tables, 15 chairs, 4 plain canvas barriers, two flame heaters and a waiter station.</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to the amount of street furniture proposed. The proposed tables and chairs are located in a high-traffic area where footways are very crowded. As such, the number of proposed tables and chairs is inappropriate for this location and, as proposed, they would create an obstruction on the public highway.</p> <p>In addition to the amount of street furniture proposed, the CGCA also objects to the configuration, namely the proposed third chair at each table that backs into the footfall. As stated in the "Westminster Way public realm strategy" SPG and "Guidelines for the placing of tables and chairs on the highway" SPG, tables and chairs create problems for pedestrians, particularly those with disabilities, because of obstruction of the public highway. This is particularly the case when chairs are placed in such a configuration that they back into the public highway, which reduces the clearance available for pedestrians, and particularly prams and wheelchairs, to safely pass. This can result in a health and safety issue if, in particular, pedestrians are forced to walk in the road.</p> <p>As the attached photo shows, the area where the furniture is proposed to be placed has limited space due to the constant use of the cycle stand. The applicant's drawing minimises the size of</p>

			<p>the cycle stand – it does not show how far the stand extends along Great Queen Street and it does not indicate how much less space is available on the pavement when the stand is in use (and it is in constant use, given its proximity to residential flats and student housing). Indeed, the cycle rack acts as a wall along Great Queen Street.</p> <p>Further, the CGCA notes that the Council has limited the Prince of Wales public house directly next door (150-151 Drury Lane) to four tables and eight chairs on Great Queen Street elevation, and the permitted configuration does not permit chairs to back into the footfall. (See 16/04540/TCH, conditions 2 & 6, and informative 3).</p> <p>Given this, the CGCA suggests four tables and eight chairs, with no other street furniture, including no waiter station, be permitted. The chairs should not be permitted to back into the public highway. An informative should be included that states, “You are advised to ensure the number and layout of tables and chairs placed on the highway reflects the approved layout as shown on the approved drawing. You do not have planning permission to place a third chair at each table and we may take enforcement action to secure their removal.” For precedent, see 14/00995/TCH, informative 4.</p> <p>Comments by 28-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/G12Xda Documents: https://goo.gl/q6uO6m Note: New application. No proposed hours listed.</p>
4.9	355 Strand London WC2R 0HS 17/03892/TCH Starbucks/ <i>Starbucks Coffee Company</i> ; <i>Evolve Architecture</i> (agent)	Use of the public highway measuring 1.6m x 6.534m for the placing of three tables, six chairs, three barriers and two planters.	<p>Whilst the CGCA has no objection to the continued use of tables and chairs, we are concerned that there is not space for the addition of planters, as well. As the attached photo shows, the existing configuration already comes to the edge of the boundary with the neighbouring property.</p> <p>Further, the CGCA is concerned about the proposed new barriers, which are moveable, meaning they can easily be pushed further into the pavement at what is one of the highest-footfall areas in Covent Garden. We are also concerned that the new barriers would create a health and safety hazard, as the feet of these barriers stick out and could easily cause pedestrians to trip over them.</p> <p>The CGCA notes that no proposed hours are listed. These should not extend beyond the existing hours of Monday through Sunday, 07:00-23:00.</p> <p>Comments by 28-06-17 Photo: https://goo.gl/Bdjj2h Documents: https://goo.gl/Dn5sZv Note: Renewal. Change in use (two fewer barriers, but planters are new). Current hours: M-SU 07:00-23:00. No proposed hours listed. On 27-05-15 agenda (see 15/04887/TCH).</p>

5. Other business

5.1	73-75 Monmouth Street WC2H 9DG 2017/2572/A A1/ <i>Shaftesbury</i> ; <i>Rolfe Judd</i> (agent)	Display of 1 x non-illuminated hanging sign.	<p>Whilst the CGCA does not object to the addition of the hanging signs, we note that all signs throughout the Seven Dials Conservation Area should not look identical or the conservation area risks looking like a modern shopping mall. Instead, as noted in the Seven Dials Renaissance Study, which Camden has adopted, hanging signs should have variety, while maintaining the character of the</p>
-----	--	--	--

			conservation area. See page 29 of the Seven Dials Renaissance Study. Comments by 08-06-17 Documents: https://goo.gl/XV5HHm
--	--	--	--

6. Next meetings & future presentations

- 6.1 26 June 2017
- 6.2 10 July 2017
- 6.3 24 July 2017
- 6.4 14 August 2017