

Minutes

Covent Garden Community Association

Planning Sub-Committee meeting held on Monday, 12 September 2016
at 18:30 at the Hospital Club, 24 Endell Street WC2H 9HQ

www.CoventGarden.org.uk



TheCGCA



@TheCGCA

1. Attendance

1.1 **Present:** Elizabeth Bax (chair), Robert Bent, Shirley Gray, Selwyn Hardy, Gary Hayes, Jo Weir, Meredith Whitten

1.2 **Apologies received:** David Bieda, Richard Hills

1.3 **Comments received:** David Bieda, Amanda Rigby

2. **Presentation:** None

3. Planning Applications & Appeals

	Address & Application No.	Proposal	Comments
CAMDEN APPLICATIONS			
3.1	New Oxford Street WC1A 1ES 2016/4632/A B1/Bay Media Ltd. (agent)	Display of 13 x double sided UPVc non-illuminated banners to lamp posts.	Objection. The proposed banners would result in long-term visual clutter that is obtrusive, obscures the facades of the buildings along New Oxford Street (several of which are listed buildings), visually impairs the siteline on one of the main streets on the border of two conservation areas (Covent Garden and Bloomsbury), and adds an unacceptable commercialisation of the conservation areas. Camden's Streetscape Design Manual encourages respect for local character and promotes high-quality, clutter-free design to make streets and public places that are safe and easy to use for all. In particular, in chapter 4 of the manual, Camden specifies that the Council "has an aim of reducing visual street clutter." The CGCA notes that the Council advertised a deadline for comments of 16-09-2016 for this application, yet made a decision on 12-09-16. The CGCA questions why a comment deadline was given if the Council did not take comments received into consideration when determining the application. Comments by 16-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/m06aXv
3.2	25 Parker Street WC2B 5PA 2016/4807/P Parker House (C3)/Parker Street No. 1 Limited; DP9 Ltd. (agent)	External alterations to the fenestration of the rear and flank elevations of the building and changes to the mix and layout of new residential units approved under 2012/6132/P dated 30/08/2013 as amended by 2016/2476/P dated 20/05/2016.	No objection Comments by 22-09-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/0cL9pI Documents: http://goo.gl/h1mOAW Note: Grade II listed building

3.3	Hend House 233 Shaftesbury Avenue WC2H 8EE 2016/4158/P & 2016/4579/L B1/ <i>Industrial Light & Magic;</i> <i>FHP Engineering Services</i> <i>Solutions (agent)</i>	Relocation of 3 x AC units from the basement lightwell to the first floor north-facing terrace.	Objection. The CGCA questions the need to relocate the three AC units to the first floor, where they will result in harm to adjacent residents' visual amenity and will cause noise and disturbance. The applicant states that these proposals are necessary due to the high temperatures at the current position at the basement lightwell. However, a more eco-friendly solution – and one that would be more appropriate given that this is a Grade II listed building – would be to install an air-heat extraction unit in the basement. Further, we note that the applicant's acoustic report indicates that more appropriate measures are acceptable (see p. 11 of acoustic assessment, Report Reference: 160608-002A, dated July 2016). Comments by 22-09-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/Jmrqqd Documents: http://goo.gl/YiEGpn Note: Grade II listed building
WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS			
3.4	448 Strand WC2R 0QU 16/07701/LBC Minamoto Kitchoan (A1)/ <i>Minamoto Kitchoan Europe</i> <i>Limited; Takanaka (agent)</i>	Installation of an external alarm sounder in the exact same position as previous alarm sounder.	No objection Comments by 15-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/gXLb3g Note: Grade II* listed building
3.5	126 Drury Lane WC2B 5SU 16/07200/LBC Sarastro (A3)/ <i>Sarastro</i> <i>Limited</i>	Display of non-illuminated menu board measuring 0.78 x 0.54 (Linked with 16/06923/ADV).	No objection, provided the menu board is not illuminated. Comments by 19-09-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/Uc5pq4 Documents: http://goo.gl/MJsZf1 Note: Grade II listed building
3.6	Charing Cross Road WC2H 0DA 16/07171/FULL Wyndhams Theatre/ <i>AEDAS</i> <i>RHWL Ltd. (agent)</i>	Variation of condition 1 and removal of condition 3 of planning permission dated 25 June 2016 (RN: 15/01870), namely, amendments to the designs of the new doors and to provide full details of those doors previously required by Condition 3.	No objection Comments by 20-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/e7XmYN Note: Grade II* listed building
3.7	7-8 St Martin's Place WC2N 4HA 16/07659/FULL B1/ <i>Best Effort Ventures Ltd.;</i> <i>CBRE (agent)</i>	Change of use of first to fourth floors from offices (Class B1) to hotel (Class C1) accommodation together with associated works to comprise the erection of extensions at fifth floor/ roof level to create a rooftop restaurant and bar with external terrace (Class A3), reconfiguration of the ground-floor retail and creation of new retail floorspace at basement	(1) Whilst the CGCA does not object to a change of use to C1 hotel at this location, we have serious concerns about how such a scheme as proposed could be managed without causing adverse impacts and disruption to the high volumes of vehicular traffic, as well as significant harm to residential amenity. Situated at the junction of Charing Cross Road, St. Martin's Lane, William IV Street and St. Martin's Place, and located directly across

		<p>level (Class A1), works to the ground floor entrance, replacement of existing windows, installation of new shopfronts and signage at ground-floor level and installation of mechanical plant at podium and roof level.</p>	<p>the road from Trafalgar Square and the National Portrait Gallery, there is no parking for taxis or coaches or other space for dropping off/picking up guests of the proposed hotel and customers of the restaurant and bar.</p> <p>TACE2 says that new hotels must not have adverse environmental or traffic effects. Further, the policy says new hotels must provide adequate on-site facilities for the setting down and picking up of visitors by coaches and for taxis serving the hotel. Such on-site facilities are not proposed by the applicant.</p> <p>(2) Additionally, the servicing and delivery proposals are not clear, particularly for the four proposed retail units. Whilst it appears that some of these units will be serviced from Adelaide Street, others will not. There is not provision on William IV Street for servicing and deliveries. Before the Council can consider the application, a detailed servicing and delivery analysis must be provided. A detailed servicing analysis would also provide a the basis for negotiating a section 106, such as restricting the number of daily trips or specifying that only electric vehicles should be used.</p> <p>(3) The CGCA does not object to the extension at the fifth floor, however, we do object use of an outdoor terrace, which would harm residential amenity. We note that this area has many residents, including directly across from the proposed hotel and adjacent, as well (see photo). Given the size of the proposed restaurant and bar, the impact from noise and disturbance, particularly late at night, would cause great disturbance to local residents. Thus, should the Council permit the roof-level restaurant/bar, conditions must be included that limit it to internal use only, and windows, doors, etc., must be closed at all times to prevent noise breakout harming residential amenity.</p> <p>(4) Further, conditions must be included that specify that the restaurant and bar are to be used only by hotel residents and their guests. This adheres to Westminster's policy TACE2 (8.20), which says that the Council will attach conditions to planning permissions for hotel development to ensure that functional areas within hotels, such as restaurants, bars, are restricted to use by resident hotel guests only and that such areas are used only in conjunction with the main use of the building as a hotel. The CGCA notes that the Council has applied this policy to other hotels in Covent Garden.</p> <p>(5) Finally, the CGCA notes that the area is more residential than it may seem, given that it</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>is located adjacent to Trafalgar Square, one of London's primary tourist destinations. In addition to the many residents, the proposed hotel is also adjacent to the Grade I listed St. Martin-in-the-Field church and the Grade I listed National Portrait Gallery. Thus, any adverse impacts on both residents and these heritage assets must be considered.</p> <p>Comments by 22-09-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/Uo7qi6 Documents: http://goo.gl/acyGC0</p>
3.8	<p>27-32 King Street WC2E 8JD 16/07821/FULL A1 & C3/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)</p>	<p>Installation of new finishes to the entrance steps.</p>	<p>No objection Comments by 27-09-16 Photo: See documents (currently behind scaffolding) Documents: http://goo.gl/0rpaFC Note: Grade II listed building</p>
3.9	<p>5 Upper St Martin's Lane WC2H 9EA 16/06595/FULL A1/Coffee Island (London B) Ltd.; Neo Architects (agent)</p>	<p>Replacement of shop front, new signage including projecting sign with external seating (2 tables, 8 chairs and 2 benches) and glass wind breaker screens (Linked to 16/06596/ADV).</p>	<p>(1) The CGCA objects to the bifolding doors and openable shopfront. Westminster planning policy clearly opposes folding and openable shopfronts. See ENV6-9.108; DES5(c); and "Shopfronts, Blinds and Signs" supplementary planning guidance, which specifies that "this type of shopfront will be discouraged." 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. The CGCA also notes that Westminster has consistently refused permission for similar requests (for example, see 14/07107/FULL; 15/03108/FULL; 15/07688/FULL; among others).</p> <p>(2) The CGCA also objects 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>

			<p>(p. 17).</p> <p>(3) Regarding the proposed street furniture, the CGCA notes that the restaurant at 4a Upper St Martin's Lane has its tables and chairs set in further from the road, which is more appropriate than the applicant's proposal to extend street furniture to the street edge of the large column. In other words, the applicant should be required to move the proposed area of tables and chairs back to align with the street furniture permitted at the adjacent premises.</p> <p>(4) A condition should be included that specifies that the street furniture must be removed from the pavement no later than the permitted end time each night. Under no circumstances is the street furniture to be permanently fixed or left out overnight.</p> <p>(5) Finally, the applicant has not proposed hours for the use of tables and chairs. These hours must be limited to Westminster's core hours.</p> <p>Comments by 30-09-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/xDs76S Documents: http://goo.gl/OilimS</p>
--	--	--	--

4. Tables and Chairs

CAMDEN APPLICATIONS			
4.1	1 Neal's Yard WC2H 9DP 2016/4708/TC 26 Grains/26 Grains Ltd.; Thomas & Thomas Partners LLP (agent)	6 Tables and 12 Chairs	<p>Objection. The proposed number of tables and chairs is excessive given the limited space available as well as the residential nature of Neal's Yard. As the attached photo shows, the distance between the shopfront and the planters/seating in the courtyard is not wide enough to accommodate six tables and 12 chairs while still allowing enough room for pedestrians, including the many residents of Neal's Yard.</p> <p>The CGCA recommends that the proposals be reduced to four tables and eight chairs.</p> <p>Additionally, 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 Neal's Yard 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.</p> <p>Further, given the highly residential character of Neal's Yard, tables and chairs should not be permitted before 9 a.m. Noise from takeaways already exists at 8 a.m., but the addition of noise from outdoor seating causes disturbance for residents. A condition should be included that specifies that any tables and chairs may not be set out and must be put away within the permitted hours. In other words, a 9 p.m. end time means that all street furniture is put away by</p>

			<p>9 p.m. When street furniture is not put away until after the end time for tables and chairs it results in noise and disturbance to nearby residents well beyond the Council's framework hours. The Council's policy justification for having tables-and-chairs hours end at 21:00 is to protect nearby residents from such disturbance.</p> <p>Comments by 21-09-16</p> <p>Photo: http://goo.gl/4NdoaC</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/EUVy7H</p> <p>Note: New application. Proposed hours: M-SU 08:00-22:00. Previous T&CH usage was for 1&2 Neal's Yard (8T, 24CH, 2 umbrellas & 2 heaters – see 2013/1051/TC).</p>
4.2	<p>190 Shaftesbury Avenue London WC2H 8JL 2016/4788/TC The Diner/<i>Winston Barker</i> (agent)</p>	<p>8 Tables and 16 Chairs</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to the two tables and four chairs positioned on the corner of Shaftesbury Avenue and Neal Street (see attached photo). These chairs and table obstruct the pavement for pedestrians turning onto or from Neal Street.</p> <p>Further, the CGCA continues to point out that the existing and proposed hours do not comply with Camden's policy regarding tables and chairs. This policy clearly states that hours must be limited to Monday to Sunday, 08:00-21:00, given that this location is not a "predominantly commercial street in the Central London Area" as defined in the guidance. (See Appendix 2 of Camden's "Tables & Chairs Guidance.")</p> <p>Comments by 27-09-16</p> <p>Photo: http://goo.gl/nXqSQL</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/KikkjJ</p> <p>Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours. M-SA 09:00-23:00; SU 09:00-21:00. On 09-11-15 agenda.</p>
4.3	<p>4 Monmouth Street WC2H 9HB 2016/4776/TC Hotel Chocolat</p>	<p>5 Tables and 8 Chairs on Monmouth Street 3 Tables and 6 Chairs on Shaftesbury Avenue</p>	<p>The CGCA objects to the number of tables and chairs proposed on the Monmouth Street frontage. The CGCA challenges the proposed drawing, which shows chairs of 50cm pushed under tables that measure only 45cm. This means that the tables will have to be pushed further into the pavement than indicated, leaving less than the required minimum clear width of 1.8 metres between the edge of the chairs and the kerb or other obstructions as required by Camden (see Tables & Chairs Application Guidance, as well as CPG5 6.10-6.11). Clearances must take into account highway and disability concerns and the space needed to use seating and tables, as well as not result in an impediment to street cleaning and rubbish collection.</p> <p>Given this, one table and two chairs, positioned flush against the shopfront on either side of the door, should be the maximum permitted on Monmouth Street (e.g., a total of two tables and four chairs).</p> <p>One table and two chairs, positioned flush against the shopfront on either side of the door, should be the maximum permitted on Monmouth Street (e.g., a total of two tables and four chairs).</p> <p>On the Shaftesbury Avenue frontage, the measurements of the street furniture again do not add up. One table and two chairs on either side of the door and configured flush with the shopfront. We have attached a photo of the tables and</p>

			<p>chairs at the restaurant next to the applicant's that shows the tables and chairs positioned more appropriately (Shaftesbury frontage).</p> <p>Hours should adhere to the Council's policy for new applications for tables and chairs. These specify that the Council will generally apply hours of operation between 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. from Monday to Sunday. (See Appendix 2 of Camden's "Tables & Chairs Guidance.")</p> <p>Comments by 27-09-16</p> <p>Photos: http://goo.gl/d9cVm3 (Monmouth) & http://goo.gl/z9W4qk (Shaftesbury)</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/Hw9NhV</p> <p>Note: New application. Proposed hours: M-SU 08:00-20:00.</p>
4.4	<p>48 Kingsway London WC2B 6EN 2016/4857/TC Viet Eat</p>	<p>4 Tables, 8 Chairs and 2 Barriers (additional 2 Tables and 4 chairs are on private property)</p>	<p>Objection. The number of tables and chairs crammed into this space is inappropriate. The drawings are misleading because they do not accurately show how the applicant has positioned the tables and chairs so tightly that customers cannot realistically get in and out of the chairs in the designated space. On the day the attached photo was taken, the applicant was using fewer tables and chairs than permitted and proposed, demonstrating that enough space does not exist for the proposed layout.</p> <p>As seen in the photo, the area of use already extends well into the pavement at this exceptionally busy location near Holborn station. Additionally, the CGCA continues to object to the use of an A-board, which is not permitted and which obstructs pedestrian flow.</p> <p>The CGCA does not object to the use of four tables and eight chairs in total (e.g. including those on private property).</p> <p>The CGCA notes that Camden has required other restaurants and cafes on this section of Kingsway to remove their A-boards. A condition should be included specifying that the applicant does not have permission to install the large A-board.</p> <p>Comments by 03-10-16</p> <p>Photo: http://goo.gl/mMhfx5</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/GlidkB</p> <p>Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours: M-SU 08:00-20:00. On 24-08-15 agenda.</p>
WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS			
4.5	<p>12 Upper St Martin's Lane WC2H 9DL 16/06996/FULL Dishoom/<i>Dishoom Ltd.</i>; <i>Harrison Clark Rickerbys Limited (agent)</i></p>	<p>Use of an area of the public highway measuring 2.732m x 9.576m for the placing of 11 tables, 22 chairs and barriers.</p>	<p>Whilst the CGCA does not object to the continued use of tables and chairs at this location, we do object to the number proposed. As currently configured, the street furniture takes up a considerable width of the pavement, which is wide at this location for the specific reason of accommodating the heavy footfall.</p> <p>Permission should be granted for 8 tables and 16 chairs, pushed against the shopfront. This is necessary because the applicant consistently has long, uncontrolled queues that wrap along the public highway, making the tables and chairs inaccessible. If the applicant continues to operate this way, additional space must be made by reducing the number of tables and chairs on the public highway.</p>

			<p>The condition specifying that the applicant cannot install the ornamental bicycles, which are included on the proposed layout but not mentioned in the application, must continue to be included (see condition 5 from 14/02794/TCH) in any permission granted.</p> <p>The CGCA objects to the use of advertisements/branding on the proposed barriers. UDP DES8 (2) says that “Consent will not normally be granted for any of the following: a) signs and advertisements on street furniture or ground surfaces, especially in conservation areas...”</p> <p>Finally, the applicant is currently using ropes, and not barriers, as illustrated in the attached photo. The applicant must adhere to the approved layout, which includes canvas barriers.</p> <p>Comments by 19-09-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/kCAgzU Documents: http://goo.gl/9lvzrF Note: Renewal. No change in use or hours: M-SU 08:00-23:00. On 12-05-14 agenda.</p>
4.6	42 Drury Lane WC2B 5RT 16/08131/TCH Farmstand/ <i>Company M Ltd.; Firstplan (agent)</i>	Use of the public highway measuring 700mm (at its widest point) x 3500mm for the placing of one table and a bench.	<p>Objection. Permission was granted on 25-04-16 to the bench, which the CGCA objected to based on the narrow pavement at this location. In granting permission, the officer noted that, “Given the limited size of the bench and the likely use of the bench by customers for only short periods, it would not materially alter the use of the premises.”</p> <p>The addition of a table means that the street furniture is no longer limited in size. The CGCA challenges the measurements used on the proposed layout. We note that in the application for the bench (16/02748/FULL), the applicant said the furniture would extend 1.1m into the public highway. With the addition of the table, however, the applicant continues to say the furniture will take up 1.1m.</p> <p>The configuration shown on the applicant’s drawing and photos is not realistic once a customer is seated. In the photos, for example, the bench is pushed under the window sill. Additionally, a customer seated on the bench would have to push the table out in order to sit. As a result, the proposals would fail to leave a minimum clear width of 2 metres between the edge of the table and the kerb or other obstructions as required by Westminster (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>Given the recent appeal (16/00268/ADVREF) that allows an A-board at this site, pedestrians will now have to maneuver past an A-board, a bench and potentially a table at this narrow pavement, which is located in a predominantly residential area. All of these items must be considered in their totality, as collectively they result in a serious obstruction on the pavement. We note that the A-board is not shown on the drawing.</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,</p>

			<p>as well as not result in an impediment to street cleaning and rubbish collection. See attached photos.</p> <p>Comments by 28-09-16</p> <p>Photos: http://goo.gl/zGysj8 & http://goo.gl/o5B2i5</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/j2rjPs</p> <p>Note: Renewal. Change in use (addition of table); no change in hours: M-SU 07:00-23:00. On 25-04-16 agenda.</p>
--	--	--	---

5. Other business

The following comments were submitted since our last meeting:

CAMDEN APPLICATIONS			
5.1	172 Drury Lane WC2B 5QR 2016/4045/P B1/ <i>Boon Brown Architects (agent)</i>	Erection of projecting extensions to the side elevation facing Macklin Street.	<p>No objection, provided the officer is assured that the extensions will not contribute to any overlooking of residential flats.</p> <p>Comments by 26-08-16</p> <p>Photo: See documents</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/KxSc8M</p>
5.2	1 Tower Street WC2H 9NP 2016/4335/A <i>Easy Coffee/ Blaze Neon Ltd. (agent)</i>	Display of 3 x Internally illuminated fascia and 2 x internally illuminated projecting signs.	<p>The CGCA objects to the use of internal illumination, as this method of illumination is inappropriate and unsympathetic in a conservation area, and conflicts with Camden planning policy (see CGP1, 8.11-8.15; & DP25). 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). Further, Camden's Seven Dials (Covent Garden) Conservation Area Statement states that "signage should be non-illuminated or externally illuminated" (see SD19, p. 28-29).</p> <p>Comments by: N/A</p> <p>Photo: See documents</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/nssvYF</p> <p>Note: Officer notified CGCA that application would be refused with warning of enforcement action taken.</p>
WESTMINSTER APPLICATIONS			
5.3	Outside Bedford Chambers, James's Street 16/06813/FULL N/A/RBS; <i>Styles and Wood Ltd. (agent)</i>	Removal of two existing traditional red telephone boxes and the installation of one BT/RBS ATM and telephone kiosk.	<p>The CGCA objects to the removal of two iconic red phone boxes, which are part of the character and historic interest of the conservation area. Like other areas in Westminster, Covent Garden has its own character and identity based largely on heritage (S25). Westminster's City Plan recognises the importance of this and focuses on making sure that growth is sustainable and properly takes into account the character of Westminster and the aspects of the borough that make it such an attractive and valued location for residents, businesses and visitors. While we recognise that the red phone boxes no longer serve their original purpose, these proposals are not appropriate.</p> <p>The replacement is not a phone box, but rather an ATM that happens to have a phone incidental to it on the side. These proposals fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Covent Garden Conservation Area (S25, S28, DES9, para 10.108-10.128). According to S25,</p>

			<p>S28 and DES9, careful consideration must be given to the characteristics of a development site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context in order to achieve high-quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Westminster's planning policy is clear that the Council expects development to retain the distinctive character of the conservation area and new development must contribute positively to this. S25 specifies that "any change should not detract from the existing qualities of the environment."</p> <p>Illumination of the proposed ATM also would detract from the conservation area. Whilst ATMs typically have some amount of internal illumination, these machines typically are found inside shops or installed in shopfronts, not sitting in the middle of the public highway, as the proposed ATM is. Thus, the amount of internal illumination would stand out and have a negative impact. See "Shopfronts, Blinds & Signs" SPG; "Advertisement Design Guidelines" SPG; and DES8.</p> <p>Additionally, this phone box is located on what could be argued is the busiest pedestrianised street in Covent Garden, with consistently high footfall coming and going between the Piazza and Covent Garden station. Further contributing to the crowded conditions are the many street performers who locate directly next to these two phone boxes, as the attached photos illustrate. Installing a stand-alone ATM in this location (e.g., not an ATM installed in a shopfront) would also cause additional congestion as a result of queues forming.</p> <p>The CGCA also is concerned about further crime activity in this area, where criminals such as pickpockets already operate frequently. There is the potential for crime and vandalism of the unit, particularly at night.</p> <p>We note that proposals to install ATMs at this location have been refused by Westminster. Last year, the Council refused permission for ATMs at this location (see 15/03103/FULL), with the Council stating that "the City Council's policy is that street clutter should be kept to a minimum and opportunities to reduce clutter should be taken wherever possible, especially in busy streets such as this" (see officer's report). Further, the officer notes that "the use of this kiosk as a cash machine is unacceptable in principle." The Council's two reasons for refusal include:</p> <p>(1) Their appearance and location would fail to maintain or improve (preserve or enhance) the character and appearance of the Covent Garden Conservation Area; and</p> <p>(2) The ATM would block the flow of pedestrians along the footpath and would obstruct pedestrian movement.</p> <p>In addition to objecting to this particular proposal, we are also opposed to the precedent that any approval would set.</p> <p>Comments by 30-08-16 Photo: http://goo.gl/qSjbnh Documents: http://goo.gl/Nx7cti</p>
5.4	34A Henrietta Street 16/07973/FULL N/A/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of external lighting to the Henrietta Street and Piazza facades.	<p>No objection</p> <p>Comments by 20-09-16</p> <p>Photo: See documents</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/hFnLt2</p>

5.5	1A Henrietta Street & 22-25 Southampton Street WC2E 8PS 16/07972/FULL N/A/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of external lighting to the Henrietta Street and Southampton Street facades.	No objection Comments by 20-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/49UcWr
5.6	11-12 Russell Street WC2B 5HZ 16/07974/FULL N/A/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of external lighting to the Russell Street and Piazza facades.	No objection Comments by 20-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/5X1KCCQ
5.7	39 Wellington Street WC2E 7BB 16/07975/FULL N/A/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of an external lighting scheme to the Piazza, Tavistock Street and Tavistock Court facades. Linked with 16/07976/LBC.	No objection Comments by 27-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/Z3kL4Y Note: Grade II listed building
5.8	The Piazza WC2E 8BE 16/07977/FULL Jubilee Market/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of an external lighting scheme to the Piazza, Tavistock Court and Tavistock Street facades including lights, fixings and associated cabling and drivers. (Linked Case: 16/07978/LBC).	No objection Comments by 29-09-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/l4R5oN
5.9	The Market 16/08232/FULL Jubilee Market/Capco; Gerald Eve (agent)	Installation of an external lighting scheme to the Market Building, Covent Garden and associated works. (Linked Case: 16/08233/LBC).	No objection Comments by 03-10-16 Photo: See documents Documents: http://goo.gl/ciiVmm
5.10	Orion House 5 Upper St Martin's Lane WC2H 9EA 16/06596/ADV A1/Coffee Island (London B) Ltd.; Neo Architects (agent)	Display of internally illuminated fascia sign measuring 1.05 x 4.30 and non-illuminated projecting sign measuring 0.60 x 0.03 linked to 16/06595/FULL.	The CGCA objects 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). We note that the Council has consistently refused applications that propose internally illuminated fascias and advertisements and, thus, there is precedent for continuing to adhere to local and national policy here. These proposals fall on the boundary of the conservation area, and the development would be visible from within the

			<p>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>Comments by: N/A</p> <p>Photo: See documents</p> <p>Documents: http://goo.gl/uQVfkr</p>
--	--	--	---

6. Next meetings & future presentations

6.1 26 September 2016

6.2 10 October 2016