

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/05042/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 162 High Street Beckenham BR3 1EW

OS Grid Ref: E: 537276 N: 169472

Applicant : Mr Saverjeet Gurwara

Objections : No

Description of Development:

The installation of a replacement shopfront (part retrospective), awning and roller shutter.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Beckenham Town Centre
Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Primary Shopping Frontage
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

The application seeks consent for a new shopfront, awning and roller shutter. The main frame of the shopfront has already been installed.

This is a resubmission of ref: 17/01723/FULL1.

Location

The application relates to a three-storey, plus roof accommodation an end of terrace property, which forms part of a wider commercial parade. The site includes commercial units at ground floor and what appears to be residential accommodation above. The building is Locally Listed and forms part of the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

Comments from Consultees

Conservation Officer: The signage is an improvement in terms of scale of design but the shopfront remains excessively glazed. The previous shopfront had a number of mullions which were removed and a low stallriser. More effort would need to be made by the applicant in this instance and accepting this amount of

glazing would make it difficult for us to apply good standards elsewhere. On this basis I feel the proposal is contrary to BE11 and BE 19

Environmental Health Pollution Officer: No objections

Highways: There are no objections to this proposal from the highway point of view.

Please apply the following to any permission

DI 03 - the licencing of the awning and projecting sign under the Highways Act 1980 - streetworks.enquiries@bromley.gov.uk

Policy Context

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. The submission of the Draft Local Plan was subject to an Examination In Public which commenced on 4th December 2017 and the Inspector's report is awaited. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

The development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley UDP (July 2006), the London Plan (March 2016) and the Emerging Local Plan (2016). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.
London Plan (2015)

7.2 An Inclusive Access

7.4 Local Character

7.6 Architecture

7.8 Heritage Assets and archaeology

Unitary Development Plan (2006)

BE10 Locally Listed Buildings

BE11 Conservation Areas

BE19 Shopfronts

BE20 Security Shutters

Draft Local Plan (Submission Version)

Policy 37 General Design of Development

Policy 41 Conservation Areas

Policy 101 Shopfronts and Shutters

All other material considerations shall also be taken into account.

Planning History

87/00333/ADVILL -Advertisement Consent granted on the 12.03.1987 for the installation of an internally illuminated fascia and projecting Box Sign.

17/01568/ADV - The installation of one illuminated fascia and projecting sign. Refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed advertisements, by reason of their scale, design and number, would result in a prominent over-proliferation of advertisements which fails to respect the scale, character and appearance of the locally listed host building, and wider Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area contrary to Policy BE21 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

17/01723/FULL1 - Installation of a replacement shopfront, awning and roller shutters. Refused for the following reason:

1. The design of the replacement shopfront does not provide accessible access and fails to respect or complement the character, appearance, proportions and rhythm of the existing locally listed building and would not therefore preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, being contrary to Chapters 7 & 12 of the NPPF; Policies 7.2, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies BE1, BE10, BE11 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

Considerations

The main issue in this case is whether the proposed works would be significantly harmful to the appearance of the Locally Listed host building and the character of the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation area within which the property lies. Consideration should also be given to pedestrian and highway safety together with previous reasons for refusal.

In respect of pedestrian and highway safety no objections have been received from the Council's Highways Officer regarding either the proposed levels of illumination or awning. This is considered to be acceptable.

Policy BE19 states that when considering applications for shopfronts the Council will require the proposed to be well related to its context (ii) be of a high quality design (iii) period features should be retained where appropriate; (iv) deep or uninterrupted fascia's are avoided; (v) stall risers are provided; (vi) display windows at first floor level are avoided; and (vii) appropriate provision is made for access by those with mobility impairment.

Paragraph 6.51 of the above policy states that the design of shop fronts has a critical role to play in the creation of attractive and vibrant town centres. They are frequently replaced and altered as tenants change. As the character and appearance of a shopping parade or street is determined by its individual components, it is important that any proposals are viewed in respect of the wider environment as well as the individual unit. It goes on to state that good design can make a positive contribution to urban character. It is vital that designs and materials of shopfronts are sympathetic to the scale and existing features of the host building and its surroundings. In particular the standardisation of shop design is often at odds with the traditional scale of the buildings. The original character and individual qualities of buildings in shopping centres should be preserved. In conservation areas and historic buildings it is particularly important that materials relate to the period, style and character of the buildings.

BE11 states that in order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas, a proposal for new development, alteration or extension to a building will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings.

The site is located within the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area and the building is Locally Listed. The application property is prominent within the streetscene but forms part of a larger commercial parade.

High Street Beckenham encompasses a variety of shop fronts, with traditional and modern designs. These vary in terms of their materiality, glazing pattern and stall riser depth. Examples of these modern shop fronts with large areas of uninterrupted glazing, and low stallriser, include No 108-110 High Street Beckenham. However, many of these examples were installed prior to the Conservation Area designation in 2015.

A recent appeal decision (APP/G5180/Z/17/3175811) for a shopfront at number 69 High Street Beckenham is considered material in the assessment of the current proposal. This also related to retrospective permission for a replacement shopfront, which included large areas of interrupted glazing and no stallriser.

The Inspector of the above appeal observed that 'Whilst the range in the appearance of shopfronts appears to have widened over time, some have retained the traditional features of a central recessed door with a fanlight above, two display windows and a generous stallriser. Where this is the case, I find these properties

make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment and therefore have an important role in preserving both the character and appearance of the CA'

The existing shop front included a side door with one display window, which was broken up by a single transom creating two areas of glazed panelling. A fanlight was situated above the door and the design had the supporting base of a stallriser. The overall design and proportions of the shopfront including the use of transoms, mullions, fanlights and door frame to break up the areas of glazing was more in keeping with the traditional character of the host building.

The current proposal has amended the scheme since the previous refusal and now proposes to install a small stall riser and suitable access for those with mobility impairment. However, the large area of glazing above would remain.

It is noted that Inspector of the above appeal found that 'Whilst the variety of shopfronts on the High Street and surrounding area have a mix of traditional and modern designs, these vary in terms of materials, glazing pattern and stallriser depth. However, I note that many of the more modern examples in the area were installed prior to the designation of the CA in 2015. Consequently, as a result of these modern replacements, I find that the character and appearance of the High Street area has been eroded. The Council designated the CA in order to, amongst other things, arrest that erosion with the intention of safeguarding elements of the streetscene which would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This is given significant weight through Policy BE11 of the UDP and the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)'.

He went on to find that 'The replacement shopfront now in situ incorporates the significant use of glazing and features no stallriser or any visual break which could be provided by a mullion and transoms. As a result, I find it to be an unsympathetic, unrelated and prominent form of development which fails to respect its context. Therefore, it is out of keeping with, and has an adverse impact on, its surroundings. Moreover, it is significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and also diminishes the character of the surrounding area'.

Given the conservation area designation there is duty to consider the impact of the proposal with regard to harm to the significance of the heritage asset and whether it would preserve or enhance the character of the CA. Consideration should also be given to the impact on the Locally Listed Building.

In this case, the large areas of uninterrupted glazing without the visual break created by mullion and transoms; together with the brash colouring of the shop frame, shutter box, awning and low stallriser would result in an unsympathetic and prominent form of development, which fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA or special interest of the Locally Listed Building contrary to Chapters 7 & 12 of the NPPF; Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016); Policies BE1, BE11 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006); policies 41 and 101 of the Local Plan (Submission Version 2017). Amongst other matters, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development has no significant adverse impact on its surroundings and preserves or enhances the

character or appearance of designated heritage assets, including conservation areas.

The proposal would also include a roller grill shutter. Whilst the shutter box is not considered to be sympathetic the grill would only cover the glazed area and the open grill design is considered to appropriate and more sympathetic to the tradition character of the building.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/05042/FULL1 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1. The design of the shopfront would result in an unsympathetic and prominent form of development, which fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA or special interest of the Locally Listed Building contrary to Chapters 7 & 12 of the NPPF; Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016); Policies BE1, BE10, BE11 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006); policies 41 and 101 of the Local Plan (Submission Version 2017).**