

Application Ref: 16/01750/FUL

Proposal: External alterations to shopfront and rear elevation and installation of ATMs

Site: 29 Long Causeway, Peterborough, PE1 1YJ,
Applicant: Metro Bank PLC
Agent: Mr Mark Underwood
 Deloitte LLP

Referred by: **Head of Planning**
Reason: Wider public interest

Site visit: 27.09.2016

Case officer: Mr M A Thomson
Telephone No. 01733 453478
E-Mail: matt.thomson@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

Site Description

The application site is a three storey stone faced building which occupies a prominent position within the City Centre, situated on Long Causeway. The building is of mid-twentieth century construction and has a distinctive symmetrical design of five bays. The proportionality of the building gives a vertical emphasis with a simple rhythm. The rear of the building has been constructed out of red brick and can be accessed from Dean's Court, which serves the Cathedral (a Grade 1 listed building) and a number of residential properties, which include the Minster Precinct (Grade 2 listed).

The property is occupied as A1 retail, and there is a full length canopy at ground floor along the frontage of the building. Adjoining land uses include banks at ground floor with what appear to be offices above, as well as residential properties to rear (Minster Precinct). Immediately in front of the application site is a new meeting place, known as the Green Square (part of Long Causeway), which forms part of the extensive city-centre public realm works undertaken by the Council, with the eastern access to Queensgate Shopping Centre beyond.

The site is situated within the City Conservation Area, and there are a number of listed buildings and locally listed buildings within the wider shop frontage on Long Causeway.

Proposal

The Applicant seeks planning permission to undertake shop front alterations. A separate advertisement application has been submitted under 16/01751/ADV and is being considered separately.

The proposed shop front alterations would include removing the existing canopy on the front elevation and introducing a central glazed elevation up to and including the first floor with a rendered cladding frame. Either side of the central glazed window at ground floor will be floor to ceiling shop windows with a similar clad frame surround as used for the central section. At ground floor either side of the central glazed window there will be two ATM machines. On the rear elevation repair works and some bricking up of existing openings are proposed.

There are significant internal works proposed, including the part removal of the first floor, however

as the property is not a listed building these works would not require listed building consent and/or planning permission.

The current use of the building is A1 retail, however would be occupied as A2 (Bank); this is a permitted change under the Town and Country Planning Use Class) Order 1987 (as amended) and the change in use does not require planning permission.

History

As part of the planning application process Officers have sought to negotiate an amended scheme with the Applicant, a scheme which would as a minimum preserve the setting of the Conservation Area.

A pre-application enquiry (PAOTH/16/00071) was received on 17th June 2016 for shop front alterations. The Council's Conservation Officers provided comments advising that they would not support the scheme as submitted, and in good faith provided a sketch outlining what would be broadly acceptable and invited further sketches for comment.

The Council's Conservation Officer subsequently met the Applicant and Agent to discuss the proposal on 14th July 2016. The Case Officer formally responded on the 22nd July 2016 advising that a scheme could be considered in principle, however a number of amendments were required to accord with Local and National Policy.

Further correspondence was received on the 5th August 2016, of which the Council's Conservation Officer responded on the 1st September 2016 reaffirming the Council's position.

This planning application was received on the 9th September 2016. An application for advertisement consent was validated on the 19th September 2016. The scheme as submitted was unchanged from what was submitted at the pre-application stage. On the 26th September 2016 Officers advised the Agent that the scheme as submitted could not be supported, and forwarded a further sketch which could be used to inform amended plans.

On the 20th October 2016 an amended plan was submitted by the Applicant, which slightly reduced the height of the shop front alteration, however this was not sufficient to overcome Officer concerns. The main area of contention was the size of the ground floor glazed flanking elements, however there remained concerns with the size of the frame surround and the type of materials proposed (originally metal cladding). The Council's response was sent on the 24th October 2016.

On the 4th November the Council's Conservation Officer, Case Officer and Simon Machen (Director of Growth and Regeneration) met with the Applicant to discuss the application. Officers were of the understanding that the two storey opening would remain, focusing on the central three windows at first floor, and the two flanking first floor windows (No.1 and 5) retained as existing, albeit with improved window frames (ideally refitted with dark powder-coated aluminum). There was also discussion of a frame surround to ground floor windows. Whilst Officers did not consider there would be a benefit, Officers invited a revised drawing be provided for comments, however in doing so highlighted that any frame surround would need to be less bulky than the surround currently proposed.

An amended plan was received on 9th November 2016, which provided an architrave of a similar bulk to the original two storey surround. Further, the metal panel cladding surround would be replaced with a stone coloured render. Officers responded on the 10th November highlighting a number of shortcomings, and that the revised scheme had not addressed Officer concerns.

Discussions continued over this period and on the 29th November 2016 Officers provided two final

options to proceed, either to amend the scheme to single storey or replicate the sketch provided by the Council's Conservation Officer. Whilst some minor changes to the original scheme have been put forward the Applicant has confirmed that they are not prepared to change the proposal any further, as such Officer Recommendation is to refuse the application.

Under the circumstances, they have asked that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

In conclusion Officers are prepared to consider a central two storey glazed element facing onto Green Square, however the surround would need to be of an appropriate size, scale and material finish. In addition, the first floor flanking windows (No's 1 and 5) would need to remain and the upper floors elevations to be untouched. The reason for this is to ensure that the building remained the focal point, rather than being hidden behind a large, unsympathetic shop front, and to respect the rhythm of the street scene.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
16/01751/ADV	One internally illuminated projecting sign and one internally illuminated fascia sign, two non-illuminated blue fascia level signs, two non-illuminated logo door handles and 4x internally illuminated ATM signs	Pending Decision	

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66 - General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS17 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP11A - (a) Shop Frontages (including signage)

Permission will only be granted if the design is sympathetic, it would not harm the character and appearance of the street and advertisements are incorporated as an integral part of the design.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

PP17 - Heritage Assets

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

Peterborough City Centre DPD (2014)

PCC03A - City Core Policy Area (a) General principles

The Council will seek development of the highest quality which strengthens the area as the retail, leisure, tourism and civic focus for Peterborough and its sub-region. New development must: improve the quality of the public realm; protect important views of the Cathedral; preserve or enhance the heritage assets of the area; and protect and enhance existing retail areas. The Council will also support development which results in a net increase in dwellings, improved connectivity, employment, conservation of historic shop fronts and development which encourages trips into the City Centre.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document runs from 15 January to 25 February 2016.

At this preliminary stage the policies cannot be afforded any weight with the exception of the calculation relating to the five year land supply as this is based upon the updated Housing Needs Assessment and sites which have planning permission or which are subject to a current application. Individual policies are not therefore referred to further in this report.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Conservation Officer (26.09.16)

Object - The proposed alteration does not respect the building or the character and appearance of Long Causeway. The design approach is clearly at odds with the respect to the wider building group to the east side of Long Causeway. The scale of the alteration to the elevation is excessive and would create an over dominance of glazing to the elevation that would diminish the presence of the building in the street and be dominant in the street scene.

The built form to the east side of Long Causeway is continuous and provides enclosure to the street. Buildings are predominantly early to mid-Victorian age and of three storey form. Many buildings have good first and second floor detailing that adds interest to the street. The ground floors have typical glazed Shopfront appearance, and upper floors are intact. The buildings recall the 'old market town' character of Peterborough and have group value in the street scene.

This proposal would significantly change the character of the building and the wider group value to the street. No one building is dominant the proposal would diminish the rhythm of the building within the street scene. The proposed change would result in over half the elevation being replaced in a very contemporary manner making the building an unwarranted dominant focal point. Repeating such change elsewhere in the street would mar the positive contribution that the three storey buildings give to the structure and appearance of the street.

Second Round (1.12.16) - The revised proposal is still considered to create an elevation that would have an over dominant appearance in the street scene. The built form to the east side of Long Causeway is continuous and provides enclosure to the street from the generally three storey building. No one building is dominant in the street scape of the east side of Long Causeway. Indeed, it can be argued that the alteration to create a two storey central opening (across bays 2, 3 and 4) would create a dominant focal point at odds with the building grain where upper floor elevations are intact, and that a scheme removing the brash canopy and re-forming the ground floor glazing only is appropriate.

The revised proposal is not supported. Clear guidance has been provided of the scheme that the Local Planning Authority can support.

PCC Transport & Engineering Services (05.10.16)

Object - The Local Highway Authority has advised that the proposed works appear to encroach onto highway land. Note - The Agent has since confirmed that the proposed works would be on their land.

The Local Highway Authority has also commented that the proposed ATMs and works to the rear of the building would not cause any highway safety concerns.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) (04.10.16)

No objection - I have viewed the documents and note that the Applicant has other similar properties in large cities so their security is likely to be good and previously challenged where necessary. The location has a large footfall and is well covered by CCTV. There are other similar shops already present with ATM's so at this time I have no further comment in relation to community safety, crime and disorder.

The only additional comment I have now having seen the proposed front elevation of the premises is that there is a large frontage of glass incorporating the ATM machines - along with a wide area for vehicles to manoeuvre if desired. There has in recent years been an increase in thefts of ATM machines from the front of premises. There is no mention of security bollards to the front of the shop - I do not however know of any local policy in relation to bollards.

This office would however be pleased to discuss any queries the applicant may have in the future in

relation to crime and security.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 9

Total number of responses: 0

Total number of objections: 0

Total number in support: 0

On the 1st December 2016 an amended plan was received. This plan has been sent out for public re-consultation (14-days). Should any additional letters of representation or new information be received this will be contained within the Update Report.

The **Peterborough Civic Society** have responded as follows;

The alterations are out of scale and character with the remaining parts of the elevation. The overall effect would be to have an over dominant appearance in the street scene. This stone clad, five bay frontage has a symmetrical, verticality which has a hint of Art-Deco seriously compromised by the deep and plain fascia boards. The proposal to cut back a part of the first floor to create a banking hall is a good one which will create a more lively elevation. It is suggested that the existing vertical form be carried down to the ground floor with the five-bay rhythm replaced with a canopy/fascia having one central bay extending over the three central windows. The canopy should perhaps be fairly narrow and project more in the central bay and less far in the two side bays. The solid stone clad sections to the left and right edges could be reinstated to re-emphasize the vertical character and give a visual solidity to the elevation. In essence we feel that alterations to the elevation should be confined to the ground floor.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Design and Impact on the Conservation Area and other Heritage Assets

Policies CC3, CS16 and PP2 seek to ensure any development would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area. Policies CS17 and PP17 seek to ensure the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, adjacent Listed Buildings or buildings of local interest.

The Conservation Officer objects to the proposal, advising that the proposed shopfront alterations do not respect the host building, nor would they preserve this section of the Conservation Area. The reason for this is that the design approach is clearly at odds with respect to the wider building group to the east side of Long Causeway.

The built form to the east side of Long Causeway is continuous and provides enclosure to the street. Buildings are predominantly early to mid-Victorian age and of three storey form. Many buildings have good first and second floor detailing that adds interest to the street. The ground floors have a typical glazed shopfront appearance and the upper floors are intact. The buildings recall the 'old market town' character of Peterborough and have group value in the street scene.

The proposed design, scale and materials are considered to be excessive and would diminish the presence of the building. Over half the front elevation would be replaced in a very contemporary manner making the building an unwarranted focal point, this proposal would therefore have an unacceptably adverse impact upon the rhythm of the east side of Long Causeway.

This proposal would therefore significantly change the character of the building and the wider group value to the street as no single building is dominant within the street scene. As such the proposed shop front alterations would not preserve or enhance this section of the City Centre Conservation Area and would be contrary to Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), Policy CC3 of the Peterborough City Centre Plan (2014), the adopted Shop Front design Guidance (2014) and the

National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Officers raise no objection to the proposed works at the rear of the building, or the provision of ATM's, however as these works form part of this scheme the application is refused as submitted.

Neighbour Amenity

Policy PP3 seeks to ensure that any development would not result in an unacceptable overbearing impact, loss of privacy, light or amenity.

The application site is situated within the City Centre, and whilst the adjacent uses are occupied as banks (A2 use) there are residential properties to the rear. The proposed external works at the front of the building would not impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers, and given the works proposed at the rear of the site are essentially replacement and/or repair works, for example no new windows are proposed, the proposed scheme would not impact upon the amenity of the residential properties to rear.

As such the proposed works would not impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers or the residential properties to the rear, and the proposal would accord with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

Access and Highway Safety

The Local Highway Authority queried whether any of the proposed shop front alterations would encroach onto highway land, however the Agent has confirmed that the proposed works would be on their land. The Local Highway Authority has also commented that the proposed ATMs and works to the rear of the building would not cause any highway safety concerns. As such the proposal would accord with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

Crime and Security

The Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) has reviewed the proposal and raised no objection, however has noted that due to an increase in theft of ATM's, the PALO has queried whether any bollards have been considered. No bollards are considered necessary as part of this application as vehicle access onto Long Causeway is controlled, and given the amount of CCTV coverage in the City Centre a vehicle travelling in the wrong direction from Cowgate would likely be noticed.

6 Conclusions

The proposal is unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED**

- R 1 The proposed shop front alterations by reason of design, scale and materials would unacceptably diminish the presence of the host building within the street scene, and would result in an incongruous, dominant and out of keeping feature that would be at odds with the respect to the wider building group to the east side of Long Causeway. The proposed shop front alterations do not respect the host building or preserve the character or appearance of this section of the City Centre Conservation area, and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the Peterborough City Council Shop Front Design Guidance (2014).

This page is intentionally left blank