



Friends of St. James's Park and The Green Park
10 Old Pye Street London SW1P 2DG

John Walker Esq.,
Operational Director
Development Planning
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QP

By e-mail southplanningteam@westminster.gov.uk

For the attention of Jon Kilner

13th December 2013

Dear Mr. Kilner

Ref 13/11100/FULL

16 Great Peter Street London SW1P 2BX

Installation of new shopfront including new entrance on the corner of Great Peter Street and Great Smith Street.

Thank you for your letter dated 25th November 2013 along with copies of the documents of the application. This is the second application concerning the elevations of the property, and which we find totally unacceptable.

We raised strong and serious objections to the previous application. The proposed changes to the elevation remain totally insensitive to the building and the surroundings. As the local amenity and civic Society, our opinions have not changed and we are dismayed by the determination to make such alien intrusions into the local environment. As a member of Community said "a good polite 1970s building has been ruined at street level".

Elevation treatment

The photograph of the building shown in a 'three-quarter' view, clearly indicates the building as a whole. The use of brick from pavement upwards, unites the elevation providing it's homogeneity. The difference in spacings of the ground floor columns and their detailing add to the interest of the elevations.

In fact, the coloured elevation drawings by RMLArchitecture demonstrate very clearly how the proposals totally destroy the consistency of the architecture. The huge plate glass windows, from pavement to ceiling, create a very uncomfortable appearance with the irregularly spaced white columns in between. The latter have as a result no relationship to the floor above. What was a cohesive elevation as a whole is made to look decidedly odd

Corner entrance

For reasons given below - due to the likely number of people expected to visit the retail premises particularly at peak times we regard a corner entrance an unsound proposition and likely to endanger both customers and other pedestrians, as well as traffic.

'Heritage consultant's opinions

We do not agree with the opinions of the 'heritage consultant' and do not accept his statements which we refute. In para. 4.03 he writes "number 16 fails to sit happily within the existing conservation area scene in that it does not have the visual calm of the largely flat facades of the majority of surrounding buildings or the

domestic scale". If that were so, how do the Applications proposals address his issues? In what way are they 'happy' ? Does drawing attention to the elevations by cladding the existing brick with glaring white column coverings produce a 'happy' building appearance ? Does adding a deep white fascia running the full length of both elevations create an improvement of calm ?. Where is there a single modicum of "calm" ? How can increasing the size of the windows making it domestic; rather the opposite.

The bald fact is that 'Itsu' has a retailer's handbook with a standard design to be applied to any location and in any environment. The proposals have taken no notice of the location, the nature of the architecture, nor the scale. It is grossly arrogant in showing no respect to the existing and largely 'traditional' context.

Information Sheet for the Design and Access Statement - The Applicant states -

- 1 It has not been necessary to discuss the proposals with the neighbours as there will be no amenity impact to them with regards to the physical alterations.
Our Response : How little the Applicant understands amenity impact.
- 2 The materials proposed have sought to reflect the local character and appearance of the area
Our Response : The Applicant has not taken onboard that the the area is predominated by the use of brick and stone dressings; desired by the Society
- 3 To the question : What is the relationship between the proposed works and public routes and do they have any impact ? The Applicant writes "there are no changes proposed to the existing access points which will be retained"
Our Response :
 - (a) The Applicant has ignored the proposal for the new corner access which is directly in line with the traffic signal.
 - (b) Next as quoted some 84% of the customers will be for 'take way' food. There will therefor be big increase in pedestrians at a very sensitive location by the crossing points of both thoroughfares.
 - (c) There will be large delivery vehicles; and refuse collection
 - (d) Although not in the Application there is a high probability that there would be an application for seats and tables on the pavements. In the event that if the Council should determine that the current Application could proceed, there should be a condition that the use of the pavement would remain strictly for pedestrians only.
 - (e) The hours for opening, and for delivery and collection should be stated having regard to the local residential use and an avoidance of disturbance.

The Society finds the application to be completely unacceptable for the reasons given above and registers it's Objection. We trust our observations and comments will be taken fully into account. We ask that our comments be made known to the Council.

Yours Sincerely
for and on behalf of the Thorney Island Society

PP Tom Ball

June A Stubbs

Chairman

Please reply to : Tom Ball AADipl RIBA DipCD MRTPI(Rtd) FRSA
10 Paxton Terrace Grosvenor Road London SW1V 3DA 020 7834 5173