

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 March 2024 14:16  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to be redacted: 2023/4899/P 65 Regents Park Road destruction of shopfront without consent

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



The majority of Council staff are continuing to work at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please communicate with us by telephone or email.

---

**From:** Pam White [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 02 February 2024 12:07  
**To:** Jenna Litherland [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Objection to be redacted: 2023/4899/P 65 Regents Park Road destruction of shopfront without consent

[REDACTED]

Looking at the application, my objection is as follows:

1. The stall riser is probably higher as proposed, at 750, than it was previously.
2. The applicant wishes to have an openable window for one or more of the sliding sashes, as they say:
  1. "Restoring the windows, and replacing the contemporary glazing and openable hatch with three symmetrical sash windows will therefore ensure the traditional features of the conservation area are reinstated."

And there was previously only one large window here, not three sliding sashes, so this is not "restoring the windows". What was here previously was one large pane of glass, not openable, and this should be restored to be the same as what was destroyed.

3. There is no detail shown of the glazing bars and the CA statement states that these should be 'slender', so it would seem appropriate to ask for detail here.

The opening of the proposed sliding sashes is considered in the heritage statement but this is inconsistent. The present opening window causes unacceptable queuing on the street as the applicant

admits but he does not explain how the new proposed opening window will avoid this queueing on the street, which is a local disturbance and one which causes obstruction; in fact he deems it acceptable which it is not:

"The proposal will replace a takeaway hatch, which caused queuing on the street, and replace the shopfront with a traditional design therefore limiting the impact of noise on the surrounding street. The proposal will therefore improve amenity at the site, and should be deemed acceptable in this regard. "

4. This application is not typical of the pattern of the shopping street in PHCA and does neither preserve nor enhance the CA.

To summarise, the applicant should be required to install a replacement window replicating what was destroyed.

Pam White

[REDACTED]