

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4716/P	Mary Nally	25/11/2024 13:44:03	OBJ	<p>There is a strong argument that it should be preserved as an historic shopfront. The Appeal Inspector, regarding an appeal at 122A (the other half of the building) for substantial works done without planning permission, same owner as 122, commented on how elegant and substantial it was (my words), which it is. Removing the window sills would only detract from this. Also, the feathered plasterwork at the top of the columns is really beautiful. Since its future use is a pharmacy, it is totally unnecessary. In the recent Appeal Statement to the Secretary of State, the owners state that the existing shopfront at 122A, which they put in, is of poor quality and has substandard materials! Such a fine frontage should be preserved from alterations by developers who are so unsympathetic to the structure of a fine red brick building. Further, extending the glazing downwards facilitates the opportunity for vandalism ie broken windows by criminals in search of drugs. I must be right in this as it was previously the HSBC Bank and security would have been a consideration. , I object to this increased exposure and you have a duty of care to me to prevent this occurrence.</p> <p>Lastly, it creates a flood risk from the increased rainfall we are now experiencing. Over time, the metal holding for the extra glazing will deteriorate. Flooding is an acknowledged constraint in this building. Aesthetically, this alteration adds nothing and the potential to detract is significant. There is nothing to commend this unnecessary alteration and I ask that you reject it.</p>
