

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4986/P	Robert Friedman	16/01/2021 14:16:20	AMEND	<p>I have no objection in principle to the change in shop front. However, there are certain points about the application itself which are concerning and I would ask that they are clarified / that the application be resubmitted with the issues remedied.</p> <p>Firstly, the application form is unclear as to what permission is actually being sought (see point 5- description of proposal, and also see the various internal floor plans). As set out above, I have no objection in principle to the new shop front, but the application - and any decision - should be clear that the application relates solely to the new shop front, and not to anything else. If any other permission is being sought eg for decoration, internal alterations, or anything else, this has not been made clear on the application. If such other permission is sought, a clearer and properly completed application would be required with a proper explanation of the proposals, allowing neighbours to consider. The current application would be insufficient.</p> <p>Secondly, the "concept image" i.e. the proposed plan, does not reflect the new shopfront, with a ramp, as in fact built. Again, I have no objection to a ramp (which will be helpful in providing disabled access) but for clarity, I would note that the proposal/application does not reflect the correct position. I imagine that other neighbours may wish to have the chance to comment once the correct position is set out.</p> <p>Thirdly, I would note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - point 8 on the application form appears to be incorrect. New pedestrian access is proposed to or from the public highway as the location of the door has changed. - The ownership certificate on the application form is incomplete. It does not give the name of the owner. <p>Fourthly, the "concept details" drawing is unclear and cannot properly be understood. It does not appear to reflect the correct position. It is not clear what the door on the left hand side is meant to represent. I would suggest that planning cannot be given based on this document.</p> <p>Fifthly, a number of the documents submitted contain writing in a foreign language. Of course, I have no objection to the use of a foreign language, but I would ask that translations be provided of all foreign language text so that they can be understood. It is not possible for consultees to fully consider the documents when they contain information that cannot be read by somebody who does not speak the foreign language in question. See, e.g. proposed shop front elevation plan and floor plans, the existing front elevation.</p> <p>Therefore, while I would have no objection in principle to the shop front as built out, I would ask that the issues with the application above are dealt with and, as appropriate, neighbours be given the chance to respond to the application once amended.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of the above points.</p>