

It should be noted that the petition itself does not quote the shopfront application reference, but relates solely to the change of use application TM/05/00608/FL. The covering letter quotes both application references and refers to the shopfront works being retrospective.

4.3 A8 Site Notice: No response.

5. Determining Issues:

- 5.1 The main issues to be considered are whether the development harms the visual amenity of the locality and whether it meets policy P4/13 of the TMBLP 1998.
- 5.2 Policy P4/13 and policy annex PA4/13 require new shopfronts and alterations to existing ones to respect the character, proportions, period and design of the individual building, of adjacent buildings, and of the wider area, with particular regard to the detailing of fascias, windows and doors, use of materials and form of any illumination.
- 5.3 The new shopfront utilises the existing stallriser, apart from it being partially removed to create a doorway, however, such alteration is entirely in keeping with the doorways to the other shops in the parade. The fenestration of the shopfront has altered through the creation of a number of smaller sections of glazing, rather than a single expanse of glazing. Such an alteration is a visual improvement to the building and is more in keeping with the other shops within the parade. The fascia board is in proportion with the other shops in the locality. The retention of the shopfront as built does not detract from the visual amenity of the locality.
- 5.4 Members will note that the PC and local residents have raised concerns over the use of the shop as a hot food takeaway and its associated impacts. However, the planning application before Members is only for the physical alterations to the shopfront. The intended use of the premises is irrelevant to the determination of this particular application. The design of the shopfront would be equally appropriate, irrespective of whether this unit were to be a take-away or remain in use for Class A1 retail purposes. The approval of this application will not imply that planning permission for the takeaway has also been granted. Although I can appreciate local concern that this application is retrospective, the legislation does explicitly allow this.
- 5.5 In light of the above considerations, I find this development acceptable.

6. Recommendation:

- 6.1 **Grant Section 73A Approval** as detailed by letter dated the 27.05. 2005 and by photographs and plans received on the 01.06.2005.

Contact: Hilary Johnson