

# CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

---

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT MOUNT BATTENHALL ON 7<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2022**

**Present:** Mr C Potterton in the Chair  
Councillor Barnes, Dr H Barrett, Councillor Bisset, Mr D Davis,  
Mr R Lockett, Mr M McCurdy, Mr D Saunders, Mrs C Silvester

**Officers:** Dr P Collins, Mr A Thompson, Interim Head of Development  
Management, Ms S Watts, Senior Planning Officer

**Apologies:** Ms A Burton, Mr M. Hughes, Mr S Laws and The Dean

### **47. MINUTES**

The minutes of the remote meeting held on 2nd August 2022 were approved as a correct record.

### **48. CHAIR'S REPORT**

#### **1. Appeal Decisions and Notifications of Appeal**

The Chair reported on two decisions in respect of Pitmaston House, Malvern Road. The Inspector had dismissed an appeal against refusal of an application for proposed change of use from residential to mixed use residential & holiday accommodation let, and also an appeal against an enforcement notice for such use without permission. The Inspector had concluded that this development does cause harm to the living conditions of nearby residents in respect of noise and disturbance, in conflict with Policy SWDP 21.

#### **2. Chair's Correspondence and Information for discussion**

The Chair expressed best wishes to Mr Thompson, who was attending his final meeting as he would be leaving the City Council shortly.

### **49. OUTCOME OF APPLICATIONS**

Dr Collins reported on the outcome of items considered at the August meeting. All but two of the applications considered had been approved, a recommendation of approval had been made for 7.6 22/00625/LB – 3 Rainbow Hill Terrace and only 7.3 22/00556/FUL & 22/00555/LB – John Gwynn House, Bridge Street and 7.5 22/00561/FUL – 42 Broad Street remained undetermined.

# CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

---

## 50. LOCAL VALIDATION CHECKLIST CONSULTATION

Sally Watts from the Development Management Team was in attendance for this item and presented a summary of how the validation process is being updated. The Panel welcomed the proposals but expressed ongoing concern in regard to timing, especially with 're-consultations' which have a restricted timescale.

The Panel were also concerned that there is still no advice being given regarding the quality of work being submitted and noted that other parts of the SWDP do include advice on 'best practice' in this regard. Sally was hoping to prepare more 'user friendly' guidance that would help householder type applicants in the preparation of more appropriate and legible drawings.

## 51. REPORT ONLY ITEMS

22/00634/LB – 17 Reindeer Court  
External redecoration and internal fitout to suit a barbering business.

### **No Objection**

22/00653/HP – 52 Portland Street  
Ground and first floor side extension. Ground floor rear extension with canopy to front.

### **No Objection**

22/00663/LB – 18 Albany Terrace  
Retrospective application for new front entrance gate.

### **No Objection**

22/00716/ADV – 58 High Street  
Proposed illuminated shop front sign, and projecting sign.

**One Panel Member commented that there should not be both an illuminated fascia and an illuminated projecting sign.**

## MAIN AGENDA ITEMS

### 52. 22/00597/FUL – 26 New Street

*Change of use of existing first floor retail space into residential flat.*

# CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

---

**The Panel has no objection in principle, subject to itemised issues, specifically the insulation to create the proposed internal spaces and reduce noise needs to be planned carefully.**

**53. 22/00666/HP & 22/00667/LB – 18 Albany Terrace**

*Timber screen to rear boundary wall. Internal alterations, door and window to rear. Rooflights in roof slope and hard landscaping to the rear.*

**The application was approved before the Panel met.**

**54. 22/00682/FUL & 22/00683/LB – Eagle Vaults, 2 Friar Street**

*Installation of an escape window on the first floor*

**The Panel has no objection, subject to the work being done to a high standard.**

**55. 22/00689/HP & 22/00598/LB – 62A Battenhall Road**

*External alterations and refurbishment including an octagonal rooflight and pergola.*

**The Panel has no objection.**

**56. 22/00696/HP & 22/00697/LB – 22 Britannia Square**

*Extension to second floor to provide bathroom and installation of glazed canopy over front entrance door.*

**The Panel objects to this application due to its impact upon the host listed building and the conservation area.**

**57. 22/00685/FUL – 57 Foregate Street**

*Erection of 3-storey mixed use development consisting of ground floor commercial unit and 2 floors of residential accommodation.*

The panel considered that the quality of this proposal falls well below what one would expect in such an important location.

**The Panel objects to this application because the proposed scheme is not appropriate for this location.**

# CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

---

## **58. 21/01023/FUL – St Placides, Battenhall Avenue**

*Demolition and new build to create a care community for the elderly with communal areas at St Placides School annex site (Revision of previously approved scheme P17B0507).*

This application was not originally on the agenda but due to its significance the Chair agreed that it should be considered.

Opinions were divided amongst the Panel. Some concluded that they would prefer retention and reuse of the existing former school building (as per the extant consent, upon which work has commenced). Others took the view that the proposed scheme was acceptable, with some modifications. These included that:

- any replacement building be of a high quality.
- the main entrance be made more prominent – it was too subservient in the proposals.
- the front elevation could be more asymmetrical, to echo the form of the existing building.

Comments were also made regarding the proposed accommodation blocks to the rear of the main building. A view was expressed that these could follow the same design philosophy as the proposed new frontage building.

Overall, the conclusion was that the principle of demolition and new construction could be accepted if the proposed scheme were of the highest quality and properly reflected the character of this part of Battenhall. More work is required in this regard.

Post meeting note: The following additional comments were received from a Panel Member following the meeting: -

*It appears to be the addition of some rustication (in the same style as that on new builds in the main Battenhall Mount development?) and a change in the windows in the second-floor level. So, there is not much change from what we saw before, and I think our comments stand re the loss of the main building and its replacement. There needs to be some further thought here.*

*Rustication – not a feature of the existing building so not sure what this adds unless it is about the 'design philosophy' to link the scheme together as in comments made yesterday. We need some further explanation here.*

*Symmetry and gables – there is some symmetry to the existing building in its three gables but the north west elevation is quite different and this adds asymmetry – it would be good if this could be picked up as it is a*

# CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

---

*prominent view in from the main road. I still think more asymmetry in the new building would better reflect the style of the existing villa and others in the CA. As you can see, we lose the height in the middle of the building in terms of its current mass, which makes the new build seem at odds with the footprint and silhouette of the existing – chopping the development into four square blocks with the glass linking elements does little to enhance the design.*

*Windows – not sure about all casements. These are on the second floor of the existing but not the lower floors which are more vertical in emphasis. Again, the Victorian/Edwardian eclecticism here adds variety which it would be good to replicate in any new build.*

*The glazed gable elements – not sure about these – is this supposed to be picking up the timber (black and white) detail of the original? If so, it's not done very well and could be much better. In the existing building the second floor is quite distinctive to the ground and first which is I think an important element of villas of this type.*

*The balconies look difficult to construct and are poorly detailed, these should be looked at again.*

*In the end, overall, I'd like to see the existing building retained and an addition to this as per the consented scheme. As the CA appraisal document says, one of the key elements of special interest in designating the area is: "Distinctive 19th century villas rich in architectural character set in large and mature grounds."*

**The Panel concluded that the scheme is not acceptable in its current format.**

## **59. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was a brief discussion around whether the panel should continue with virtual meetings or resume 'in person' meetings. On balance, the Chair decided to stay with virtual but with the option of face to face for certain applications if felt appropriate.

## **60. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday, 5<sup>th</sup> October 2022 at 5pm via Zoom.

---

Chair at the meeting  
Date: 5<sup>th</sup> October 2022