

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8th MAY 2024

Present: Mr C Potterton in the Chair
Dr H Barrett, Ms A Burton, Mr S Laws, Mr R Lockett, Mr M McCurdy, Ms A Marles, Mr M McCurdy, Mr D Saunders, Mrs C Silvester and Councillor A Gregson

Officers: Dr P Collins

Apologies: Mr D Davis

119. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6th March 2024 were noted.

MAIN APPLICATIONS

120. 24/00123/FUL – Rose Hill Cottage, Rose Hill

Construction of a new dwelling following the demolition of existing property.

Due to time constraints on the deadline for comments, the Chair and Vice-Chair had visited the site the previous week and provided the Case Officer with some detailed comments. Nonetheless, some discussion ensued. During this it emerged that the property was once the Gardener's cottage to Rose Hill House. It was concluded that the current scheme needed improving, especially regarding its massing.

The Panel agreed that the application was not acceptable in its current format for the reason given.

121. 24/00137/LB – The Saracens Head, 4 The Tything

Various minor alterations to the structure and layout.

The application had been approved before the meeting so not considered, although there were some comments regarding the very poor quality of the application, especially of the drawings.

Mr Lockett made specific comments as follows – *There is no Heritage Statement and no adequate "existing" plans and elevations from which to assess the Replacement Covered Area (alias Servery). This appears to be new build blocking access to the historic bowling green which was celebrated within the context of 19th century city entertainment (see C. and T. Wardle, History of Barbourne and perhaps my Survey.)*

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

122. 24/00227/ADV & 24/00228/LB – The Saracens Head, 4 The Tything

Handwritten signs on the front and side elevations.

The Panel noted that the signage had already been applied to the building and that, although the signage itself was very good, it bore no relation to how it had been depicted on the submitted drawings, further emphasising the point above regarding the very poor quality of the application drawings relating to this site.

The Panel has no objections.

123. 24/00192/FUL – Building rear of 37 Lowesmoor

Re-development of existing structure into 1No. residence (use class C3).

The Panel agreed that more detail is needed, especially of the existing building. Again, the drawings are inadequate. Generally, it was considered that the proposals offered a poor amenity standard and did not enhance the conservation area.

The Panel objected to the application requesting more detail, particularly relating to the existing building.

124. 24/00205/FUL – The Gilding House, Princes Drive

Part-conversion of existing building into 8No. 1-bed residential apartments.

The Panel agreed that some work was proposed to a neglected half of this building and was welcomed. However, the proposals showed no links back to the building's former use. Also, comments were made regarding the 'generic' nature of the submitted Design & Access and Heritage statements. These covered all the buildings on the site in which the applicant had interests, and thus made teasing out the points relevant to the application site very difficult.

Mr Lockett had written, and read out, some very detailed comments in regard to this application, as follows (noting that these are Mr Lockett's comments and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the panel as a whole) –

*This seemingly minor application for a small part of the Worcester Royal Works has within it a **Design Access and Planning Statement** which is in effect a consultation document seeking approval for an overall commercial as against a conservation approach with specific implications for the Bone Mill. There are therefore some matters of principle as well as a Full application to consider which would merit, in my view, a presentation and a specific site visit.*

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

The principle proposed is that the remaining fragments of the Porcelain Factory are given over to residential or other commercial development so that there will be little physical presence of Worcester's 2nd greatest industry except for the facades of buildings. The Porcelain Museum collection itself presents a 2D view of the industry - no sweat, no noise, no machinery, but is the only thing for a visitor to experience at present.

*The only gesture towards conservation, the principle itself having been jettisoned, comes under 5.3 and 12.7 of the **Design Access and Planning Statement** in which commercial viability is quite brazenly put above conservation. We should remember that the preservation of the Bone Mill was a rare if not unique part of the development bargain, a "condition" that has already been whittled down. It is here proposed that the Bone Mill's development should avoid **excessive retention of existing historic features (5.3)**. This means removing more kilns/industrial features. Could there be a more flagrant demonstration of the disregard for industrial heritage and the abandonment of any meaningful Conservation?*

There is a feeble, non-specific "offer" that some space might be found for some other aspects of the porcelain industry, the rest having been given over to commercial use. but this is the (only) moment for a response. from the Panel which could voice the opportunity to preserve some meaningful industrial heritage on site, i.e. for the whole Bone Mill to be used to illustrate its own and other manufacturing processes, illustrated in 3D.

There is no proposal to retain any memory of industrial processes within the Gilding House itself which is the building specific to this application but characteristic of the consultation document as a whole.

The Panel had no objection in principle, subject to itemised issues and/or conditions.

125. 24/00233/FUL & 24/00234/LB – 31 Friar Street (The Cardinal's Hat)

Installation of gazebo structures in the beer garden.

The Panel has no objection or comments.

126. MINOR APPLICATIONS

24/00150/FUL – 31-33 New Street

Extraction system to the rear elevation.

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

The Panel has no objection in principle but queried whether the (generally) galvanised flue could be painted to blend in more with the surroundings.

24/00180/ADV – 31-33 New Street

Advertisement consent for a fascia sign.
The Panel has no objection or comments.

24/00185/HP – 18 Fort Royal Hill

New first floor window to Northwest elevation.
The Panel has no objection or comments.

24/00211/HP – 23 Park Avenue

Single storey rear and side lean-to extension, replacement of 2No. wooden sash windows for uPVC double glazed sash windows. Addition of 2No. sun tunnels to rear elevation roof.

The application had been approved before the meeting so was not considered.

24/00237/ADV – 4 Broad Street

Advertisement consent for 1No. non-illuminated hanging sign, and 1No. illuminated fascia sign.
The Panel has no objection or comments.

24/00104/FUL – 8 Severn Street

Installation of heat pump to side elevation, and changes to front fenestration.
The Panel has no objection or comments.

24/00262/HP – 53 York Place

Conservatory to rear of property.
The Panel has no objection or comments.

127. CHAIR'S REPORT

1. Appeal Decisions and Notifications of Appeal

App/D1835/D/23/3333390 – 21 Pitchcroft Lane, Worcester, WR1 3JP – 11th March 2024

The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor extension with undercroft parking area at 21, Pitchcroft Lane, Worcester, WR1 3JP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00638/HP, dated 26 July 2023, subject to conditions.

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

This was the first-floor extension on 'stilts' upon which CAP commented thus: - *'Welcome positively. This is an innovative approach to flood plain issues'*.

2. Chair's Correspondence and Information for discussion

None.

128. OUTCOME OF APPLICATIONS

Dr Collins had circulated his report on the updated outcome of items considered on the 3rd April 2024.

Applications are undecided unless otherwise stated.

Main Applications

24/00053/FUL – 19 The Foregate (Refused) (LB seen in March, Recommendation made)

[Retrospective] Alterations to ground floor and conversion of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors from existing House of Multiple Occupation to a 9-bedroom House of Multiple Occupation.

24/00123/FUL – Rose Hill Cottage, Rose Hill (On May's Agenda)

Construction of a new dwelling following the demolition of existing property.

24/00137/LB – The Saracens Head, 4 The Tything (Approved)

Listed building consent for various minor alterations to listed building structure and layout.

24/00192/FUL – Building rear of 37 Lowesmoor (On May's Agenda)

Proposal: Re-development of existing structure into 1No. residential accommodation (use class C3).

Minor Applications

24/00110/LB – 42 Britannia Square (Approved)

Installation of access gates.

24/00113/HP – Dormerdale, Battenhall Road (Approved)

(Part) removal of boundary wall to extend vehicular access.

24/00126/HP – 47 Riverview Close (Approved)

Side and first floor extension.

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

24/00161/HP – The Anchorage, Old Road (Approved)

Rear and front single-storey extensions.

24/00185/HP – 18 Fort Royal Hill (On May's Agenda)

New first floor window to Northwest elevation.

24/00150/FUL – 31-33 New Street (On May's Agenda)

Extraction system to the rear elevation.

129. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Heritage Report

Following the circulation of his report to the Panel, Councillor Gregson confirmed that there were one or two items that he wished to discuss with the Chair and Vice Chair and would do so outside of the meetings to consider how to take matters forward.

48 Broad Street/19 Foregate Street Applications

Dr Barrett raised concerns related specifically to discussions concerning 48 Broad Street and 19 Foregate (not clear why the full application was refused but the LB application approved – refusal of the full application, given it was retrospective – can we now expect enforcement here and some assessment of any damage done to the LB?).

Specific issues relating to these applications:

1. Application that have been validated and approved with very poor heritage statements that do not meet the minimum requirements as set out in the city's own validation procedures which you recall were updated a couple of years ago. Lack of detail about the buildings, no consultation of HER, little detail on what is significant and what will be changed by proposals.
2. Poor drawings which we asked to see again with more detail in terms of making a decision, but we did not see and then the applications are approved so our comments are not being incorporated and no opportunity to input these (both applications but particularly an issue for 48 Broad Street as that has been approved – it is still not clear from the plans what alterations are being made to this listed building).
3. Recommendations from conservation/archaeology officers that are seemingly being ignored by case officers and then not being put on conditions, so for example conditions relating to building survey for 48 Broad Street which do not relate to the whole building but only the ground floor.

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

(Incorporating the Civic Society Development Panel)

AC Systems and Extract Systems

Anita Marles asked if there could there be a higher/consistent level of information regarding proposals that include AC systems and Extract systems.

Images of equipment and descriptions that include sizes, noise levels, methodology for attachment to the buildings, colour and finish of external materials, and internally how duct work is accommodated in historic setting.

130. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 10th July 2024 at 5.00p.m. via Zoom.

Chair at the meeting
Date: 10th July 2024