

**CONSERVATION ADVISORY WORKING PARTY**

Tuesday, 9th August, 2022  
Time of Commencement: 6.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor Barry Panter (Chair)

**Councillors:** Johnson                      Reece  
Barker  
Lawley

**Apologies:** Councillor(s) Broome, Fisher and Heath-Pedley

**Officers:** Scott Bracken                      Senior Planning Officer  
Charles Winnett                      Planning Officer

**Also in attendance:** Andrew McFee  
Dr C Wakeling  
Parish Councillor Christine Mrozicki  
Parish Councillor Celia Jarrett

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Andrew McFee declared an interest in application 22/00589/FUL (Newcastle Lodge, Keele 22/00589/FUL) as he works for the company who are working as the agents of the application.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 July, 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

**3. PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED APPLICATIONS**

**Resolved:** That the report on the decision on applications previously considered by this Working Party be received.

**4. NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

**Resolved:** That the following observations be made on the application listed below:-

Cornwells Chemist, 9-15 High Street, Newcastle 22/00558/FUL

Concerns were raised that the proposal would remove the symmetry of the shop front and that the collection machine, due to its size, would appear as a dominating feature on the front elevation of property.

## **Conservation Advisory Working Party - 09/08/22**

A number of alterations were suggested which would help to soften the proposal impact on the shop front, these included the retention of the properties stall riser, and the retention of the top section of window above the collection machine. It was generally agreed that the collection machine should, if possible, be reduced in size and that details of the proposed materials and should be secured through a planning condition.

### Betley Court, Main Road, Betley 22/00567/FUL & 22/568/LBC

It was recognised that the proposed alterations would only impact the buildings least important frontage, however the majority of the group questioned the necessity of the works. It was generally agreed that more details should be provided in support of the application, including sectional drawings and an additional justification for the works, which if purely cosmetic, may not be necessary.

### Newcastle Lodge, Keele 22/00589/FUL

No major objections were raised against the proposal but some questioned how necessary the works were given that the gazebo is unlikely to be used by students all year round. It was however generally agreed that the temporary nature of the proposal would limit its impact and that this could be secured through a condition. The use of timber was challenged by some members of the group as it is slightly contrasting with the more traditional styled brick built lodge nearby.

### 17 Nantwich Road, Audley 22/00438/FUL

The majority group agreed that the existing dry stone wall is unsightly and is in need of repair and that whilst proposed brick wall was not significantly harmful, the dry stone walls removal should only be a last resort and that more evidence and justification is needed to demonstrate that repair works are not feasible or possible.

Several members of the group raises concerns to the proposed porch, given that there is a lack of other examples along Nantwich Road which would make the proposal look out of place when seen in context with the street scene. A concern was also raised regarding the proposed roof light window as it was considered that insufficient details had been provided with the application to demonstrate what materials would be used for the windows and for what purpose the window would serve.

### The Olde House, Bar Hill, Madeley 22/00631/FUL & 22/00630/LBC

Objections were raised by a several members of the group with regards to the overall massing, siting and layout of the proposal as they considered that the footprint was too large for a dwelling of this size. Mixed opinions were given on the different traditional and contemporary designs style proposed, with some members of the group raising concerns that chosen design choice would give the proposal an uncoordinated appearance. The impact of the attractive chimney was also raised as an issue and some of the group felt the extension would be more appropriately sited on the side elevation of the original dwelling. Concerns were also raised to the number

***Conservation Advisory Working Party - 09/08/22***

of different materials to be used, especially the use of metal which is not present on the original dwelling.

A number of alterations were recommended including the removal of the bi fold doors and the alteration of the glass connecting section which appeared to some as a contrasting feature. It was generally accepted that the proposal would have no impacts on the wider Conservation Area given the nature of the application site.

**5. CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE FUND**

There were no applications.

**6. URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no Urgent Business.

**Councillor Barry Panter  
Chair**

Meeting concluded at 7.40 pm