CONSERVATION ADVISORY WORKING PARTY

Tuesday, 1st November, 2022 Time of Commencement: 6.30 pm

Present:	Councillor Barry Panter (Chair)	
Councillors:	Barker	Reece
Apologies:	Councillor(s) Johnson and Lawley; Dr S Fisher and A McPhee	
Officers:	Louise Wallace	Urban Design/Conservation Officer
	Debbie Jones	Planning Officer
Also in attendance:	Dr C Wakeling	Staffordshire Historic Buildings Trust
	Mr D Broome	Newcastle Civic Society

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest stated.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 August, 2022 be agreed as a correct record.

3. **NEW APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

Resolved: That the following observations be made on the applications listed below:

Church of St Marys, Blore Road, Hales 22/00806/FUL

The group accepted the principle of providing level access into the church and the materials were also considered acceptable, although a question was raised about the requirement for a warm touch rail, rather than steel. The group understood the choice to create a symmetrical design solution but from a pragmatic perspective felt that there only needs to be one ramp and were concerned about the creation of a pinch point at the top of the steps. One ramp would create less obstacles practically and visually and would have the least impact day to day use of the church and the setting of the heritage asset.

Furnace House, 36 Springwood Road, Chesterton 22/00820/FUL

The group raised concerns on the scale of the proposed extension and the impact that this would have on the setting of the adjacent Historic Monument. Members highlighted that the monument is a striking feature which overrides the scale of the adjacent house. As a result of the

Conservation Advisory Working Party - 01/11/22

proportions and scale of the extension, the development would negatively disrupt the relationship between the house and the furnace. Some members also noted that little justification was offered in relation to the scale of the extension and any associated benefits. Members of the group also raised concerns with the proposed alterations to the retaining wall and the implications that this would have on the stability of the monument and any underlying archaeological features. The group did however accept that the removal and replacement of the existing UPVC conservatory was a benefit. The group also identified that greater attention should be paid to the architectural detail of the main house and how this could be reflected in the proposal.

Oakley Hall 22/00847/FUL & 22/00848/LBC

The group welcomed the proposals to the house and had no objections with the changes to the existing permissions as they seemed more refined. As the windows were not 18th century and technically the proposed works reversible, they also did not object to the slim double glazing. More information is required for the lift. With regard to the Brewhouse wall, they were content with the widening and reduction in height. Although it would change the screening element into the courtyard it was felt that this was an acceptable loss as it would provide replacement bricks to reinstate the wall. There was some discussion over the replacement finials and it was felt that perhaps the urn finials would provide a better aesthetic rather than reconstituted replacements which may fail.

4. CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE FUND

There were no appications.

5. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no Urgent Business.

Councillor Barry Panter Chair

Meeting concluded at 8.00 pm