

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 re-constituted replacements which may fail.

4. CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE FUND

There were no applications.

5. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no Urgent Business.

**Councillor Barry Panter
Chair**

Meeting concluded at 8.00 pm