

**Advisory Management Committee
Notes of the Meeting Held at The Spirella Building on 12th March 2020**

Committee Members
in attendance - [REDACTED] (Chair)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Others in attendance - Claire Pudney - LGCHF
Emma Parkins – LGCHF

Apologies - [REDACTED]

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF 12th
March 2020**

1. Minutes of the last meeting

1.1 The minutes of the last meeting, held on Thursday 9th January 2020 were agreed by those in attendance and will be signed by the Chair of that meeting, [REDACTED] (PG).

2. Election of Chair

2.1 The Committee agreed that [REDACTED] (AC) would be the Chair of the meeting. AC confirmed that he will be able to attend the Householder Applications Committee (HAC) meeting to be held on Friday 24th April 2020.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3.2 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3.3 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3.4 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3.5 [Redacted]

4. Declarations of Interest

4.1 None

5. [Redacted]

5.1 [Redacted]

5.2 [Redacted]

5.3 [Redacted]

5.4 [Redacted]

5.5 [Redacted]

5.6 [Redacted]

5.7 [Redacted]

5.8 [Redacted]

5.9 [Redacted]

- 5.10 [REDACTED]
- 5.11 [REDACTED]
- 5.12 [REDACTED]
- 5.13 Whilst on site, the homeowners advised [REDACTED]
- 5.14 [REDACTED]
- 5.15 [REDACTED]
- 5.16 [REDACTED]
- 5.17 [REDACTED]
- 5.18 [REDACTED]

6. 29 Howard Drive – Ground floor front extension, following demolition of original porch

- 6.1 CP explained the scheme to the Committee on behalf of GA.
- 6.2 CP advised that there is a desire to retain the book-end style of terrace layout.
- 6.3 CP discussed the previous applications which were refused.
- 6.4 CP advised that a 2-storey rear extension was approved in November 2019.

- 6.5 CP advised that the homeowner subsequently submitted this current scheme but did not show the approved 2 storey rear extension on the plans.
- 6.6 CP advised that cumulative impact is deemed as overdevelopment of the plot, although there are no specific guidelines in relation to overall volume. CP advised that the design is contrived.
- 6.7 CP advised that the homeowner has recently stated that a family member [REDACTED], although this has not been highlighted throughout any of the application submissions and [REDACTED].
- 6.8 CP confirmed that the approved rear extension has considerable ground floor space, as well as a cloak room.
- 6.9 The Committee queried the reasoning for omitting the approved rear element within the plans.
- 6.10 CP advised that the First Stage Approval letter states that works shall be completed within 3 years. Should the works not be implemented, in usual circumstances the applicant would be required to re-apply.
- 6.11 CP advised that the homeowners have cited various similar extensions; however, these are shallow front extensions which continue the book-end appearance and do not have the addition of a rear extension.
- 6.12 CP advised that there would be a reluctance to approve a shallower front extension, due to the approved rear extension.
- 6.13 The Committee carried out a site visit and viewed the property from the front.
- 6.14 The Committee discussed the front extension at neighbour property No 31, which was approved in 2010.
- 6.15 The Committee expressed their difficulty in identifying an original property.
- 6.16 The Committee queried consent of the rear extension, CP confirmed that the proposal complies with the Design Principles.
- 6.17 The Committee reviewed JG's comments, which in summary are: Other examples provided are all prior to the Design Standards, or have no consent, as reported. The rear extension has gained approval. The front extension would change the character of the front of the building.

To maintain consistency of decision making, support shall be made of the original decision. Could alternatives be explored with the applicants.

- 6.18 The Committee agreed that the proposal is unacceptable and discussed whether the porch could be reduced in depth.
- 6.19 The Committee reviewed Point 3.4 of the report and agreed that the proposal is not consistent with the character of the original house.
- 6.20 The Committee were unanimous in supporting the decision to refuse consent, made by the Heritage Advice Service; due to the proposal being contrary to the Design Principles. The Committee felt that the Design Principles are extremely clear and should be emphasised further to the homeowners.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 

8. Date of next meetings

- 8.1 14th May
9th July
10th September
12th November

The meeting closed.

Signed:

Date: