

**Advisory Management Committee
Notes of the Meeting Held via Microsoft Teams on 8th July 2021**

Committee Members
in attendance - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Others in attendance - Claire Pudney – LGCHF
Clare Buddle - LGCHF
Tracy Albon – LGCHF

MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF 8th JULY 2021

1. Minutes of the last meeting

1.1 The minutes of the last meeting, held on Thursday 13th May 2021 were agreed by those in attendance and will be signed by the Chair of that meeting, [REDACTED]

2. Election of Chair

2.1 The Committee agreed that [REDACTED] would be the Chair of the meeting. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] will be able to attend the Householder Applications Committee (HAC) meeting to be held on either Friday 20th August 2021 or Friday 17th September 2021, if required.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 [REDACTED] – CP advised that HAC agreed to refuse the application.

3.2 [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] – CP advised that both of these applicants have requested a review by the Independent Inspector.

4. Declarations of Interest

4.1 None.

5. [REDACTED]

5.1 [REDACTED]

5.2 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

5.3 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- 5.4 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- 5.5 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- 5.6 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- 5.7 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- 5.8 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

6. 22 Cashio Lane – Part single and part two storey extension to rear, side and front of property with replacement windows and porch

- 6.1 CP explained the scheme to the Committee.
- 6.2 CP advised that the applicants sought pre-application advice for the proposals which were considered excessive and not in keeping with the Design Principles.
- 6.3 [REDACTED] and CP carried out a site visit.
- 6.4 CP confirmed that the proposal has been granted consent from NHDC.
- 6.5 CP advised that the property is a good example of a later Crickmer property.
- 6.6 CP advised that the proposed 7.8m rear extension is contrary to the Design Principles and would set a challenging precedent if approved.
- 6.7 CP confirmed that, following discussions, the applicant has agreed to install the original, Crittall style windows, but this compromise is not sufficient.
- 6.8 CP confirmed that a side extension may be acceptable if the extension was to extend over the garage maintaining the original simplistic line of the Crickmer building, although this would need to be subservient to the host building.

- 6.9 ■ advised that the applicant believed that he could extend to the rear building lines of the neighbouring properties, but the proposals exceed this.
- 6.10 ■ suggested that the applicant employs an architect, as the drawings submitted, which he drew himself, are very poor.
- 6.11 CP advised that the applicant said that he would take legal action if the Heritage Foundation does not issue an approval for the proposal and his solicitor has informed him that he would have a good case. He also advised that builders have been appointed and works are due to commence in the summer. CP advised the applicant that if this is the case the works would be at risk and confirmed that the Heritage Foundation would commence legal proceedings. CP advised that she will be writing to the applicant to confirm this and to advise them of the HAS procedure if an application is refused and also reiterate that the Heritage Foundation would work with the applicant to negotiate an achievable scheme. If a stop works letter is issued this notice will be referenced to reinforce the Heritage Foundation's case.
- 6.12 The Committee agreed that the proposal would make the original stylish design unrecognisable and does not preserve or enhance some of the important Crickmer examples which will be lost.
- 6.13 The Committee agreed that there may be an achievable scheme, to a maximum depth of 5m at the rear, which would emulate proportions of the original design and not destroy it. They also agreed that the alterations must be subservient.
- 6.14 ■ is encouraged that the Heritage Foundation are requesting original windows.
- 6.15 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.

7. ■

- ■
- ■
- ■
- ■
- ■
- ■

7.6 [Redacted]

7.7 [Redacted]

7.8 [Redacted]

8. Any Other Business

8.1 [Redacted]

8.2 [Redacted]

8.3 [Redacted]

9. Dates of 2021 meetings

9.1 9th September
11th November

The meeting closed.

Signed:

Date: