

## **Executive Committee 9th January 2018 – Planning Report**

We have been consulted on seven applications since the report to the last meeting. Two of these did not raise any issues of concern and no comments were submitted:

APP/17/01356 - The Barns, 5 Village Road: change of use from commercial office to non-surgical cosmetic treatments.

APP/17/01475 – 45 Claughton Firs: single storey rear extension

Comments were submitted on the following:

### **APP/17/01265 – 2 Rose Mount (former Brimark premises)**

Proposal: Alterations and conversion of existing commercial premises to create a live-work unit comprising a residential apartment on first and second floor with an artist studio on ground floor/basement.

Comment: Having met with the applicants in advance, we strongly supported this proposal as representing an exciting opportunity for the re-use of an important building which would make a positive contribution to the village centre. We responded to the applicants' concerns about some negative comments received following a pre-application meeting with the Council planners by circulating our members, setting out the basis for our support and asking them to submit representations. Seventy representations in support were recorded on the Council's online consultation page. *[Note: the application was subsequently approved].*

### **LBC/17/01333 – 14 Arno Road**

Proposal: New roof with internal alterations

Comment: The application proposes to restore the roof and other key features to their original condition using traditional materials, including renewal of the timber sliding sash windows where they have decayed. The proposal to restore this important Listing Building is very welcome. Its rapid decline into dereliction has been a source of major concern.

### **APP/17/01335 – 58 Christchurch Road**

Proposal: Replacement of existing timber windows with UPVC windows to front & rear elevations and replace roof covering and roof light.

Comment: No objection subject to a condition requiring prior approval of the specific style of vertical sliding window to be installed, as referred to in the application, which has been used elsewhere in the village centre, and is a reasonable match with the proportions of the traditional sashes.

### **APP/17/01457 – 17 Rose Mount (former T for 2 premises)**

Proposal: Change of use to restaurant with ancillary bar (ground floor, first floor and second floor)

Comment: The scale and form of development is identical to that proposed in the previous application (APP/17/00654), for which the Council refused permission on the grounds of the adverse impact it would have on residential amenity. Although the Society did not object to that application its potential impact on residential amenity was a key concern that the Society asked the Council to consider in determining the application. Additional information on noise disturbance and policy considerations have been submitted in support of the current application. However, we did not consider that this justified over-turning the previous decision.

**LBC/17/01529 – 20 Fairview Road**

Proposal: Create driveway to rear of property with canopy over, gated access and associated landscaping works

Comment: A similar proposal was part of a previous more extensive application approved in 2008, the main part of which was for the construction of a free-standing residential annex on the Fairview Road frontage of this Listed Building. We supported the residential development (which was built and given a Design Award by the Society). However, at that time we felt that the proposed development of a new rear access with a car port and canopy on the Arno Road frontage would harm the setting of the Listed residential property at 14 Arno Road; the main concern being the unsympathetic canopy/pergola feature. This element of the 2008 scheme was not constructed and the consent had therefore lapsed. The current application revives the proposal in virtually identical form. Having been previously approved it is most unlikely that the Council would reverse its decision. However, our view has not changed and we have responded by simply drawing attention to our original concerns.