

Planning Committee

Wednesday 07 February 2018

Late Observations Schedule

Schedule Items

<u>Item</u>	<u>App No</u>	<u>Observations</u>
-------------	---------------	---------------------

4	17/0971	<u>Consultee Comment – FBC Heritage Team</u>
---	---------	--

“As the records will show the Regeneration Team objected to the principle of extending to the frontage of this building as it was considered to be inappropriate in the context of the open nature of the central square as well as its impact on the building. However, taken in the round planning permission was granted and this sought to echo the traditional verandah, with open sides and effectively providing wet weather shelter. The detailing was aimed at being elegant and well detailed appropriate to the particular Edwardian host building and the broader conservation area. It was important that the projection and the extended floor was minimal so that the verandah was seen as a sitting over the paved surface below. It is also important that the extension is lightweight so that the façade of the host building can clearly be seen through the structure.

Notwithstanding earlier decisions, it is considered important that any extension seeks to retain the same design principles as previously supported. The present structure, constructed on site, appears as being very bulky with full enclosure and very heavy framing. It appears more like an enclosed conservatory rather than a traditional verandah. This is not what seemed to have been envisaged. As such this is considered unacceptable. The alternative design as put forward is better in that it would have less ‘heaviness’ as the inner frames of the glazed panels to the three elevations are to be removed, being replaced by a lower glazed balustrade. The raised plinth also remains which is inevitable and increased in height since the floor area of the extension is larger than approved.

The alternative plan shows scrolled brackets. Traditionally these ‘spandrel brackets’ were structural giving support to the cross members. On plan these appear to be quite lightweight, almost flimsy and are obviously decorative giving the illusion of support rather than literal. If this is to be an illusion then I would suggest that they have the weight and appearance of being in proportion to the structure of the extension itself. To achieve this perhaps a condition would be appropriate such that this can be resolved with the aid of a larger scale plan. The issue of draining from the roof is also not resolved as far as can be seen.

This lovely building is elegant and finely detailed and is now on the Local List. If Committee is minded to ‘go with’ a scheme on this site that differs to that approved, then that which removes the full glazing is far preferable. I would also condition the other matters referred to.”

Officer Comment:

The consultee comments provided are noted, and add weight to the Officer assessment with regards to the revised design of the open sided canopy.

Officer Recommendation

The recommendation of approval remains unchanged, but the following additional condition is suggested:

That prior to the commencement of development of the canopy feature hereby approved, details of the ‘spandrel brackets’ shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented during the

construction of the canopy.

Reason: As such details are not shown in the application submission and are required to ensure that the overall development accords with the design requirements of a building in the Lytham Conservation Area as required by Policy EP3 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan and Policy ENV5 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032.

5 17/0997 Consultee Comments

The comments of the council's Strategic Housing Officer have been received and are reported below.

The development will provide 6 affordable units of housing which I would support, and based on the location is next to similar properties. All the units are to be two bedroom and based on applicants registered for affordable rented accommodation this accommodation would be much sought after. I have read the communities concerns regarding access, flooding and loss of woodland area which would be dealt with as part of the planning process. The details gives no indication of tenure or who the registered provider is, bar Windmill Holdings Ltd. At the outset I would be expecting these units to be for affordable rent.

Officer Comments

The comments are self-explanatory in that they support the provision of these properties for affordable housing. Condition 3 requires that details of the mechanism to deliver and sustain the properties as affordable housing are provided and so no revisions to the recommendation are required as a consequence of these comments.

9 18/0011 Representation

One additional objection letter has been received referring to the structure being large, beyond any previous build line, it obscures a great deal of the view of the Square from Clifton Street, and, is very detrimental to the Conservation Area.

Consultee Comment – FBC Heritage Team

“As the records will show the Regeneration Team objected to the principle of extending to the frontage of this building as it was considered to be inappropriate in the context of the open nature of the central square as well as its impact on the building. However, taken in the round planning permission was granted and this sought to echo the traditional verandah, with open sides and effectively providing wet weather shelter. The detailing was aimed at being elegant and well detailed appropriate to the particular Edwardian host building and the broader conservation area. It was important that the projection and the extended floor was minimal so that the verandah was seen as a sitting over the paved surface below. It is also important that the extension is lightweight so that the façade of the host building can clearly be seen through the structure.

Notwithstanding earlier decisions, it is considered important that any extension seeks to retain the same design principles as previously supported. The present structure, constructed on site, appears as being very bulky with full enclosure and very heavy framing. It appears more like an enclosed conservatory rather than a traditional verandah. This is not what seemed to have been envisaged. As such this is considered unacceptable. The alternative design as put forward is better in that it would have less ‘heaviness’ as the inner frames of the glazed panels to the three elevations are to be removed, being replaced by a lower glazed balustrade. The raised plinth also remains which is inevitable and increased in height since the floor area of the extension is larger than approved.

The alternative plan shows scrolled brackets. Traditionally these ‘spandrel brackets’ were structural giving support to the cross members. On plan these appear to be quite lightweight, almost flimsy and are obviously decorative giving the illusion of support rather than literal. If this is to be an illusion then I would suggest that they have the

weight and appearance of being in proportion to the structure of the extension itself. To achieve this perhaps a condition would be appropriate such that this can be resolved with the aid of a larger scale plan. The issue of draining from the roof is also not resolved as far as can be seen.

This lovely building is elegant and finely detailed and is now on the Local List. If Committee is minded to 'go with' a scheme on this site that differs to that approved, then that which removes the full glazing is far preferable. I would also condition the other matters referred to."

Officer Comment:

The consultee comments provided are noted, and add weight to the Officer assessment with regards to design of canopy as constructed. The recommendation of refusal remains unchanged.