

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>APPLICATION NO: 17/02447/FUL</b>        |   | <b>OFFICER: Mr Ben Hawkes</b>              |
| <b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 16th December 2017 |   | <b>DATE OF EXPIRY :</b> 10th February 2018 |
| <b>WARD:</b> Prestbury                     |   | <b>PARISH:</b> PREST                       |
| <b>APPLICANT:</b>                          | Mr & Mrs Minihane                                       |  |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>                           | St Francis, Park Lane, Prestbury                        |  |
| <b>PROPOSAL:</b>                           | Demolish existing and construct a new detached dwelling |  |

## OFFICER REPORT UPDATE

The following consultation responses have now been received:

### **Cheltenham Civic Society**

*12<sup>th</sup> February 2018*

We appreciate that the dwelling, St Francis, has little statutory protection, at present, but we concur with the views of the conservation officer. We understand the character of the area is under review regarding its designation as a conservation area, and therefore it would be premature to demolish this building.

It is one of a pair in the 'arts and crafts' style and though it has suffered the indignity of replacement windows, it forms an important part of the character of the area. The style of the proposed dwelling leads to the question: why demolish the existing building when its replacement would be one of less architectural merit?

We recommend that this application be refused.

### **Architects Panel**

*13<sup>th</sup> February 2018*

#### Design Concept:

To support a replacement dwelling scheme, the panel needs to be convinced that the new design is an improvement on the existing architecture. The existing building is not Listed but could be considered a non-designated heritage asset. Its contribution to the street architecture is arguably significant by virtue of its unusual Arts and Crafts features, its unique plan and its scale and character.

The panel felt there was nothing special about the design of the proposed replacement dwelling that justified replacing the existing building.

#### Design Detail:

Many of the design features of the scheme were considered inappropriate, in particular the first floor glass balconies. The muddled incoherent mix of contemporary and traditional stone detailing results in a design that the panel felt would be inappropriate in this relatively sensitive location.

#### Recommendation:

Not supported.