ADC/0142/09

From: michael norman [redacted]
Sent: 27 May 2009 14:53
To: Keith Morgan
Cc: Tony & Bronwen Vinicombe
Subject: Current Planning Applications

Dear Keith,
A few comments pro tem (I'm off for a few days):--

1. St. Mary's Hall. Full response when we have seen the revised Drawings.

2. Southlands. Ditto when we have met with Crest Nicholson.

3. 32 & 32/34 High St. (160/09 & 198/09).
Little indication that the AC unit might be of interest to the proposed flat-dwellers above!
The proposed 1st Flr. rear extension is not very pretty and does not appear to have been given much thought architecturally. The original building was about 1840 and quite proper and one would have thought the idiom would best be continued, i.e., classical with no more than 30 degree roof pitch with slates. The poor drawing does not help nor does it give much encouragement that the designer might do better.

4. The new Nationwide signage is nice but the garish blue background is awful. Was this part of the deal or can it be remedied? Taken as a whole, it is little improvement upon the temporary effort that so offended.

5. 29/31, High St. (142/09) If there are elevational alterations to the rear, a drawing would be useful since it backs on to the River and could be quite visible.

I had a quick look at the West St. retaining wall of the Railway bridge abutment and saw the splitting. Having heard nothing from the Engineers I can only comment that since it has clearly to be rebuilt and the existing flint rubble is an unlikely candidate that the *facing* on the curve be done in snapped headers, preferably Staffs blue engineering bricks or similar, that will sit happily with the remaining flintwork.

Regards,
Michael.