

**Notes of a Meeting Re Archery Road
22nd January 2010**

	<p>Present: Tim Cookson (TC) Martin Woodhouse (MW) Nick Baker (NB) Jane Stephen (JS) Karen Phillips (KP) Anne Stubbs (notes)</p>	
	<p>Purpose of Meeting and Initial Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To discuss comments from Jane Stephen regarding the development of the Archery Road site • Notes that JS recently submitted were in relation to the meeting previous to the last one and had therefore been superseded. • JS confirmed she had revisions on listed building comments and will comment within 10 working days regarding these • Blocks A and B not yet repositioned. MW has some parking and boundary issues which may need separate listed building consent • Block M is not against the boundary wall. The wall will not be demolished and listed building consent is not required. 	
	<p>Elevations:</p> <p>House Type 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query regarding the fire wall. Agreed fire wall would not work on these house types. • JS suggested projecting balconies to help the look of the elevations – MS and NB will consider but do not want buildings to look “fussy” <p>House Type 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JS suggested that on 2nd floor balconies that glazed panels should be used at the front rather than the brick as will give more light. Agreed costs must be considered and agreed to implement on 3 storey but not 2 storey houses. • Fire walls would not be suitable for this house type. • On the rear elevation JS requested that the 2nd floor windows which were shown as one large and one small one be replaced by one large window – this was agreed. <p>House Type 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JS asked that dormer not be wider than the window below but this will create problem for light but could change flushing around to the same material as roof. • Agreed to have split window to carry on vertical lines. 	

- Option of glazed fronts to balconies was discussed but agreed preferable to move rendering to ease look of it.
- On the rear elevation it was felt dormers were too close together – agreed to change to one large dormer rather than two small ones.

House Type 4:

- JS asked that on the front elevation the double window be moved and try to get less render elevation. Need to consider what is brick and what is render. NB and MW will look at extending bay feature.
- JS asked if it was possible to have just one step on the roof lines rather than 2 as it looked busy on the eye. NB will have a look but this may not be possible, however, this could change the look of the houses but agreed the need for consistency.
- MW and NB pointed out that it must be remembered that these buildings were meant to be contemporary and some of the suggestions seem to steer away from this.
- On the side elevation the windows were not aligned, however NB said that they needed to be like this to allow for the window in the bathroom. JS suggested the bathroom window be taken out, however, it was agreed to keep the window as there will be a landscape buffer to hide these.
- Suggestion made that on the rear elevation the 1st and 2nd floor windows could be squared up and the windows enlarged on the ground and 1st floor. Also consideration to be given as to whether to have render or brickwork.

House Type 5:

- Roof Profile – With regard to the roof light it was felt preferable to replace the two dormers with one larger window in the roof to keep the balance right.
- Agreed to move garage window and to make slightly smaller to align.
- Rear elevation – the joined dormers appear too dominant and JS asked if they could be adjusted to be in line with the 2nd floor. NB and MW said that this would cause problems to the en-suites but could consider having sloping roofs. If it is not possible to have two single dormers then it was accepted that this would have to be left as it was but consideration can be given to have different material for between the windows to improve the appearance.
- Agreed to have first floor balconies projecting.

House Type 6:

- Agreed to align windows and doors.
- Agreed to have projecting balconies at rear of properties.
- The plinth between ground and 1st floor to be rendered

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed that no side elevations will be visible from roadway <p>General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS asked if Block G layout could be changed from 3 pairs of semis to 2 semis and 1 detached property as the plot width was narrow in comparison to others around, however JB and MW stressed that this would not be possible but could consider making linkages more prominent to give the appearance of wider plots. 	
	<p>Apartment Blocks:</p> <p>Block D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Firewalls could be inserted into this block. JS asked if the shallow bays could come out further but it was decided that this is not possible – JS will look at any that she considered would be essential to take out further. Agreed to align the windows and have flat roofs behind the parapets. JB and MW to look at whether glazed balconies are possible <p>Block E:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS asked if the dormer and balcony could be split up on the roof slope as opposed to joined together – confirmed that this could be done. JS asked if the size of dormer window could be reduced – JB will look into this. On the east elevation it was suggested that there is a glazed balcony which was confirmed would be done. Suggested full height on window turret as this would emphasize it. <p>Block F:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS pointed out that the rear façade looks too boxy and the look of this needs to be improved – possibly with a bay or French windows or a chimney stack. On the front elevation a projecting bay was suggested, however, this may not work with the over sailing roof. Possible to reduce the amount of brickwork. <p>Block J:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JS suggested reducing the scale of the balcony higher up on the 3rd floor. JB and MW will look at whether appearance of whole elevation could be amended. <p>Block M:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JS required a confirmation notice that the boundary wall will not be destroyed. • Not possible for the lift over-run to be made smaller • Flat roofs on this block will be hidden by parapets • JS mentioned the kitchen windows were rather low but this did not create any specific problems. <p>Block A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following on from a meeting with Chris and Murray amended layouts for the position of the trees has been drawn up • Block B remains the same but Block A is moving to protect the tree • Visitors parking will be near apartments but confirmation is needed of exactly where this will be Hope to have revised drawings for the above by end of next week. <p>Courtyard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JS queried what boundary materials would be made of and asked for this to be confirmed. • JS also asked for confirmation of the extra parking spaces in this area. <p>General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed that NB and MW would produce revised drawings with the above suggested changes rather than JS writing it all down. • JS will provide comments regarding Block M and will then phone these through to NB next week. • NB will do amendments for Block F by Monday and the ones for Block M by the end of Tuesday next week. • Plan to issue revised drawing pack by 29th January which will incorporate all house and apartment types. • Feedback needed on listed building comments. 	
	<p>Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MW stressed his concern over the length of time that the discussions regarding conservation issues was taking and was very anxious for these final adjustments to be made urgently and then approved by JS. • TC agreed to meet with JS and KP urgently to discuss time needed for JS to complete her work in this respect and, if necessary, would allow her specific time to be set aside for completion of this work. • TC to advise MW and NB of the outcome of this meeting and a specific timescale to be drawn up for this work to be undertaken and completed. 	

--	--	--