

NOTES OF A MEETING

- Subject: APPROVAL OF DETAILS
3 PHASES OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PAPWORTH EVERARD
S/1424/08/RM, S/1624/08/RM, S/1688/08/RM**
- Purpose: TO AGREE A CONSENSUS APPROACH BETWEEN
THE PCC, SCDC and their urban design and landscape
advisors**
- Date: 16.12.2008**
- Present: NB, CC – SCDC
Fiona Goodville, Paul Hicks, Chris Howlett - PCC
RD, NP – professional advisors to SCDC**

1.0 PREAMBLE

- A number of procedural issues were discussed concerning the outline consent, associated planning conditions and their applicability to the approval of reserved matters.
- The PCC also considered issues of drainage remained unresolved with Anglian Water.
- PCC noted that applicants had declined to meet them to further discuss reserved matters
- It was agreed that the key purpose of the meeting was to consider the various plans submitted. There was some confusion as to what plans had actually been received, submitted and commented upon. To resolve this, it was agreed that
 1. NB would circulate/ re-circulate all relevant phase 2 plans (for the middle and southern phases). **ACTION – NB TO CIRCULATE.**
 2. This meeting would consider in detail phase 1 (for the northern part of the site).
 3. It was agreed that there were issues of overall co-ordination / design coherence across the entire site that would require attention in addition. These would include key views, continuity of landscape design, and other issues.

2.0 ANALYSIS OF NORTHERN PHASE (APPLICATION 1424)

2.1 Layout

It was agreed that there were issues of general principle and matters of detail. The key matters of principle were agreed as

- The introduction of the larger house types and its setting out in a more geometric format has diminished the design quality.
- There are a considerable number of small areas of space that cannot obviously be defined as either public (and publicly maintainable) or private (and defensible). These will therefore present problems of spatial organisation, maintenance and appearance. Clear definition of land to be adopted and land to be privately

conveyed would assist open area design, and associated enclosures (see bullet point below). Plots 7,9,28, 29, 38, 47 and 48 are examples.

- The layout does not distinguish between, adequately define, or provide a purpose/function /visual hierarchy for masonry walls, fences, railings and other enclosures, for example hedges.
- A plan showing the building storey heights and how they are related to urban design principles is required to properly consider the reserved matters.
- The housing layout and landscaping need to be considered simultaneously as one urban design exercise. Therefore, to fulfil reserved matters, there should be information on surface materials, planting etc (in addition to matters including boundary treatments etc) raised above.
- Access to rear gardens along with wheelie bin standings and put out routes + rear and side gates inadequately defined. Plots 9 and 44 for example appear to have no satisfactory rear access.

The matters of detail were identified as

- Plot 1 - re-orientate to face pos.
- Plots 1, 2 and elsewhere - turning heads / open parking in front of houses to public view; revised lha. standards may no longer require turning areas to dwellings on estate distributor road.
- r/o/Plots 6 & 8 - parking court large and awkward/ geometric in layout; has detrimental effect on setting of listed building; how enclosed – fences, brick walls?
- Thatched Cottage Green / Plot 29 - inadequate design response/ more separation to setting of listed building; higher ground to plots 28 & 29 not fully acknowledged / accounted for; views / framing/ planting issues.
- Plot 19 – backs of garages poorly orientated to street scene and in relation to back edge of footpath.
- Plot 78 – A satisfactory response to urban design comment.
- St John's Lane – the larger dwellings are less well orientated in relation to the curved road alignment and will not produce the same quality of street scene as previous layout; related issues re front garden depths and loss of private garden areas.
- Turning Head to Plot 66 – unsatisfactory in urban design terms.
- Turning Head adj. Plot 63 – Over-large; effect of large expanse of hard surface exacerbated by unsatisfactory relationship of turning head and driveway.
- Plots 30 & 32 – improved in relation to urban design advice.
- Plot 41 and Corner – space for tree planting has been eroded; now not practical to include large trees to give strong enclosure to street scene.
- Plots 51 – 54 – important elements in spatial organisation / enclosure of Church View Square; quality of house design; requires full integration/ co-ordination with other phases.

2.2 Building Materials

Key agreed principles were:

- The development will be very visible in the Cambridgeshire landscape and have a major impact on the settlement. Materials should therefore be appropriate to Papworth, as defined in local and district design guides.

- An overall cohesive and consistent choice of materials, with limited and logical variations within it is preferable to one group of buildings in one mixture of materials, with other groups in other materials, with no apparent rationale.
- A buff Cambridge stock brick with small plain tile roofs to 2 storey and 2.5 storey buildings with pantiles to single storey buildings was the preferred choice for the overall materials pallet. Slate, red bricks etc may be appropriate to give carefully contrived variation.
- The detailing of the buildings should reflect the choice of materials; for example, steeply sloped roofs are appropriate to plain tiles, but pantiles are appropriate with roof slopes of 30 – 35 degrees.

2.3 Building Design

It was noted that

- the submitted plans are very much “standard designs” with limited adaptation to the Cambridgeshire vernacular.
- The Argyle type is highly visible from Ermine Street.

Details that were considered unsatisfactory included

- The heavy brickwork parapet kneelers.
- Wood/pvc box bargeboards and eaves.
- Brick on edge soldier courses.
- The 6 panel door to house type 497 is too elaborate for the dwelling size/design.

Do PCC wish to include their detailed comments for each type? Is NP comfortable with this? At the meeting we concluded that the rear extension to the Malvern? Type was quite agreed as awkward but at this stage, did not structure discussion and did not consider in detail the other house types.

It was also concluded that

- Individual plot design variations were necessary on key plots and these should be detailed.
- Certain house types did not appear to have full detailed drawings.
- Some straightforward architectural detailing, for example, brick arch lintel heads above doors and windows and stone sills, was necessary on the rear elevations, on the basis that the rear elevations would be seen from within the housing area and from distant views.
- More information was needed on materials and detailing, for example were the sills indicated on the drawing artificial or natural stone, or wood, or brick?
- Like materials, there should be an overall and consistent theme for detailing, with logical variations.

3.0 PROGRAMME AND ACTIONS

- NB to distribute phase 2 application plans asap.
- All to give dates to NB for reconvened meeting to consider phase 2 – suggest during 2nd and 3rd weeks in Jan?
- NB to advise applicants of re-scheduling to Feb committee.

Prepared by: **RD**
16.12.08

Choice of Building Materials and Notes on Associated Architectural Detailing

Application: Housing Developments at Papworth Everard
By: RD
Date: 7th January 2009
Status: Draft Document for Discussion.

Introduction

The SCDC Design Guide 2005 (Draft SPD) sets Papworth Everard within the Western Claylands. Within this landscape character area it is stated that

- Buildings are generally one and a half or two and a half storeys in height and domestic in scale.
- Walls materials include plaster frame construction (mostly cream in colour), warm red brickwork and occasionally yellow brick. Farm buildings are typically of brick, weatherboarding and flint.
- Roof materials include plain clay tiles, pantiles, longstraw thatch and Welsh slate (the latter only from the 1850's onwards).
- Timber frame (ie. 17th c and earlier buildings) details include high pitched roofs, casement windows or horizontal sliding sashes, gable and window drip boards; 4 or 6 panel doors on more formal houses, plank doorson cottages; chimneys set laterally on the roof ridge.
- 18th c houses (which occur in a few villages) have details that include 4 or 6 panel doors, gauged brick arches over windows and distinctive cornices.
- 19th c houses (which also occur in just a few villages) have details that include sawtooth dentil courses, 4 or 12 panel sash windows, decorative/contrasting/polychromatic brick banding, detailing and chimneys at gables flush with gable walls.

A key principle of the guide is to “Ensure new developments reflect the form, scale and proportions of existing vernacular buildings and pick up on traditional building styles, materials, colours and textures of the locality.”

The Guide also introduces the concept of a “materials hierarchy”, with socially important buildings such as country houses generally using higher quality materials than for example agricultural stores and outhouses. The importance of design compatibility / historical accuracy between materials and architectural detailing is also emphasised.

The table overleaf gives an indication of materials and associated notes that provides a starting point for a co-ordinated choice of materials on all the proposed Papworth Everard housing schemes.

House Type	Suggested Materials	Notes
2.5 storey house forms (19 th c design type)	<p>Walls: warm red Cambs. stock bricks.</p> <p>Roof: small plain tiles</p> <p>Wooden Joinery</p> <p>Dressings</p>	<p>Gauged brick window and door arches, 3 course platbands (at first floor level) corbled eaves and brick plinths are associated details.</p> <p>Multi mix incorporating buffs, pinks and red/browns.</p> <p>Dormer design should reflect materials – therefore gabled dormers most appropriate.</p> <p>Wood / pvc box eaves and fascias are not acceptable.</p> <p>Sash windows and 4 or 6 panel front doors with plank type rear doors.</p> <p>Recon stone sills to doors and windows</p>
2 storey form (18 th c influence)	As 2.5 storey above.	
Other 2 storey forms	<p>As above but</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. casement windows more appropriate 2. plank doors 3. 1 or 2 Cambs buff stocks may be appropriate 4. 1 or 2 red brick and flint panel buildings at key visual locations. 5. 1 or 2 slate type roofs in combination with the buff stock bks. 6. 1 or 2 rendered buildings – cottage type, in combination with buff pantiles. 	<p>Brick arches most appropriate above doors and windows.</p> <p>Could use thatch on cottage buildings in very specific key visual locations!!</p> <p>Porches, dormers etc to use same material as main roof and incorporate appropriate design details.</p>
Single Storey Buildings, including garages	<p>Walls: -Red stock bks -Chosen white stock bks -Black stain horizontal weather boarding. -Red stock brick with flint panels (on key focal point buildings). -red and buff stock bks In alternate banded courses (single course or 3 course bands). - Render</p> <p>Roofs: predominantly buff single roll pantiles; some triple roll and 1 or 2 orange pantile ok.</p>	<p>Brick plinth detail most appropriate with horizontal boarding, flints etc.</p> <p>Cream painted</p>

NOTES OF A MEETING

- Subject: APPROVAL OF DETAILS
PHASE 1, RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PAPWORTH EVERARD (BARRATTS SITE)
S/1424/08/RM, S/1624/08/RM**
- Purpose: TO AGREE A CONSENSUS APPROACH BETWEEN
THE PCC, SCDC and their urban design and landscape
advisors and BARRATTS re DETAILED DESIGN
ISSUES following JANUARY COMMITTEE MTG**
- Date: 18.1.2009**
- Present: NB - SCDC
Paul Hicks, Chris Howlett - PCC
RD, NP – professional advisors to SCDC
John Finney – CCC Highways
Alan Pape – Parc Design
Peter Biggs - Barratt
Matt Lee – Liz Lake Landscapes**

1.0 REVISED LAYOUT PHASE 1 - ISSUES

PB & AP tabled a revised Phase 1 layout. This was compared to the last submitted layout and the following observations made:

- **Plot 1** – revised, dwelling faces pond, with access footpath to front. It was noted that a large attenuation pond may be required (as shown on drainage drawings?) covering large part of Plot 1. **PB to investigate and report back.**
- **Plots 1 & 2** – turning areas deleted – **JF confirmed acceptable to CCC.**
- **Plots 23 – 28** – revised orientation of dwellings to account for setting of lb & revised tree planting proposals noted – **NP confirmed as generally acceptable but refer to notes re notes on house type design.**
- **RO Plots 5 & 6** – concerns re remoteness of parking court, potential for parking misuse of access road, and relationship between dwelling internal layout and practical rear / front access. **PB to investigate narrowing access roads to prevent parking misuse.**
- **Plots 7 & 14** – garage court dog leg fence (and other car court enclosures), in wood and vulnerable to car damage. PB stated it would be maintained via estate management plan.
- **Plots 2-19** – continuity of frontage required, between plots 3, 4, 11 and garage block to plots 16 – 17. **AP to revise.**
- **Plots 48 -50** – continuity of frontages required. **AP to revise.**
- **Plots 23 – 24** – PB confirmed as intended as 2.5 storey type. **Agreed to revise to 2 storey house types on these plots and for these house types elsewhere on the plan.**
- **Plots 20-21** – **Agreed as 3 storey town house types.**
- **Plot 29** – Close boarded fence to proposed boundary vulnerable. **Need for protective landscape strip agreed. AP / ML.**

- **St John's Lane** – Road layout / alignment to revert to that originally approved. **AP / ML. Issues of trees, root barriers, easement, traffic calming, front gardens and building frontages all require resolution.**
- **Plot 63 (and elsewhere)** – footpath runs out onto rumble strip, unacceptable. Pedestrian, disabled users and safety issues to be re-visited here and throughout. **AP, PB**
- **St Peter's Lane** – Concerns over tightened building alignments – revert to approved layout. **AP to produce series of 3D sketch up type illustrations as analysis to unfolding views to church and in other direction.**
- **Noted that sketch up illustrations would assist in understanding of urban design principles / practise at other key points on Phase 1. AP.**
- **Plot 57 (and others)** – adjust alignment to allow planting of specimen trees. **AP / ML.**
- **Plots 36, 57, 58** – adjust alignments to give frontage continuity. **AP**
- **Plots 35 & 36** – revert to symmetrical and narrow gable form (as plot 56) and move garages to rear. Re-visit turning head design and tree proposed (2x forest trees desired) **AP / ML.**
- **Plot 55** – adjust to widen street scene. **AP.**
- **Plots 48 – 50** – Re-align to flow of road. **AP.**
- **Plot 78** - Can it be made to front the green; public elevations / house type requires revision / better articulation. **AP/PB.**
- **Plot 79** – adjust alignment to road. **AP.**
- **Plots 38 & 47** – footway to be **re-designed as NP's sketch suggestion. AP.**
- **Plots 22-54** – changed back – principle agreed.
- **Plot 19** - change materials to brickwork.
- **Elevation Drawings** – need to accurately relate to layout, including boundary treatments and tree planting. Elevations useful but Sketch Up or similar representations would give more realistic view of actual urban design principles in the estate.
- **Plot 18** - possibility of substituting FOG unit for dwelling adj. plot 18; need to resolve access to parking court; possible to adjust position of plot 22? **PB/AP to produce revised draft layout.**

LAYOUT & UD ISSUES PHASE

- **Area around Square / Plots 57 - 64** – NP emphasised need for enclosure; PB noted issues re flying freeholds; noted that flying freeholds occur elsewhere on layout. **PB to consider with legal team.**
- **Ro 57 – 64** – Poorly defined space and parking; AP suggested lane type approach incorporating a frontage unit. NP accepted possibility but emphasised need for spatial coherence to Square. **JF noted potential pedestrian/ vehicle conflict, legibility as ROW and legal/adoption issues. AP to prepare sketch for discussion.**
- **St Peter's Lane** - Plots 51 -54 – frontage alignment in relation to vistas; need to define frontages both for visual reasons and to prevent front of house parking space. **AP**
- **Plots 55 – 56** - position appears to have been moved forward. **AP to re-visit.**
- **Plots 62 -64** – one large house required as previously agreed. **AP/PB**

- **Plots 9 & 10** – Re-align to road & relate to houses/ plots on opp side of road. **AP**
- **Plot 70** – pavement return alignment.
- **Plot 88** - ??
- **Plots 90 -92** – Apartments suggested to wrap around corner to produce visually more cohesive frontage. **AP sketch.**
- **Trinity Way** – re-align various plots, 103 – 96 to allow tree planting as approved scheme. **AP/ML.**
- **Vehicular Road** – Plots 105, 45, 58, 77 etd vehicular through run, vehicular dominated; clear differentiation between 2 garage court/ parking areas to prevent vehicle through movement but allowing peds & cyclists. **AP.**
- **Plots 49 – 45** – parking areas as bullet point above; need to design out potential front of house parking; Discussion on dropped kerbs, conservation kerbs, bollards etc. **AP to produce draft plans + sketch up views.**
- **Plot 45** – gives abrupt gable view to cul de sac. **PB** to consider changes of house type.
- **Plot 118** – re-align. **AP**
- **Plots 43, 27, 25, 44** – re-align to improve enclosure to mini green. **AP**
- **Plot 28** – re-orientate to address POS.
- **Plot 34 -37** – re-align (back to) original position.

CONDITIONS ON RESERVED MATTERS

- **Planning Conditions** – **NB** to write to **PB** to propose resolution.

PROGRAMME

- **2.2.09** – Officer meeting at Cambourne
- **16.2.09** - Deadline for drafting Committee report.
- **4.3.09** - Committee

Meeting Closed: 12.15pm
Prepared by: RD
Date: 21.1.09

NOTE – A further discussion between NP, RD, CH & NB took place on house types – see separate minutes.

NOTES OF A MEETING

- Subject: APPROVAL OF DETAILS
PHASES 1 & 2, RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
PAPWORTH EVERARD (BARRATTS SITE)
S/1424/08/RM, S/1624/08/RM**
- Purpose: TO AGREE A CONSENSUS APPROACH BETWEEN
THE PCC, SCDC and their urban design and landscape
advisors and BARRATTS re DETAILED DESIGN
ISSUES following JANUARY COMMITTEE MTG AND
MEETING OF 18.1.2009**
- Date: 2.2.2009**
- Present: NB - SCDC
Brain Johnson, Chris Howlett - PCC
RD, NP – professional advisors to SCDC
John Finney – CCC Highways
Alan Parc – Parc Design
Peter Biggs - Barratt**

1.0 TIMESCALES

NB confirmed that revisions are required by 7.2.09; committee distribution deadline is 16.2.09; committee date is 4.3.09.

2.0 PHASE 1 LAYOUT

- **Plots 14-26** – access between narrowed to avoid parking misuse.
 - **Plots 3,4,11**- re-align to give frontage continuity.
 - **Plots 48- 50** – re-align to give frontage continuity.
 - **Plots 23 & 24** – replace 2.5 storey units with 2 storey (plots 3 & 4 now 2.5 storey).
 - **Plots 3-4** – now 2.5 storey.
 - **R/o 27-29** – **introduce landscaping to r/o parking bays.**
 - **St Johns Lane** – re-align to approved layout configuration.
 - **Plots 31-41**– pull back frontage to allow tree planting; fog unit introduced to parking area (plot 81).
 - **Plots 70-71** – re-align to road frontage.
- St Peters Lane**
- **Plots 36- 37** – amend to give corner turners.
 - **Plots 55-62** – pushed back to open frontage (noted)
 - **Plot 63** – footpath adjusted as original approval dwg.
 - **Plots 40 41**– Pull forward to align ridges
 - **Plot 31 – 32** – align ridges.
 - **Plots 35 &36** – narrow gable unit noted with layout adjustments; better landscape definition agreed.
 - **Plot 37** – amendment agreed.

- **Plot 78- 80** – Amendment agreed.
- **Plot 22** – amendment agreed
- **Plots 1-20** – concerns re ridge and verge heights allayed by street scene elevations.

St Johns Lane

- **Plots 30 – 40** – very rigid building line noted. Suggested amendments include additional tree planting outside plot 78, tree reinstated next to plot 43. Road finish **agreed** as rolled gravel over bit mac between turning head areas.
- **Plots 1,2-3, 6-8 and all elsewhere** - Change drive material to bit mac.
- **Plots 11 & 15** – change triangle to parking access to bitmac.
- **Plot 48 –path adjoining** – path to be rolled bitmac with rolled aggregate finish????
- **PATHS** – finishes to be shown on plan – generally tarmac, some brick paviers; **CONSENT TO INCLUDE CONDITIONS** on form of construction and final finish of footpaths etc.

PHASE 2 – LAYOUT (note new numbering in brackets where stated – otherwise refer to original plan plot numbers)

- **Plot 9 & 10 (99 – 1)**– adjustments agreed.
- **Plot 88-93 (168 -172)** – corner units noted and agreed.
- **Plots 96 &97 (176-177)** – re-orientate to front road.
- **Plots 118 (198)** – revised position noted.
- **Plot 28 (110)** – revision noted.
- **Access between 1109 -107** – proposal to reduce access width (2.1m width agreed) to give pedestrian only route agreed in principle; detail of walls, piers etc **TO BE CONDITIONED**.
- **Plots 39-49** – corner turner now incorporated and agreed; drives agreed.
- **Ramp Outside 155 &142** – re-position and ensure min width of 1.8m achieved by enlarging front gardens.
- **Plots 58 &59 (142 & 143)** – re-position house types (see above).
- **Plot 76 (156)** – consider feasibility of introducing casement to GF kitchen.
- **Plots 62 -64 (164)** – now 1 unit.
- **Plots (138 & 164)** – access between; proposed to reduce width by walls and piers – **DETAILED DESIGN TO BE CONDITIONED**.
- **Plot 139** – add window to s gable to secure passive supervision of open space.
- **Block paving to be continuous in above area to footpath link.**

PHASE 2 HOUSE DESIGN

- **GENERIC POINTS**

CHIMNEY detailing to be **CONDITIONED**.

HORIZ BOARDING – Colours, Type, Construction to be **CONDITIONED**.

WINDOWS – NB to **check planning history** to ascertain if decision in principle made in **wood**.

WINDOW SILLS – all windows to incorp sills; windows specified with plain. Bottom rail to avoid repetition of sill with window above purpose designed stone or brick sill. Details to be **CONDITIONED**.

REAR ELEVATIONS – noted that some house types include door and window head detailing to front and rear elevations; SCDC stated wish for

consistent detailing to front and rear elevations, as already is the case on some house types; similar consistency sought/required on DW Phase.

PORCHES – robust section and construction (mortice and tenon type)
wooden porch canopies required, with minimum of additional decoration/detailing. Porch design to be **CONDITIONED**.

- **TYPE ?? – horiz boarding agreed in principle.**
- **ARGYLL** – add header arches above windows + brick sills.
- **ESKDALE– Style F** – adjust chimney position; delete glazed panels to front door.
- **ESKDALE 3 storey** – remove side lights to front doors.
- **MAIDSTONE** – details of porch canopies to be **CONDITIONED**.
- **MAIDSTONE A** as above
- **MAIDSTONE B** as above
- **MAIDSTONE C x 2** - as above + add brick sills
- **MARLOW “M”** – delete parapet gables; alternative snapped header dentil course suggested – tba.
- **MALVERN** – as Marlow.
- **MILLFIELD** – Add bk sills.
- **NORBURY “N”** – DORMER DETAILING TO BE **CONDITIONED**.
- **RICHMOND “A” (rendered)** – add chimney.
- **RICHMOND “B”** – add sills.
- **THORNTON (brick)** – add recon stone kneeler.
- **THORNTON B** – add sills + 4 panel front door.
- **THORNTON style D - ??**
- **WOODCOTE** – remove box eaves and incorp clipped verge and simple eaves detail as suggested.
- **ARGYLL C** – add sill and head detailing.
- **K 1’s** – details of parapet and assoc kneeler to be revisited. Move rear windows in from corner to give greater solidity / balance to elevation.
- **Exposed Gables**
 - Plot 43 – add GF window
 - Plots 26, 37, 46, 52, 54, 58 all ok
 - Plot 15 GF and 1st F single casements tto be added; adjust boundary wall.

MATERIALS

- **Materials schedule on layout plan (tabled) noted and thought to be acceptable in principle.**
- **Materials Principles for DW Phase is as below:**
 - **Larger House Types and 2.5 storey Houses**
 - **Roofs** – conc. plain tiles red / pink mix colours etc tba.
 - **Walls** – mainly buff Cambs type clay stock brick; one or two key properties to be in red/brown Cambs stock type clay bricks; (unless specified as render.
 - **Mid Range Houses**
 - **Roofs (from)**
 - Conc plain tiles
 - Pantile type tiles (pink or yellow)

Welsh slate type tiles

- **Walls (from)** – mainly buff Cambs stock type bk; one or two red/brown Cambs stock type bks to more formal designs; render or horiz. Wood type boarding as specified.

- **Smaller Dwelling Types**

- **Roofs (from)**
pantile types tiles (pink/red or yellow)
Welsh slate replica tiles.

- **Walls (from)**
Buff Cambs type clay stock bks
Render
Horiz Wood type boarding

- **Garages**

- **Roofs** – pantile or slate types
- **Walls** – buff bk, boards or render.

NOTES

1. **Boarding** – Colours and detailing to be agreed – Planning
CONDITION.
2. **Render** – Colours and detailing to be agreed – Planning
CONDITION.
3. **RWG's** – black pvc
4. **Windows** – materials to be research re planning history.
5. **Window and Door Sills, Keystones, Kneelers etc**– artificial
stone detailing,
colour etc to be CONDITIONED.

- **The concrete tile table by PB was not considered acceptable.**
- **IT IS RECOMMENDED that the general principles for the materials is put forward as above with the fine detail of manufacturers name and type, sample panels, materials combinations etc TO BE CONDITIONED.**

SOLAR PANELS

Type, location, extent of roof slope coverage etc TO BE CONDITIONED. Suggested garage roof be considered for panels, where v close to houses.

GARAGES

Various designs tabled; AP to email to RD for comment.

BOUNDARY TREATMENTS AND DETAILING

Principles set out in brief; final details, form of construction, materials etc to be CONDITIONED.

PLANTING

As much info as poss to be provided with outstanding matters to be **CONDITIONED**.

Meeting Closed: 2.00pm

Prepared by: RD

Date: 3.2.09