

# Minutes

## Planning Committee

---

Date 25 October 2007

Time 2.00pm

Present Councillor Watkins (in the Chair), Councillors Huntley, Knight, Al-Nuaimi, Mrs Jenkins, Hando and White.

Apologies for Absence Mrs Buchanan-Smith, Atwell, Whitcutt, Linton and Richards

Also in Attendance Cllr Mrs Heath

37

### [Development Control - Planning Applications](#)

#### **Resolved**

(1) That decisions be recorded as shown on the Planning Applications Schedule attached as Appendix A

(2) That the Head of Planning and Economic Regeneration be authorised to draft any amendments to/additional conditions or reasons for refusal in respect of the Planning Applications Schedule, attached as Appendix A.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE – 25 October 2007****DECISION SCHEDULE**

<b>No</b>	<b>Site/Proposal</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Additional Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b>
07/1211	Partial discharge of Condition 03 of PP 07/0927/RM and 07/0112/RM, Condition 13 of PP 05/1474/O and Conditions 16 & 17 of PP 07/1014/RM (Public Art Strategy) relating to the redevelopment of Newport City Centre ( <b>option 1</b> -relocate existing mural)	Stow Hill	HPER explained that three applications had been submitted to seek to partially discharge conditions as the first stage in seeking approval for the proposed art strategy. The three applications provided different options for the future of the Chartist Mural and outlined the implications for other items of public art.	Option 1 – Refused  Option 2 – Approved (Note to be sent to Modus asking them to consult the Accent Newport group when considering an appropriate alternative site.)
07/1212	Partial discharge of Condition 03 of PP 07/0927/RM and 07/0112/RM, Condition 13 of PP 05/1474/O and Conditions 16 & 17 of PP 07/1014/RM (Public Art Strategy) relating to the redevelopment of Newport City Centre ( <b>option 2</b> – new replica of mural)	Stow Hill	In accordance with the Public Speaking Protocol, Mr Drewett, the representative from Accent Newport, advised the committee on the outcome of the public meetings and the consensus of opinion. - Views ranged from leaving the original completely untouched to replacing with a new piece of art. - Option 2 to create a replica using original design drawings in a prominent site in the city appeared to be the most popular choice. People loved the mural with its bold and exciting bright colours. It depicted the pride of Newport in its past and present and its savagery	Option 3 - Refused
07/1213	Partial discharge of Condition 03 of PP 07/0927/RM and 07/0112/RM, Condition 13 of PP 05/1474/O and Conditions 16 & 17 of PP 07/1014/RM (Public Art Strategy) relating to the redevelopment of	Stow Hill		

	<p>Newport City Centre (<b>option 3</b> – new public art with chartist theme)</p>		<p>enthralled residents who loved the passion of the chartists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A facsimile replica would show that poignant detail and the substantial section already lost would be recreated from the original drawings. The original suffered from water penetration behind the tiles and a replica would address those problems using weatherproof materials and new technology to ensure better colour retention.</li> <li>- A replica would preserve history and cherish what the chartists stood for and should be sited in a prominent position. It should be robust to stand the rigours of our climate and would continue to be loved by the people of Newport and promote chartist ideals.</li> </ul> <p>Cllr Al-Nuaimi was pleased that the issue was now being considered and that Modus appreciated the value of the mural to Newport. He had seen the passion shown by residents in the public meetings and he believed that all three options were credible. One issue was the size and scale of the mural and that needed to be preserved. There could be problems with weather proofing the existing mural and there was a risk that it could be damaged when being moved. Option1 gave a safeguard that if the project did not go ahead the mural would be in storage and not lost. Safeguards needed to be in place that the work would be done and a prominent place in the city was vital. He was pleased that Modus</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

		<p>were recording and photographing the work and said it was important that this was available and the pieces could be saved and sold</p> <p>.</p> <p>Cllr Hando spoke as a long time citizen of Newport and said his initial reaction was to save the original at all cost. After attending the public meetings and meeting Oliver Budd he was convinced that it did not make sense to move it. It had originally been constructed in panels in a studio then moved to the current site. It was never intended to be moved and if outdoors the potential damage was worrying. A replica could be made to withstand the weather. A £250,000 bond could be considered up front to ensure the replica was made. He asked that a complete replica be made and that it be displayed in one piece.</p> <p>Cllr White supported option 2 because of the weather and asked if there was already a suitable site where it could be erected.</p> <p>Cllr Knight did not accept that option 2 was the best solution and that the original could be saved. It would cost more but the importance of it would only be realised when it was lost. A replica would not have the same history as the original and finding a suitable site would be difficult.</p> <p>Cllr Jenkins thought that option 1 was unrealistic and that it was not intended to be moved and could be damaged. Option 2 was</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>the preferred option and it was part of her heritage.</p> <p>Cllr Huntley agreed with the majority of the speakers and asked for reassurances that Oliver Budd would be available to do the work from the original designs.</p> <p>HPER explained that details of an alternative site would be before the committee within six months and options were already being considered.</p> <p>The Council had been working for over a year with the developers to take the scheme forward including a development agreement. There were obligations on both parts and the developers were to develop the scheme including £250,000 for artwork. This formed part of the development agreement and therefore a bond was not necessary or appropriate.</p> <p>HLS confirmed that this was catered for in the development agreement and there were sufficient safeguards in place.</p> <p>Cllr Watkins understood Cllr Knights views but was concerned that if it were removed and installed elsewhere it could collapse and it would need to be protected from the weather. Modus were aware of the strength of feeling and he supported option2 with a location to be agreed.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>The Committee expressed their thanks to Mr Drewett for attending and for the public meetings and suggested that Modus consult the group when considering an appropriate alternative site.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--