

Time Commenced: 16:00  
Time Finished: 17:00

## **CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE 01 July 2021**

Present: Councillor Sue Bonser  
Councillor Mike Carr – Elected Member  
David Ling – Co-opted Member  
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce (Vice-Chair)  
Chris Twomey – RIBA (Chair)  
Councillor Robin Wood

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer,

### **08/21 Election of Chair**

Chris Twomey was elected as the new Chair of CAAC, thanks were extended to Chris Collison the former Chair for his work over the past three years.

### **09/21 Election of Vice Chair**

Paul McLocklin was elected as Vice Chair of CAAC

### **10/21 Apologies**

There were apologies from Chris Collison, Co-opted Member, Chris Wardle Derbyshire Archaeological Society, Ian Goodwin, Derby Civic Society, Carole Craven, Georgian Society, Maxwell Craven, Georgian Society.

### **11/21 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items

### **12/21 Declarations of Interest**

There was one declaration of Interest: Chris Twomey 21/00554/FUL, 17 Victoria Street, Derby DE1 1ES

### **13/21 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 22 April 2021**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **14/21 CAAC Items Determined since last agenda**

The Committee received an update on previous applications that had been determined since the last report.

**Resolved: to note the report**

**15/21      Applications not being considered following  
consultation with the Chair**

A report of the Strategic Director of Communities and Place, detailing matters not brought before the committee for information following consultation with the Chair. The report was circulated so that members can get a full picture of all the applications received. It was not proposed that this report be considered at the meeting today.

**Resolved: to note the report**

**16/21      Applications to be considered**

The committee received a report presented on behalf of the Strategic Director of Communities and Place on the applications requiring consideration by the Committee.

**Allestree Conservation Area**

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Application No &amp; Location</b> | 20/00754/FUL and 21/00755/LBA<br>13 Cornhill, Derby, DE22 2GG         |
| <b>Proposal</b>                      | Demolition of existing extension. Erection of a replacement extension |

**Resolved: No Objection**

There are two applications for listed building consent and planning consent. The Committee were informed that the house was a Grade II listed building in Allestree Conservation Area. Number thirteen was the middle house of a row of three.

The officer explained that a 2008 front conservatory extension was to be demolished; this was marked dark grey on the plan and the outline of proposed extension was hatched grey. The black hatching shows the proposed new extension which would be part conservatory with a lot of glazing.

There are some proposed changes to 1960's window, which was to be removed, and a new timber window installed above the height of the roof; at the moment there's flat roof and a cutaway for the window behind. In terms of materials for the extension these would be red brick walls, red brown clay tiles to match the existing tiles on the main house, the windows are proposed to be dark metal and the same for the external doors.

CAAC noted that this was a ground floor extension to a listed building and the removal of smaller existing ground floor extension (garden room).

The Committee noted the comments submitted by an absent member of CAAC. "The listed building description suggests that the overall structure, of which number 13 constitutes a part, is listed as an 18<sup>th</sup> century house/mill (ie watermill). However, only small part of the overall structure is shown on the first edition OS and there was no hint of a mill race on the first edition either. The proposed alteration was only to be minor. However, if application was approved it would be appropriate for the groundworks to be the subject of a watching brief, if nothing else to see if there was any trace of a race".

CAAC asked how much of the existing historic rear wall is being removed to open it up? The Officer explained that several walls were proposed to be removed which included the current extension and highlighted them on the plans. The existing listed building was shown as the purple area on the plan and was not part of the extension.

CAAC were also concerned about the junction between the new extension and the adjacent property's extension, which was awkward on the existing extension and remains awkward on the proposed extension. CAAC suggested that the height of the frontage could be reduced slightly (where the two roofs join) to make the junction tidier. Concerns were raised about the materials, brickwork for the flank wall and tiles, the pitch of the roof was such that it would not be possible to use clay plain tiles on the extension, which questions the size and proportions of the extension itself. The parapet wall to the side should have a stone or some sort of decent capping rather than just cut brick proposed.

CAAC felt that it was a fairly modest extension and agreed that the junction is quite awkward as existing and the proposal does not seem to improve it; there was an issue about removal of all of the wall even though it was a later wall. It would help if in the reading of the evolution of the building there was a sense of what was there before and what has now been added, perhaps some simple brick piers/stub walls each side rather than removal of the whole wall would help to do this. Regarding the pitch of the roof currently the visual appearance of the existing window is being truncated.

CAAC felt that in principle it was a modest proposal but that it does need some refinement. They had no objection in principle to the proposal but suggested that the truncating of the 1960's window could be resolved if the height of the building extension was reduced slightly and materials revisited.

CAAC had no objection but would leave to officers to try and improve the construction of the extension. Officers to discuss matters of detail of the extension with applicant in due course.

## **Conservation Area Darley Abbey**

**Application No &** 21/00965/FUL

**Location** Land at North Avenue, Darley Abbey, Derby DE22 1EZ

**Proposal** Installation of a replacement 24m high monopole supporting nine antenna apertures, four cabinets, the retention of four cabinets and relocation of one 0.3m dish and development ancillary thereto.

**Resolved: Objection, more information required.**

The officer explained that the reason it was before CAAC was because it was within Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site. The proposed location has a 20m monopole currently in place which is in a compound with 3 antenna and a dish and associated equipment this has been in place since 2004. The current mast has structural problems because of its age and needs to be replaced. An application was made in 2019 to replace the current mast with one of 25m with ancillary cabinet, this was withdrawn due to objections from Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage. They had strong concerns about the increased height of the mast and of the impact of the monopole on the outstanding universal value of Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site. The officer highlighted that there are no photographs available other than those of the existing pole. There were also no long views showing the impact of pole on the wider environment, and there was no Heritage Impact Assessment available. There are several proposed additional objects being added in the compound and an increase in height of the pole from 20m to 24m.

CAAC stated that the lack of a Heritage Impact Assessment (based on ICOMOS guidance) was crucial to the assessment; they should also see photographs from key locations within the DWVMHS including along the Heritage Way which would be a standpoint for judging the impact on the universal value of Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site. The additional height of the mast will make it much more visible from valley. There was a lack of information, and long-distance photographs are essential to view this properly particularly with the additional antenna; it was not just a slender 24m pole, there was a need to see what it will look like.

CAAC objected to the proposal subject to further information being provided. A computer visualisation of what it would look like from below in the valley was suggested. There should be a Heritage Impact Assessment, including a good understanding of the visual impact, so that the proposal can be judged properly. Objection more information required.

## **Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 21/01019/FUL  
**Location:** Lavender Lodge, 4-50 Stafford Street, Derby DE1 1JL  
**Proposal:** First Floor rear extension to nursing home (additional bedrooms with ensembles)

**Resolved: No Objection**

The Committee were informed that this was a full application for planning permission. It was for a 1<sup>st</sup> floor rear extension to the nursing home to provide

additional bedrooms with ensuites. The building was situated outside the Friar Gate Conservation Area but was close to the Bonded Warehouse in Friar Gate Goods Yard, the ground behind the Nursing Home rises to a raised platform where the Bonded Warehouse sits. The officer explained that the Nursing Home caters for long stay residencies and for people with complex needs and conditions. The Home was nearing full capacity, hence the application for 9 new bedrooms, 5 on the ground floor and 4 on the first floor.

The officer presented photographs showing the building and its relationship to the nearby Bonded warehouse. Slides showing the existing extension and proposed extensions were presented. The main changes in the north west elevations were highlighted. There were relatively small changes in courtyard which included a couple of proposed block windows to allow installation of a hospital lift. The existing ground floor layout was shown. There was parking proposed on ground floor and enlarged, widened windows to rooms 10, 11 and 12 plus the proposed location of the hospital lift. The proposed layout of new rooms 41, 42 and 43 and 44 with associated ensuites in adjacent corridor were displayed. CAAC was informed there was a small area of decking proposed to room 26.

CAAC noted that it was essentially a two-storey extension to close the courtyard, with parking underneath and rooms above, and some minor changes to the south west side enlarging the lift space. CAAC asked about the status of an application for a supermarket building to the north east of the Nursing Home and the officer confirmed that the building did not get consent.

CAAC commented about levels, and asked how much was cut in; it would have been nice to see a cross section of the building where it backed on to the Bonded Warehouse. It was explained that the building cuts in quite deeply, there was an embankment to the back with trees, so most of the building would be obscured.

CAAC had no objection to the proposal.

## **City Centre Conservation Area**

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Application No &amp;</b> | 21/00554/FUL  |
| <b>Location</b>             | 17 Victoria Street, Derby DE1 1ES   |
| <b>Proposal</b>             | Extensions and internal alterations to the rear of the existing bar and residential flat above. |

### **Resolved: No Objection**

This is building in City Centre conservation area, Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment as part of the design and access statement. Opposite the building there are a number of listed buildings along Victoria Street, Wardwick and the Strand, for example the former Post Office building and The Wardwick Public House further on. There are some internal works to the building and externally the proposal intends to undertake a couple of extensions to the rear of the building to form a roof terrace. On the second floor an amendment of a roof form to the rear mono pitch roof. The front elevation mentions new branding and signs but there are no details yet. The proposed extensions to rear won't be seen from the front

elevation. Photographs of the current extensions on the first and second floor were displayed as well as the existing and proposed layout for ground floor and 1<sup>st</sup> floor. In terms of first floor, an office was proposed to be created with a bedroom above and an extension to the current roof form to form toilets. A roof terrace was also proposed. There were little changes proposed to the front elevation. The rear elevation existing and proposed arrangements were displayed, there are changes to rear with a new extension and new doors. Looking at the building context extensions won't be seen from the front or side but from the rear there will some change in the area where there is currently a pitched roof. In the black door to rear of elevation a new window was proposed.

In summary there would be extensions to rear of the building, a new roof terrace, a second floor flat and extension of ground floor bar area.

CAAC were concerned of the effect of the upcoming Becketwell Scheme. It was confirmed that there were no applications as yet for a "feature building" on the corner, but these proposed changes to 17 Victoria Street could become more visible when the current adjoining building in situ was demolished.

CAAC highlighted that this building was not listed and had already been subject to work and changes in the past, but the front elevation was being left intact. In principle CAAC did not have an objection, but if the adjoining building were to be demolished it would open the view of that rear extension from the new square that has been proposed. Whatever was put forward in the Becketwell scheme would have to address the appearance.

CAAC generally welcomed a tidying up of the rear of the building and felt it was quite a comprehensive scheme and well thought out. Anything that improves what was there currently should be welcomed; on balance the scheme was worth supporting. They acknowledged that the building may become more prominent when all the phases of the proposals to Becketwell are completed opening views from the square. However, CAAC had no objection and supported and welcomed the proposal.

**MINUTES END**