

Time Commenced: 16:00
Time Finished: 17:15

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

14 October 2021

Present: Councillor Sue Bonser
Councillor Mike Carr
Councillor Robin Wood
Chris Collison, Co-opted Member
Carole Craven, Georgian Group
Maxwell Craven, Victorian Group
Ian Goodwin, Derby Civic Society
David Ling – Co-opted Member
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce (Vice-Chair)
Chris Twomey – RIBA (Chair)

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer,

25/21 Apologies

There were apologies from Chris Wardle Derbyshire Archaeological Society,

26/21 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair

There were no late items

27/21 Declarations of Interest

The following Declaration of Interest was noted:

Chris Twomey 21/01481/FUL and 21/01482/LBA, 37A Cornmarket Derby DE1 2DG.

28/21 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 02 September 2021

The Minutes of the meeting held on 02 September 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

29/21 CAAC - Consideration of change to the current name

It was noted that at the last meeting, CAAC members had considered a change of name for the committee in principle. There had been acceptance that this could be an opportunity to change the committee's name, but no fixed ideas had been suggested, although it was proposed that 'heritage assets' should be reflected in

the name of the new committee. On further discussion, it was felt that 'heritage' was too broad a term, although it was noted that it featured in the title of the Government Heritage Advisory Board. The word 'conservation' was considered appropriate with all the committee members. However, it was suggested that the title of the committee could be simplified to something more succinct, that would better describe the role and reflect the wide and varied scope of projects dealt with by the committee, as well as provide a new acronym.

The Chair suggested that further discussion take place at the meeting of 14 October 2021 to decide if the name of the committee should be changed and if this was agreed a new name should be recommended. At this meeting a committee member suggested 'Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee (CHAC)'. The Chair asked for comments from the committee. A committee member queried whether CAAC was a Council committee; the officer confirmed that it was. Another member stated that the term 'committee' added a certain amount of weight to the work undertaken. Another felt that there had been significant changes to Government Heritage Advisory Board and suggested it would be a good idea to include the word 'heritage' in the new title.

It was agreed that the name of the committee should be changed. The new name Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee was proposed and agreed.

To recommend to Council that the name of the Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) be amended to the 'Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee (CHAC)', to better reflect the work of the committee.

30/21 CAAC items determined since the last Agenda

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

It was noted that since the last meeting Application 21/01173/FUL and 21/01174, Land at St Peter's Churchyard, use of the land as an outdoor food, drink and artisan trader venue, including erection of kiosk buildings and entrance gates, had been refused. The officer confirmed that reasons for refusal included heritage and stated a link to decision notices could be provided.

Resolved: to note the report

31/21 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. This was a full report which shows all the different heritage items which can be commented on individually or as part of the organisations the

committee members represent. It was not proposed that this report be considered at the meeting today.

Resolved: to note the report

32/21 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.

Mickleover Conservation Area

Application No & Location	21/01111/FUL and 21/01112/LBA 1 The Hollow, Mickleover, Derby DE3 0DG
Proposal	Replacement of Existing flat roof with gabled roof and erection of an outbuilding (garden room)

Alternations to include replacement of flat room with gable roof, refurbishment works and replacement first floor window

Resolved: No Objection

1 and 2 the Hollow are Grade II listed buildings thought to date from the late 18th century early 19th century. Next door to the properties are 4 to 5 the Square, also Grade II listed, which are in Mickleover Conversation area.

There are a several proposals for this application, which include: replacement of 2 storey flat roof bathroom extension, with one that has a brick gable and a blue tiled roof with 2 conservation rooflights; the repair of the roof; several changes to windows in the rear elevation including the remodelling of a modern window to the first floor, which is being reduced in size, and also the replacement of a window (Yorkshire sash), in poor condition, to the right hand side; the pitched roof proposed to be in red facing brickwork to match existing; there was also proposed an erection of a single storey timber framed office garden room in the rear.

The Committee were informed that the first-floor bathroom needed additional head height as it was restrictive. The proposed window replacements are slim double-glazed units, and 2 conservation rooflights are proposed. The new garden building would be located part way down the garden. It would be approximately 15 square meters and be a timber framework, other materials used would be western red cedar to the front and charred larch black cladding to rear and sides, roof metal cladding would be a black steel sheet.

In summary there would be a gable roof on the flat roof at the top, reducing the size of larger window to something more appropriate and an addition of a garden building

CAAC felt that the proposal represented an improvement on the existing situation, especially regarding the main building where the replacement of a flat roof in the way suggested was good, and changes proposed to windows were appropriate. The garden room will be far enough from the building to be a distinct separate entity, and it would be semi temporary in nature. It was adequate in terms of levels and distance from the main building. The proposals were satisfactory.

The proposal in relation to the bathroom was welcome; it was a great improvement to the building, but concerns were raised about window and 2 rooflights, perhaps the proposed rooflights could go which would leave a traditional roof in place. There was a need to replace the window and it was proposed to use slim line double glazed units, but guidance from Historic England usually advises single glazing however with the emphasis on building insulation now, CAAC felt double glazing was a good idea. The officer advised clarification had been sought from the agent and it was not proposed to add double glazing into the existing window but replace it with a slim double-glazed unit.

CAAC had no objection to the application. They felt the proposal was an improvement to the main building and the changes to the windows are fine, but they suggested rooflights were unnecessary as there was an existing window into the bathroom and sufficient light. Garden room acceptable and far enough from the main house

Darley Abbey Conservation Area

Application No & Location	21/01437/LBA The Bakehouse, Abbey Yard, Derby DE22 1DS
Proposal	Repair and cleaning of brickwork, walls, floors and ceiling, installation of heating and ventilation system to include erection of removable cabinet in yard. Formation of a new doorway together with repairs to drainage at the upper floor level. Erection of ramp access and installation of partitions in connection with the formation of a cloak room.

Resolved: No Objection

The Bakehouse forms part of a listing for the stables and service wing for the former Darley Hall dated early 18th century demolished in 1962. The detached service block was Grade II listed. This proposal was to repair and enable use of the lower ground floor accommodation as an office suite or studio in accordance with the existing business use.

The officer explained the proposal was for the lower ground floor which was accessed by the lower car park. It included several replacement doors, reinstatement of 3 lost painted timber windows one sash and two casements, a timber ramp, the installation of a WC in cloakroom connected to an existing soil and vent pipe. Regarding alterations there was one new opening where a doorway had been in place previously, and the installation of air handling ducts

attached along a route either side of the beam or joist at a lower level to vaulted spaces finally to a timber cabinet in the yard area.

The officer highlighted some of the areas in the building; there are several lathe and plaster areas, a lime ash floor, in other spaces there was an oven and fireplace and several brick pavers on the floor which would all be retained as part of the scheme. Minimal cleaning was planned with a low-pressure water wash, There were props and structural work to repair and retain a brick arch over an oven and some lime repairs.

In terms of the external elevation the proposal was to re-instate 3 windows, a large sash and 2 casement windows. The doors now are a combination of metal and timber frame which it was proposed to replace with tongue and groove boarded doors with a light to the centre. In terms of air handling ducts, the ductwork is 150 mm, the officer explained the routes through the building.

The Chair summarised the repairs which were essentially bringing the lower ground floor back into use as a studio, putting new windows and doors into existing openings which had been bricked up and one minor opening formed internally.

The officer provided more information about the duct routes; it was explained that some would have to be placed at a high level, to the side of door openings. The head height was restricted but the applicant had advised that there was necessary head height by siting the ducts adjacent to the ceiling to main beam and joists. CAAC's main concern was the abutment to the vaulted section, they asked if this would be weakened, and if a condition could be applied for detail to be provided as to how openings would be formed and restraint to the existing brickwork given.

CAAC had no objections to the proposal. They welcomed the re-use but suggested a condition over how openings for pipework are formed (and limiting these).

City Centre Conservation Area

Application No & Location: 21/01481/FUL & 21/01482/LBA
37A Cornmarket, Derby, DE1 2DG
Proposal: Change of use of first and second floor from restaurant (Use Class E) to eight apartments (Use Class C3) including installation of a new door and window to the rear elevation, bin store and re-location of air conditioning units.

Alterations in association with the change of use of first and second floors from Restaurant (Use Class E) to eight apartments, including the installation of a new door and window to the rear elevation, re-location of air conditioning units, alterations to signage and installation of pods, lobby areas and modular kitchens

Resolved: No Objection

This building was an important one in the streetscape of Derby designed by Joseph Pickford in 1768; the proposal was to convert the upper floors into 4 bedsits in both the first and second floor.

This was a Grade II listed building in the City Centre Conservation Area. There was a previously approved scheme in February 2018 but as the work was not started within the 3 years, they have re-applied. The proposals are for a change in use from a restaurant on the first floor to a conversion to 8 apartments to first and second floor, new doorway, window to the rear, relocation of air conditioning units, alterations to signage, and the installation of a pod, lobby area and modular kitchens.

The officer explained there are very minor changes between this and the last scheme; they included creating a fire lobby at the bottom of the stairs to the ground floor, on the first floor there was a change to a location of door. On the second floor there were more changes to try and rationalise drainage and plumbing, some of the kitchen locations have changes and some of the WC and shower pods have also moved. The changes had been approved previously, but there was an additional new entrance for residents. The timber bin enclosure to be removed and replaced by a brick built one, the extraction flue and other unnecessary vents have been removed and a window that was blocked previously has been re-instated. To the rear the unsightly air conditioning units have been removed and a bracket for a hanging swinging sign has been re-used. These were all approved as a part of the original proposal. The officer also highlighted the addition of dry riser to the existing door to the left-hand side. The Committee were informed that as part of the noise report secondary glazing would be added to all the windows and there are finer details of the mechanical vent and heat recovery system proposed, with more information on the fire strategy provided.

CAAC understood that the interior of the house had some good plasterwork. The officer stated there was not a lot remaining on either floor. The wall divisions had been given permission previously so there was no change to the walls, other than where the bathrooms and kitchens have been proposed. CAAC noted that in the statement the 2nd floor room, which was probably the most intact, remains mainly untouched.

CAAC had no objection. They felt that the 8 units of accommodation created worked in terms of the windows available and the addition of a new door, and brought about a beneficial use for the building, being the best way to conserve it. It was a comprehensive proposal, particularly the removal of all the detritus on the face to the lock up yard. It was a well thought out scheme, especially the orientation of the rooms to use windows and the retention of stained-glass windows on that elevation.

Conservation Area

Application No & Location 21/01563/VAR
85 King Street, Derby, DE1 3EE

Proposal

Refurbishment of Commercial Ground Floor Units together with formation of 6 Residential Units on first and second floors. Installation of glazing and repair to external masonry including bricking up of existing openings – Variation of conditions 3 and 4 of previously approved permission 05/18/00791

Resolved: Objection

This was a locally listed building, part of 85 to 89 King Street. In 2018 an application was approved for the refurbishment of commercial ground floor units and formation of 6 residential units to the first and second floor, the installation of glazing and repair of external masonry including bricking up of existing openings. This submission was a variation application for conditions 3 and 4 about materials on the approved plan and joinery details on window sections.

The plans submitted show that the applicants are trying to work with apertures in place. There has been a slight change in retaining brickwork for store risers, narrowing, and adapting the shop fronts to accommodate an existing archway to an alleyway which was partially blocked; it was intended to block it up with an inset of 25 mm so that it was recessed. The applicants are proposing less pilasters. On the drawing, it was not clear if or how they would be connected to the fascia. The window details are still proposed to be timber but would be thicker double-glazed units, there was a varying number of glazing bars of different widths also shown on the plan. Regarding the windows that were to be replaced the plan originally showed 8 over 8 for the larger ones and 4 over 4 for the smaller ones but there are now proposed to be 8 over 8 of the smaller ones; this does not match the historic window pattern.

CAAC stated that the original application had 3 separate shop fronts, this application had 1 and the pilasters have disappeared either side of the entrance. It would have looked better if there were pilasters either side of the opening, so that you would still have 3 separate shop fronts. Overall CAAC felt there was a poor relationship between facias and the details to shop fronts. The design does not stand out, the standards of design were higher on The Strand; the shop fronts do not match the rest of the buildings, they suggested the applicant be pointed in direction of the shop front refurbishments carried out around Derby to see the standard expected. CAAC stated that the window details are inappropriate, and the proportion to amended windows were incorrect, the width of glazing bars are 35mm and above.

CAAC Objected to the proposal because it would have an adverse impact on the locally listed building and was in a prominent location.

CAAC raised concerns over UPVC soffit and facias, the changes to windows were unsupported there was no justification why the changes are necessary. The shop front proposals were poor and they suggested the applicant be referred to the Shopfront and Advertisement Guidance and to view shop fronts that were done as part of the recent shopfront and building repair grant scheme. The need for more

pilasters was suggested; any pilasters should be taller and connect with the fascia, more detail was needed.

Conservation Area

Application No & 21/01579/LBA
Location 29 York Street, Derby, DE1 1FZ
Proposal Demolition of rear extension and extension of boundary walls to enclose rear yard and formation of en-suite in connection with previously approved permission 21/00291/FUL – change of use from office (Use Class E) to dwelling house (Use Class C3)

Resolved: No Objection subject to change of location for en-suite

The property was a Grade II listed building on the corner of Vernon street and York Street. The proposal was for removal of a slate roof kitchen extension to the rear, the installation of a pod to form an en-suite in one of the bedrooms with a sani-flow system and drainage via the roof void. Slate vents and the existing boundary wall to be extended with blue brick plinth and render to match existing wall.

The proposal showed the kitchen being removed to form a rear yard, which was proposed to be fenced and car park spaces retained. There was a slight change to the doorway proposed in terms of the height and width from new kitchen to the rear yard. The first floor had an addition in main bedroom of a new en-suite. Another slight change was an outlet pipe to the rear wall.

The officer provided some additional information from the applicant which stated that the existing kitchen was hidden behind the boundary wall and only became visible when looking back from York Street. There were no changes to the existing cellar, the en-suite to the first floor was a fully reversible studwork pod, the ceiling of the pod would be lower than the ceiling of the room. A moulding would be installed on the top of the studwork wall and it would be possible to retain a 50mm separation from the chimney breast so that the feature could be read within the room.

The Chair summarised, this was a modest proposal to remove the existing but later single storey extension and extend the wall to create an enclosure to form an outdoor space, this was then separated from the parking area, on the first floor upstairs it was planned to insert an en-suite.

CAAC felt there were no problems with the alterations to rear of the building. However, they were less comfortable with addition of en-suite which seemed to destroy the proportion of the first-floor room, it was very awkwardly positioned over the chimney breast, in reality the room could not be read, and it would be better to find an alternative if possible.

CAAC had no objection to the proposals subject to change of location of en-suite, perhaps to an alternative corner, because of the awkward placing in relation to the chimney breast.

Friar Gate Conservation Area

Application No & Location	21/01644/FUL Bio House, Derwent Street, Derby, DE1 2ED
Proposal	Demolition of part of garage building. Change of use of remaining building from garage (Use Class B2) to offices (Use Class E(g)). Erection of an additional storey to the existing office building together with alterations to the elevations and associated works

Resolved: No Objection

The officer explained the site will be familiar to CAAC as it was approved previously in 2016, but the approval lapses in December so a new scheme has been proposed. The previous scheme was predominantly residential use and varied in heights from 5 to 6 to 9 storeys, CAAC had objected to the proposals. This proposal was for two buildings for office use; there was no further information for building 3 yet.

The officer explained the proposals for buildings 1 and 2. The heritage assets for the building being considered here are nearby the Exeter house, the Exeter Public House, and the National Westminster Bank opposite. Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site was a little way off, the southernmost point of DVMW was the Museum of Making. The City Centre and Marketplace and views should also be considered.

The officer outlined proposals for building 1, it would be of a lower structure on Derwent Street, some of the building was being retained and some redeveloped. There was a range of materials being proposed for the building. For building 2, some of the building was being retained, as was the frontage, but there was a proposal for a rear extension. The ground floor and first floor would be for office use.

The Committee noted that this was quite a different proposal from that previously proposed. They noted there was no detail for Building 3, and that essentially Building 1 was a three-storey office building and there was an extension to Building 2.

CAAC queried if this application closed the previous application for a 15-storey tower block. The officer confirmed that the previous application lapses at the end of the December 2021. CAAC welcomed this development on the site. It was a building of human scale which conformed well with the 1930's National Westminster Bank building and does not overpower the two public houses. They agreed that it was a huge improvement with what was currently in place.

CAAC queried the quality of materials; they felt that for the building to work the cladding must be of a high quality. The officer explained that for Building 1 the materials are described as light grey flat panel vertical profile metal cladding, dark grey vertical profile metal cladding, yellow feature surrounds, dark grey glass panels, grey metal door system, yellow metal window system. For Building 2 a lot of the building would be retained; this was the existing brick, the extension to rear would be a grey metal window and door system, timber cladding, and a grey metal curtain walling system. CAAC felt that the materials needed to be carefully selected to get the right quality on the site but had no objection to the windows. The quality of materials on facade are important and they had concerns with the middle section where the cladding comes down to ground level, they suggested lightening up that section such as the cladding not coming to ground level and the glazing to cover the front, or some other similar method of handling would make it more successful. They suggested that the panels at the lower levels could be damaged. CAAC felt that overall, the scale, form and massing was much more in keeping with the area. CAAC welcomed the proposal but felt there was need for further discussion in relation to design matters.

CAAC had no objection to the proposals subject to change. The improvement on the previous scheme was noted the buildings in the new scheme being lower and of a more human scale. CACC had no objection subject to discussions on materials to make sure they are of high quality (to building and floorscape) and design details of the cladding to ground floor Derwent Street frontage it was suggested the glazing extended along complete frontage.

MINUTES END