Derby City Council

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
11th December 2014

ITEM 6

Report of the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods

Friar Gate Bridge – update report

SUMMARY

1.1 To inform what can be done with Friar Gate Bridge and how much it will cost a study was commissioned by Planning and Regeneration departments.

This report outlines the findings of the study commissioned to identify options to assist in the conservation of the Friar Gate Bridge; a grade II listed structure. The report has helped inform officer discussions over the last few months to attempt to identify a suitable way forward to both conserve this important heritage asset and to bring forward the sensitive regeneration of the wider Friar Gate Goods Yard.

The concluding report consisted of two parts. The first part identified a variety of schemes of repair work to the bridge together with the associated costs (based on 5, 10 and 10+ years, taking into account works as necessary to accommodate different uses on the structure). The second part was an options appraisal for possible uses, which analysed the costing options and which is not yet complete.

RECOMMENDATION

2.1 To note the progress that has been made on securing a sustainable future of Friar Gate Bridge and the obstacles that still need to be overcome.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

3.1 To ensure that Members of the Conservation Area Advisory Committee are aware of the outcome of the recent report.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

4.1 Friar Gate Bridge is an elegant Grade II listed structure, decorated with ornamental cast ironwork. It was built in the 1870s to carry the Great Northern Railway across Friar Gate in Derby, and was cast in Derby by Andrew Handyside and Company.

4.2 To help decide what can be done with Friar Gate Bridge and how much it will cost a study was commissioned by Conservation/Planning and Regeneration departments and was overseen by our Structures Section.

The concluding report consists of two parts. The first part identified a variety of schemes of repair work to the bridge together with the associated costs (based on 5, 10 and 10+ years, taking into account works as necessary to accommodate different uses on the structure). The second part was an options appraisal for possible uses and which analysed the costing options.

The repair options considered by this Study limited itself to the metal bridge element and not the stone abutments or units. It also excluded other elements such as; drainage improvements under the bridge, the clearance of trees, vegetation, rubbish and other debris along with the removal of the safety netting. These omissions will need to be factored in to the final costings before a decision on the way forward is made.

The three main repair work options considered in the first part of the study were:

Option 1: Do Minimum Works (circa £22,500) - a short term holding operation to make the Bridges safe and allow the netting to be removed from the outside faces. Decay is managed but not generally halted.

Option 2: Stabilise condition for the medium term (circa £239,700) - with 5-10 year paint coatings life, extendable with maintenance. Improves aesthetic appearance by painting and returns the structures to a condition in which they could be used for light loadings.

Option 3: Restoration for the longer term (circa £886,100) - with 10 + years coatings life, extendable with maintenance. Improves aesthetic appearance and returns the structures to a condition in which they could be used for medium loadings.

The findings in the first part of the Study by the expert metalwork consultant suggest that Option 2 would provide the best value for money.

4.3 The options appraisal in the second part of the Study has considered a number of possible commercial and recreational uses for the long term sustainability of the bridge and was intertwined with the potential access arrangements. An Officer Project Team (consisting of officers from Development Management, Conservation and Regeneration Services) has since been formed which will review and progress this work.

It has been agreed that Derby City Council will continue the dialogue with adjacent landowners, the Heritage Lottery Fund and any other potential funding body to help secure the long term sustainability of the bridge.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5.1 None

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer	n/a
Financial officer	n/a
Human Resources officer	n/a
Estates/Property officer	n/a
Service Director(s)	Paul Clarke
Other(s)	n/a

For more information contact:	Chloe Oswald 01332 641634 chloe.oswald@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	None
List of appendices:	Appendix 1 – Implications

Appendix 1

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

1.1 None directly arising from the report.

Legal

2.1 None directly arising from the report.

Personnel

3.1 None directly arising from the report.

IT

4.1 None directly arising from the report.

Equalities Impact

5.1 None directly arising from the report.

Health and Safety

6.1 None directly arising from the report.

Environmental Sustainability

7.1 None directly arising from the report.

Property and Asset Management

8.1 None directly arising from the report.

Risk Management

9.1 None directly arising from the report.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

10.1 The project supports current policies.