

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

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

21 January 2021

Present: Chris Collison (Chair)
Carole Craven – Georgian Group
Maxwell Craven – Georgian Group
Ian Goodwin – Derby Civic Society
David Ling – Derby Civic Society
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce
Chris Twomey - RIBA
Chris Wardle Derbyshire Archaeological Society

Cllr Mike Carr – Elected Member
Cllr Hardy Dhindsa – Elected Member
Cllr Robin Wood – Elected Member

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer and Sarah Claxton, Senior Planning Officer

15/20 Apologies

There were no apologies.

16/20 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair

There were no late items. The chair notified the Board that he had received a letter from the Derwent Valley Mills which highlighted the New Management Plan for World Heritage Sites was now in place from 2020-21. It had been adopted by HM Government and could be viewed on the website. The letter also asked who would be representing the Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) at their Conservation and Planning Group. The Committee agreed that the Chair would continue as the representative from CAAC.

17/20 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of Interest.

18/20 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 3 December 2020

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

19/20 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.

20/20 Recent Appeals – to be noted

The Committee noted that a Planning Inspector Decision had been received in respect of the appeal in relation to the application at Ford Street, within the Friar Gate Conservation Area. The Committee noted that the Appeal was dismissed following refusal of consent for a tele-communications installation. The Inspector who determined the matter on behalf of the Secretary of State had agreed with the City Council that the proposal was inappropriate for the area.

21/20 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 comment following consultation with the Chair, was considered. The report was circulated so that members can get a full picture of all the applications received, a selection of these form the next agenda item. It was not proposed that this report be considered at the meeting today.

Resolved: to note the report.

22/20 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 & 20/00411/LBA

Location The Old Hall, 5 Orchard Street, Derby DE3 0DF

Proposal Re-roofing of the dwelling house

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC noted that in terms of re-roofing further information had been submitted, including a photograph which showed the areas on the roof where there were issues and where there had been water ingress over the last few years. Photos of water ingress within the building was also provided.

CAAC had previously objected to proposal and asked for additional justification for the extent of re-roofing and requested a more comprehensive report, method

statement and more detail. CAAC noted that there was water damage so there was justification for re-roofing, but with conditions for materials and method statement.

It was suggested that if this committee and the Planning Committee are minded to approve, then proper architectural recording and monitoring of the fabric before and after the alterations are made should be carried out in order to have a proper record of the significance of the asset.

A member of the committee highlighted some issues relating to the re-flashing of the chimney and the valley. The officer was asked to provide scrutiny to the flashing round the chimney and the valley at the rear on the same area.

It was noted that the report suggested “rosemary tiles” as a replacement for 20% of the roof, although, all the tiles on the roof looked to be handmade. It was suggested that the owners should be asked to see if they can source any second hand, reclaimed handmade tiles to match the existing tiles, rather than replacing them with the machine made “rosemary tiles” as proposed.

CAAC had no objection to the proposal but suggested the following two points be considered:

- There should be a proper archaeological recording of the fabric, both before and after the work was undertaken, to have a record of the significance of the asset
- All efforts should be made to try to source replacement tiles to match the existing. These were likely to be handmade replacement tiles rather than replacing with the standard manufactured Rosemary tiles as suggested at present.

Mickleover Conservation Area

Application No & 20/01148/FUL

Location The Old Hall, 5 Orchard Street, Derby DE3 ODF

Proposal Erection of an outbuilding (garage)

Resolved: No Objection

Previously there was an application in April 2020 for a two-storey garage and store in this location to the front of the Old Hall, which had been refused. The application also included a garden building. CAAC had concerns about two storey garage and store but were not concerned about the garden building as regards setting of the listed building.

This application was for a single timber clad garage, last time committee saw proposals a revised proposal was submitted for a smaller building but CAAC felt the location was inappropriate and other options for possible location should be considered, one suggestion was where the cart sheds had been sited historically.

CAAC noted that several other areas had been looked as a possible location following CAAC comments. The analysis of applications showed that these other possible locations were tight to park and turn around a vehicle. The applicants preferred location was still at the front of the Old Hall.

CAAC felt it had been helpful to see the new information, including the analysis of locations for garage. However, one member felt there was little remaining ground around the historic building and that anything erected, apart from a small garden building, would cause harm to the setting of the building. It was also suggested that the distance between proposed garage and feature in centre of the courtyard was tight; there was usually a need to leave six metres to manoeuvre a vehicle in an out of the garage, the building might need to be moved back to accommodate. CAAC noted that the applicant had tried to pursue alternative arrangements and had also reduced the size of the building which was tucked away to the left-hand side. It was an improvement on what had been previously submitted. However, there were concerns about the impact on the trees around the proposed site.

CAAC had no issues with the garden building. However, there were concerns about the potential impact on trees from siting of the garage building. CAAC suggested a minor adjustment to location might be needed to retain trees in this location. A watching brief for archaeological works before development, should be carried out, subject to a condition.

CAAC had no objection to the proposal but asked that cognisance was given to the location and impact on trees, that any minor adjustments to suit the long term retention of trees needs to be considered. There should be a watching brief regarding archaeological evidence on site undertaken prior to works on the actual buildings.

Railway Conservation Area

Application No & 20/01032/LBA

Location Carlton House, 116 London Road, Derby DE3 ODF

Proposal Installation of replacement windows to the front elevation

Resolved: Objection

The application was for replacement windows for a Grade two listed building, photographs show details of the existing windows and their state of repair. A number of windows, are in need of repair, to the top floor. The proposal was for a 24mm double glazed units for the sash windows and the flush casements within this building.

CAAC were informed that the main reasons for replacement windows with double glazed sealed units (contrary to guidance for listed buildings) was due to noise. However it was advised that secondary glazing, which was the preferable method for listed building glazing was far more effective for noise than a sealed unit. The central window appears to be an original and a good example of a curved headed sash window typical of its age. CAAC noted that these are important windows and an important group of buildings, and there was a need to pursue a traditional approach on listed buildings. If thermal improvements were also being sought

there are now some much thinner glazing units available that do not involve the plant on bars proposed, these windows could be as thin as 6-7mm, with an integral traditional glazing bar.

CAAC suggested that rather than using a sealed unit, secondary glazing could be used.

CAAC objected to the proposal at present on basis of information available to them. They thought the solution was inappropriate in terms of the type of glazing and the joinery. They asked the officer to go back to applicants to consider an alternative solution to the replacement windows for this important Grade II listed building.

No Conservation Area

Application No & 20/01542/FUL

Location Land to the North of Haslams Lane, Derby (Between River Derwent and Derby to Duffield Railway Line).

Proposal Creation of a cycleway

Resolved: No Objection

The proposal was a cycle and pedestrian route 1.97km in length from Haslams Lane, next to Darley Mills, heading northwards towards and underneath the A38; 0.93 km would be in Derby City area and to the north it would be in the Erewash Borough Council area. There are various heritage assets in the area. The pathway would be 2.5metres wide and would be tarmac with concrete edging. There would be slightly different detail where the cycleway was adjacent to a track for vehicles, for example tractors.

The Chair stated, in the interests of transparency, that in recent times he had undertaken the independent examination for the neighbourhood development plans for Little Eaton and for Breadsall, but did not feel that required him to make a declaration of interest.

The Chair asked for any comments on the proposal in terms of its effect on the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site or the other heritage assets in Darley Abbey area, or any other comments.

It was noted that the path was not well maintained and had many potholes. The scheme would be an improvement; the path was at a low level so there would not be much impact on heritage assets. However, CAAC felt that the path should be constructed using materials more suitable to a rural setting, such as resin bound gravel with a metal edge, rather than tarmac and concrete edging. There was some discussion regarding "Ridge and Farrow", but it was agreed that there was no medieval field system on that side of the river. CAAC suggested that the path ought to be more eco-friendly, the width of the path (2.5metres) was also discussed, and CAAC suggested that necessary precautions should be taken to strengthen the path against floods.

The Chair summarised the discussion. There was a unity of thinking about the materials, no objections were raised about the principle of having a cycleway through the area. National policy asks that opportunities to better reveal the significance of Heritage Assets are taken. The creation of a cycleway does encourage people to travel along at a pace that allows them to appreciate the significance of a heritage site. CAAC concluded that they had no objection to the proposal but were of a strong opinion that the surface material, and possibly the edging material, should be looked at again, and an alternative to the use of tarmac and concrete edging should be found so that a more eco-friendly and a visually more acceptable surface treatment should be adopted in this case.

Friar Gate Conservation Area

Application No & 20/01570/FUL

Location 8-14 Agard Street, Derby DE1 1DZ

Proposal Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of student accommodation block comprising of 93 bedrooms within 69 units and associated works

Resolved: Objection

Photographs of the site include a row of cottages on the frontage to Agard Street, adjacent to flats and student accommodation. All previous versions are roughly the same in terms of closeness to Pickford's House. There had been a reduction in height in the previous application. The last version was refused on environmental health grounds, the new application addresses this. However, in trying to move back from Agard Street, the height has been increased. The previous height of last version was up to the brickwork of the adjacent taller building. The new building proposal was for eight storeys which would be halfway up the grey blue cladding.

CAAC felt that overall, this scheme like the previous one, will cause substantial and irreversible harm to the setting of Grade one building and to the neighbouring buildings, some of which are two star. The building was far too high contextually, the maximum height looking onto Agard St should be two storeys, and four storeys if set back, like the scheme approved at 18 Agard Street which sets a precedent for approval. The scheme was not good in the first instance but has now regressed.

The economics over the coming years are always going to dictate the number of storeys we are going to be getting, so whenever there's a planning application we will always get a similar situation. The University zone on that side of the road will be overly developed. Objection because of the impact on Grade 1 building Pickford's House.

CAAC were disappointed that after a long and arduous progress, the applicants have gone back to making the building bigger. At least there was a logic with what was proposed previously in that they were limiting the building to the height of the brickwork on the adjacent building and stepping down from there: to go higher again was not acceptable.

The Heritage Statement does not give a full impression of the likely impact of the building on the south side of Friar Gate. If this application does go ahead there would be a need for archaeological recording paid for by the developer.

CAAC was clear that the proposal was now unacceptable and raised an objection on the grounds, not only to the detrimental impact on the significance of the Grade I listed building Pickford House, but also the other heritage assets near the site. CAAC stated that the impact was so significant that the proposal should be refused on heritage grounds.

MINUTES END