

# ITEM 04

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

## **CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE 04 March 2021**

Present: Chris Collison – Institute of Historic Building Conservation (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 (Vice Chair)  
Cllr Hardy Dhindsa – Elected Member

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer and Stephen Bate, Senior Planning Officer

### **23/20 Apologies**

There were apologies from Chris Wardle Derbyshire Archaeological Society and Cllr Wood

### **24/20 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items

### **25/20 Declarations of Interest**

There were two declarations of Interest:

Chris Twomey 21/00208/LBA, 41 St Mary's Gate and  
Paul McLocklin 21/01649/FUL, 43 Church Lane, Darley Abbey, Derby

### **26/20 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 21 January 2021**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **27/20 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**

## 28/20      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 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**

## 29/20      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.

### **No Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 20/01176/FUL

**Location** Ye Olde Cottage, 19 The Hollow, Littleover, Derby DE23 6GH

**Proposal** Raising of the chimney stack

**Resolved: No Objection**

The Committee were informed that this was a Grade II listed 16<sup>th</sup> century building in Littleover. The thatch had been lost but was re-instated in the 1970's, replacing a slate roof. Photographs of the building through the years were displayed to the Committee. The proposal was to install a wood burning stove and increase the height of the chimney and a twin wall flue liner would also be installed in accordance with building regulations. A floor plan was displayed showing the location of the fireplace in the sitting room; the fire was currently not in use. CAAC were informed that the chimney height would be increased to the correct height above the thatch in line with Building Regulations and noted within Historic England Guidance.

CAAC noted the comprehensive heritage report and felt it was a sensible approach to effectively re-instate the higher chimney to ensure the thatch did not catch fire. It was suggested that if a taller chimney pot was used the brickwork would not need to be increased.

CAAC noted the brickwork and pointing of the whole chimney stack would be carried out to give a uniform appearance; it was queried if there would a preventative bird guard on top of the chimney installed. The officer stated that this was not mentioned in the application but would be advisable as mentioned within Historic England Guidance.

CAAC had no objection and agreed the proposed installation was acceptable given the installation of a wood burning fire; guidance should be followed that could minimise fire damage to the roof was acceptable.

### **No Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 20/01177/LBA

**Location** Ye Olde Cottage, 19 The Hollow, Littleover, Derby DE23 6GH

**Proposal** Installation of wood burning stove and raising of the chimney stack

### **Resolved: No Objection**

The Committee were informed that this was a Grade II listed 16<sup>th</sup> century building in Littleover. The thatch had been lost but was re-instated in the 1970's, replacing a slate roof. Photographs of the building through the years were displayed to the Committee. The proposal was to install a wood burning stove and increase the height of the chimney and a twin wall flue liner would also be installed in accordance with building regulations. A floor plan was displayed showing the location of the fireplace in the sitting room; the fire was currently not in use. CAAC were informed that the chimney height would be increased to the correct height above the thatch in line with Building Regulations and noted within Historic England Guidance.

CAAC noted the comprehensive heritage report and felt it was a sensible approach to effectively re-instate the higher chimney to ensure the thatch did not catch fire. It was suggested that if a taller chimney pot was used the brickwork would not need to be increased.

CAAC noted the brickwork and pointing of the whole chimney stack would be carried out to give a uniform appearance; it was queried if there would a preventative bird guard on top of the chimney installed. The officer stated that this was not mentioned in the application but would be advisable as mentioned within Historic England Guidance.

CAAC had no objection and agreed the proposed installation was acceptable given the installation of a wood burning fire; guidance should be followed that could minimise fire damage to the roof was acceptable.

### **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 20/01649/FUL

**Location** 43 Church Lane, Darley Abbey, Derby DE22 1EX

**Proposal** Erection of an additional storey to form a dwelling house with a single storey front extension, alterations to the external materials, and formation of a new vehicular access

### **Resolved: No Objection**

The committee were informed that the dwelling was just outside the Derwent Valley Mills Conservation Area. St Matthews Church, a Grade II listed building was on the opposite side of Church Lane as the dwelling. There was a stone wall at the front of the property and other neighbouring properties which runs along Church Lane and was in the conservation area. Whilst most of the neighbouring properties had small gaps in the wall to give access to driveways, the wall in front of this dwelling did not. The base was the original stone with breeze blocks on top. It was proposed to demolish the wall in front of the dwelling to provide parking space. The dwelling was currently a bungalow and it was proposed to build upon this to create a two-storey house with a contemporary design, re-cladding the walls in slate and copper. There would be different levels of the dwelling to the rear of the property.

One member of CAAC had difficulty envisaging the context of the new building in the area as there was little contextual information. There were no photographs provided of how it would fit into the surrounding landscape and with the church opposite. They noted that the church, surrounding land and the front wall are in the Conservation Area. The proposal was felt to be quite radical in relation to adjoining properties. This was not problematic in itself but there was a need to consider the character of the Conservation Area. CAAC discussed the boundary wall and felt that the wall should not be entirely lost. An option of having a driveway opening and retaining half of the stone wall was suggested. The breeze blocks in the wall could be removed and the wall could be reconstructed from the remaining original stone with a gap for a drive entrance.

CAAC found it difficult to see if the proposal would enhance the Conservation Area and setting of the building. A CAAC member highlighted that Church Lane had quite a diverse collection of buildings some were pre-war, but most were built during the 1950's to 1960's. A radical and new design could enhance the area. Another CAAC member felt the architect's view was very much of its time, an unequal mono-pitch roof was a 2020 solution and copper was very popular. It was suggested that building materials that were more complementary to the surrounding area, and in particular the church opposite, could be used.

CAAC had no objection in principle but were concerned about some of the details in the proposals and the officer was asked to enter into negotiations with the applicant to see if the scheme could be improved. They suggested reconsidering the design, materials, and frontage. It was suggested that stone from the section of the wall to be demolished could be retained and re-used to build a wall which would link better with the ones in front of the neighbouring properties. There was no need for the application to return to CAAC.

### **Strutts Park Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 20/00074/FUL

**Location** Orange Tree Day Nursery, 105 and 105A Duffield Road,  
Derby DE22 1AE

**Proposal** Two storey front extension and installation of a balcony to the first-floor front and side elevations

### **Resolved: No Objection**

The proposed balcony extension was intended to be a transparent structure of toughened glass and metal which does not enhance the existing building. However, CAAC acknowledged that the building was set well back from the street frontage, was well screened behind the frontage villa and was unlikely to have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area.

CAAC had no objection on balance to the proposal but stated that there could be some improvement to the materials and colours used to make the front extension more harmonious with the existing building. The supporting information was considered, and they felt the proposed balcony extension provided a safe outdoor space for children, which was beneficial to health and wellbeing. Officers were asked to review the nature of the materials to see if there could be some slight improvement. CAAC had no major issues in terms of the Conservation Area.

### **City Centre Conservation Area**

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Application No &amp;</b> | 21/00208/LBA   |
| <b>Location</b>             | 41 St Mary's Gate, Derby, DE1 3JX                                |
| <b>Proposal</b>             | Repair and replacement of windows to the side and rear elevation |

### **Resolved: Objection**

CAAC objected to the proposal as they felt it would be more visually effective to use traditional window styles, with glazing bars and secondary double glazing on all elevations. The officer was asked to negotiate with the applicant/agent to see if an improvement to the scheme could be achieved to create a better external appearance than the one currently proposed.

### **City Centre Conservation Area**

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Application No &amp;</b> | 21/00262/LBA  |
| <b>Location</b>             | 43 Wardwick, Derby DE1 1HJ  |
| <b>Proposal</b>             | Repair and review of plaster on internal walls of listed building |

### **Resolved: Objection**

CAAC were informed that the description of works on the building had been amended to include repair and renewal of plaster on ceilings and walls of the Grade II listed building. Previous applications had been approved to change the use of the building from office to a multi occupied house of 8 bedrooms across the first and second floor levels. The applicant had now requested changes to the plastering of internal walls and ceilings. Two different options were proposed; option A: to attach chicken wire to the ceiling and lime plaster, option B: to use plasterboard.

CACC felt that putting another frame or skin on walls was likely to cause more damage. They also felt the repairs should be like for like and traditional methods

and materials should be used. They felt that short cuts to ensure work could be completed quickly should be avoided on listed buildings.

CAAC objected to the proposal as they felt that the building needed like for like repairs using traditional methods and materials.

MINUTES END