

**SUPPLEMENT TO THE REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR – REGENERATION,
TO THE PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE, 25 JANUARY 2007**

B1 APPLICATIONS

- Address:** Roundhouse Group, Roundhouse Road

Firstly I have to report a consultation reply of support from Derby Cityscape. Also, the entire scheme was reviewed by "Opun", the architecture and built environment centre for the East Midlands, at its meeting on 17 January. The architect presented the scheme to the panel and an officer of my Division explained the Local Planning Authority's position. The panel's view was one of total support for the principles behind the scheme. As may be expected, some critical comments were made on certain details. Largely these were on matters already being taken up by the Local Planning Authority and English Heritage and are being pursued through negotiation.

It would I think be convenient if I summarised the changes that have now been made and commented after each one.

- Comment. - These are satisfactory. However, it should be noted that this building has had to be designed in the absence of a committed operator and there may well be some amendments in the future, which will require a fresh application in its own right.

- Comment – This sets out the practice’s general approach to sustainable development and explains how it is carried forward to this development with particular regard to insulation, heating, lighting, water supply and waste. The standards of thermal efficiency that can be obtained in the new build parts of the development will not be achieved in the conversion work owing to the need to retain and respect the historic structures. However, the retention of these is in

itself a form of sustainability and it is case of accepting that hitting some sustainability targets precludes others.

3. Quite substantial changes to the external areas layout to improve access and circulation, parking and servicing. The main report was written in respect of a draft version but the relevant drawings showing a refinement of those ideas are now submitted.

Comment - I am now satisfied that the broad structure of the arrangement of the open areas is satisfactory. That is the division amongst highway, circulation areas, parking, servicing and landscaping will work functionally and will be visually appropriate.

4. The above plan again changes the landscaping, quite radically.

Comment - Whilst the *parts* of the site devoted to landscaping are acceptable, the assessment of that detail has not been completed by my officers in conjunction with English Heritage. This is not just consideration of species of planting that can safely be left to a condition, but relates to the fundamental question of the purpose of landscaping in relationship to the setting of the historic buildings. Historically, there would have been none but a continuation of that is desirable neither aesthetically nor functionally. It is clear that this part of the proposal requires further intensive development and that a clearly satisfactory scheme must be agreed before the issue of a decision.

5. Comprehensive revised elevational drawings have been received. These show “alterations”, that is the way in which the existing buildings are to be repaired with some inappropriate past alterations reversed, and “proposals” which incorporate the substantial new work, particularly in the link block.

Comment – These were received this week and are being assessed. They do represent a further development of the ideas incorporated in the applications as submitted. They are clearly moving in the right direction but require further evaluation by my officers and English Heritage.

In particular the question of the character of the link block remains contentious. It is a delicate line between a pastiche which just would not work and a contemporary approach that could be so assertive as to rival the primacy of the historic buildings. Work is continuing and a further version may be produced between now and the time of the meeting. This is an aspect that must be settled at determination stage; a major architectural component cannot be “conditioned out”.

6. Certain details relating to the restoration and adaptation of the listed building have now been received.

Comment – These details relate to the most complex aspects of the restoration raising difficult issues of balance. The general approach must be to retain historical authenticity by the retention and repair of damaged or deteriorated parts of the fabric in traditional materials and methods or, alternatively, the fabrication of

new components but of traditional materials and form. The other approach is to recognise that the materials available at the time of construction are prone to failure and that modern equivalent alternatives may be justified better to ensure the long-term future of the buildings.

Neither approach will be always preferred; on each aspect where there is choice the implications of alternatives have to be evaluated fully before an informed view can be taken. The late availability of much of this material and the fact that it is vital that English Heritage's views are taken fully into account mean that I cannot give any realistic advice on these aspects at this time. However, this is not as vital as may first be thought. Very few of the details will affect the planning application and there is not the same urgency to determine the listed building application.

General position.

Apart from the applications, I have to advise Members that there has been in recent weeks, and there continues to be, systematic loss of historic fabric by theft and damage to what remains. On-site investigation and assessment by specialists has been hampered and this has of course not helped the provision of details. Restoration is becoming progressively more challenging and the success of the current College proposals is increasingly vital to the future of this group of buildings.

It has become increasingly obvious during the processing of the applications that the time allowed, from the College receiving the promises of funding to the date by which those funders require evidence of a planning permission, was quite inadequate for a scheme of this complexity. The preparation of a competent scheme for the restoration of a group of listed buildings of this significance takes far longer than a design for new build.

Despite intensive work on the preparation and submission of further details, and on their assessment by my officers and those of English Heritage, there are several aspects that are not sufficiently developed, submitted, and assessed to the point where they can be safely accepted as details on which a permission can be granted at this meeting. Ordinarily I would withdraw the report and bring it back to the next meeting but I am acutely aware that this would put in grave danger the opportunity to secure the full range of funding that is essential for the viability of the scheme.

At the latest we have effectively a further two weeks to the final date for the issue of a permission. The work is being produced, and can be assessed, at a rate that will meet that target, but I have little choice but to change the recommendation on the planning application and ask Members to give me authority to resolve all the remaining matters outlined above and then to determine the planning application.

For the listed building application, the recommendation remains the same although it is now clear that some of the scheduled conditions will not be required. Instead, agreed details will be covered by their drawing number appearing in the schedule of drawings in condition 1. The vital aspect of this is to obtain the full support of English Heritage so that that application does not become delayed when referred to the Secretary of State.

Revised recommendation for DER/11/06/01802 (Planning Application)

11.1 To authorise the Assistant Director – Regeneration, **to grant planning permission** once those outstanding details which are considered to be essential prior to determination are in a satisfactory form, subject to:

(i) the conditions as set out in the main report:

(ii) such other conditions as may appear to him to be necessary in the light of evaluation of the current and any further details;

(iii) the omission of such scheduled conditions as may appear to him to be no longer necessary in the light of evaluation of the current and any further details;