

Time Commenced: 16:00  
Time Finished: 17:05

## **CONSERVATION & HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **7 July 2022**

Present: Councillor Robin Wood  
Chris Collison - Co-opted Member  
Carole Craven - Georgian Group  
David Ling – Co-opted Member  
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce (Vice-Chair)  
Chris Twomey – RIBA (Chair)

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer

### **10/22 Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillors Mike Carr and Sue Bonser, Maxwell Craven, Victorian Group, Ian Goodwin - Derby Civic Society, and Chris Wardle, Derbyshire Archaeological Society

### **11/22 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items

### **12/22 Declarations of Interest**

Chris Twomey declared an interest in item 17/22 City Centre Vision Emerging Ambition Document”.

### **13/22 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 9 June 2022**

### **14/22 CHAC items determined since the last Agenda**

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

**Resolved: to note the report**

### **15/22 Applications not being considered following consultation with the Chair**

The Committee were asked to consider a report of the Strategic Director of Communities and Place, detailing matters not being brought before them for their

information. It had been decided not to bring these matters to the Committee following consultation with the Chair.

**Resolved: to note the report**

## 16/22 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.

### **Conservation Area City Centre**

<b>Application No &amp; Location</b>	22/00750/FUL and 22/00751/LBA Dog and Moon, 16 Sadler Gate, Derby, DE1 3NF
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of a timber pergola, two timber structures with bar and food servery. Installation of a new awning to the front elevation and external lighting. Internal works to include installation of food hoist to first floor.

**Resolved: Objection subject to further review when more detailed information is seen alongside a proper Heritage Statement**

The Committee noted that the building was a Grade II listed building, the proposed refurbishment would include work to the front façade and redecoration of previously painted brickwork, window frames, sills and lintels, new external lighting positions and a new canvas awning. In the back yard a timber pergola structure with a clear polycarbonate roof and two separate flat roof shed structures to house an external bar & external food offer were proposed.

The internal refurbishment work proposed installation of new fixed seating, a new opening modern brick bar, a new food hoist and enclosure to be used to deliver food from the first-floor kitchen to the ground floor bar area. A new opening in the first-floor structure would be made to accommodate the new food hoist. New kitchen equipment would be installed, and the floor and wall would be re-finished. It was noted the officer was unable to visit the site prior to the meeting.

The Chair highlighted the main changes which were the external proposals for the front of the building with an awning and floodlights, Internally, modest changes had been proposed, the most significant being the hoist from the kitchen to the ground floor and back again in lieu of using stairs for food delivery. In the rear yard it was proposed to erect two temporary timber buildings for serving food and drinks, as well as a pergola structure with a polycarbonate roof.

The Committee stated that the Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment did not provide adequate information. More detail was needed on the details of flooring and lighting. They were concerned about the floodlights and awning at the front of the building which were deemed unnecessary and would have a detrimental effect on Sadler Gate as a whole.

CHAC also discussed the visibility of the rear yard from outside with buildings in need of repair and the use of a lot of polycarbonate sheeting in the new proposals. The officer confirmed there were high walls surrounding the back yard and only glimpses could be seen from the rear. However, more could be visible from any surrounding high-level buildings.

The Committee also discussed the position of the food hoist and its possible impact on a lime ash wall. There was a need for more detail on the whole scheme, especially where historic wall fabric could be damaged by installation of a proposed food hoist

The Committee objected to the proposal and requested more detail on the application and a full Heritage Statement. They agreed that the spotlights and awning on the front of the building were not appropriate to the street scene of Sadler Gate and there was a need for more information and justification on the installation of the proposed food hoist and its impact on a lime ash wall. They had no issues with the proposals for the rear yard.

## **Strutts Park Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp; Location</b>	22/00811/FUL and 22/00812/LBA Former Headteachers Cottage, 1 Arthur Street, Derby DE1 3EF
<b>Proposal</b>	Conversion of the Headmasters House (St Helen's House site) into ground floor Deli/Café and first floor residential apartment

### **Resolved: No Objection**

The Committee noted that this was the Headmasters House and was curtilage listed to the Grade I, St Helen's House and was also in the Strutts Park Conservation Area. There are several alterations and repairs forming a part of this application that had been approved in the previous 2020 application, but a new application was needed because of a change of use to a Deli/Café on the ground floor and an apartment on the first floor. Also, as there are some alterations which are different to the previous scheme a new listed building application was required.

The officer highlighted the new items on the application. On the rear elevation there had been two new windows proposed for this area, but the applicant no longer wished to put those windows in place. They are also proposing to retain the existing door rather than blocking it up. To the front elevation they propose to convert a window into a door, an archway would be left in place on the front which would be the access into the deli and café. It was proposed to have an opening in the boundary wall in front of the new doorway. On the ground floor, it was proposed to remove one additional wall in the new deli, there would be some blocking up to provide the unisex WC. On the first floor more of a wall which was to be removed would now be retained.

The Chair summarised the key elements to the application. The Headmaster's House was within the curtilage St Helen's House. It was essentially a change of

use to create a deli/cafe ground floor with a single apartment on 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The principle changes are the removal of an additional wall on the ground floor, the removal of section of boundary wall on the principal elevation and insertion of a new door to give access to a café. On the first floor a wall that was to be removed will now be retained

A Committee member felt the building was attractive an arts and crafts building and of some value but was of lesser significance than the main buildings on the site. He thought the removal of the lean-to walkway had already been considered and consent was given, and the items highlighted for change were by comparison of less significance than the staircase etc that were previously considered.

It would be a shame to break through the wall to form a new doorway, however opening space would help its use. The wall changes seemed relatively insignificant, unless it could be proved they would disrupt the character of the layout of the building, a separate passageway now seemed to be a part of the room. The tendency now was to open rather than sub-divide rooms. Overall, it would be better to get the building back into use, so no objection to the proposals.

Another CHAC member had no real issues about opening the two rooms into one space if the essence of the division could be kept by the nibs either side of the doorway and down one side of the beam, so the expression of spaces remained intact. Regarding the formation of the doorway and removal of section of the boundary wall, the only issue to highlight was the boundary wall which was bonded into the gable of the main wall so it would be beneficial if the details could be amended so that the wall was altered rather than the building, to leave a pier of about a brick and half would be a better detail the fabric of the main building would stay intact.

The Committee welcomed the building being brought back into use and had no objection. Their only significant comment related to the section of wall, whilst they accepted the removal of the section of wall to enable a new entrance, they requested that a section of the wall be left so that a short pier remained rather than cutting into the gable end which would mean removing alternate bricks to leave a row of 'teeth' into which the new bricks are interlocked. They thought it would be better to move the opening slightly away from the gable edge to enable a pier to be left behind to form an opening in the wall and not interfere with the fabric of the building.

## **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp;</b>	22/00855/FUL and 22/00886/LBA
<b>Location</b>	1 Abbey Yard, Derby DE22 1DS
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing garage and erection of a new garage. Installation of windows and roof lights and minor internal works

**Resolved: No Objection subject to the officer having detailed discussions about the garage and flush casement windows with the applicant.**

The Committee heard that the site comprises a Grade II listed cottage, No 1 Abbey Yard. It was a Grade II listed building. The site was located within Darley Abbey, Abbey Yard falls within the Darley Abbey Conservation Area and Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site. A thorough Heritage Statement had been provided.

The proposed changes to the main house included two rooflights to the rear and on the side elevation a new door to the basement. There were no changes to the front elevation. Two new windows were proposed, in the basement and on the ground floor. In the basement there were limited alterations apart from a new door and window which will match the existing one. On the ground floor the works included reconfiguration of the kitchen and dining area by removing a partitioning wall to create an open plan kitchen/ diner, enlargement of the ground floor WC by removing the storage cupboard wall to create a larger space and exposing the brickwork on both sides of the chimney breast and insertion of a log burner. On the first floor two rooflights were to be inserted, looking at using breathable paint and lime plaster repair.

On the outside of the property, it was proposed to demolish the existing garage and replace it with a new red brick one and a hardstanding for a single vehicle and a driveway. The garage would be rebuilt further north of the site to follow the existing wall, it would be single storey with a wooden gate adjacent to it one side and a roller shutter garage door.

The Chair summarised the application, which was a Grade II listed property noting that the Heritage Statement was very comprehensive. External changes included rooflights and a couple of windows on the side elevation. There was little change internally apart from removal of some walls on the ground floor, not much change on the first floor except the rooflights. Most significant changes were to the garage building with brick detailing over the entrance.

A Committee member noted that any significant alterations had been undertaken in the past and were done well. There was a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which explained why the proposals were being put forward and would improve the use and have no significant harm to the building. The proposal was carefully designed to match with the existing bricks of the wall and slates for the main building, those two aspects were satisfactory, he had no objection to the proposals.

Another Committee member stated that he had no objection to the interior alterations to form new openings. He noted that the existing windows are storm proof and hoped that the new timber windows would be flush casements. However, he was concerned about the loss of the scalloped pediment over the top of the existing garage door, which was characteristic to the area and forecourt, perhaps a slightly more sensitive approach could be taken which retained the character of the raised section would be better. It was suggested that perhaps it could be retained with the widening of the opening to avoid the loss of the scalloped pediment.

This was agreed by another committee member who felt the current scalloped top to the garage was preferable to the triangular option proposed. It would be good to

see the original kept and maybe widened. Again, there were no objections to the internal alterations, aside from confirming that the window replacements would be wood, this was confirmed.

The Committee had no objection to the proposals subject to reconsideration of garage design and retention of current wall with 1930's scalloped parapet. They suggested enlargement of access opening to accommodate wider car access and suggested the design of the new timber windows should be appropriately designed flush casements. The officer was asked to have discussion with the applicants regarding the Committees recommendations for the windows and garage.

### **City Centre Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00964/ADV  
**Location** Ye Olde Dolphin, 6-7 Queen Street, Derby, DE1 3DL  
**Proposal** Display of various non-illuminated and externally illuminaterd signage

**Resolved: to defer to the September meeting**

The Committee agreed to defer this item to the next meeting as listed building applications had not yet been submitted.

### **City Centre Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00965/ADV  
**Location** The Cosy Club, Royal Buildings, Victoria Street, Derby DE1 1ES  
**Proposal** Display of three illuminated fascia box signs, external wall lights and one internally illuminated projecting sign

**Resolved: to defer to the September meeting**

The Committee agreed to defer this item to the next meeting as listed building applications had not yet been submitted.

### **Friar Gate Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00983/FUL and 22/00984/LBA  
**Location** 4 Vernon Street, Derby DE1 1FR  
**Proposal** Change of use from offices to seven flats (Use Class C3)  
22/000984/LBA Internal alterations in association with change of use from offices to seven flats to include removal of internal walls and staircase, blocking up of doors, creation of new openings and partition walls

**Resolved: Objection**

This application was for 4 Vernon Street, a Regency Villa, Grade II, circa 1840, listed building in the Friar Gate Conservation Area, these applications were for a

change of use to seven flats from offices. The internal changes included the removal of internal walls and staircase, blocking up of doorways and the creation of new openings and partition walls. There was no Heritage Statement or detailed Heritage Impact Assessment, or a narrative on the evolution of the building, interpretation of the layout or construction of walls supplied. No information had been supplied in terms of fire partitioning, sound insulation, drainage vents or flues.

The officer highlighted the proposal plan which showed the amount of alteration needed to install seven flats in the building. The demolition plan also showed how many walls were to be removed. The staircase between the ground and first floor was also to be removed.

The officer had visited the property and displayed several photos including one of the front room and dividing wall between two spaces where the whole wall was proposed to be removed. It was explained that there are cupboards within arched openings where plans show removal of the whole wall to the right. On the first floor there was a recessed joinery cupboard on a wall which was proposed to be removed. The staircase between the ground and first floor was to be removed and there were some proposed changes to the staircase on the top floor.

The Chair summarised the details of the application, which was a Grade II listed property on Vernon Street, it was reiterated that the Heritage Statement had very little information about the building, there was no narrative or justification for the changes, and nothing was said about the asset. This needs to be addressed before the application can be considered. The Project was about change of use from offices to seven flats and there was considerable change including removal of walls and cornicing, recessed cupboards, and historic staircase.

Comments from an absent Committee member were detailed by the Chair. The property was one of the least altered internally in the street. Concern was raised about the proposed changes to the house to create seven flats in a street of this quality which should be opposed in principle. A recent example of a property which had been converted back to a single dwelling from one of multiple flats was cited. This would be a much better option for this building to become a single dwelling. There was a lot of knowledge and background about the building which was not included in the Heritage Statement.

A Committee member felt it was a poorly conceived scheme the comments made about preserving the building as individual units was preferable. However, there was too much loss of historic fabric in the proposals. There was no justification within the scheme The proposal should be objected to both in principle and lack of detail in the application. Another member felt the scheme was totally unacceptable for this 1830's building.

A Committee member agreed with the return to residential use for the property, the principle of converting back to individual use was a good one but was concerned about the number of flats proposed for this building which should be reduced.

The Committee resolved to object in strong terms to the proposal on the basis that there should be proper justification for any change through a well-considered and fully researched Heritage Statement. The committee were concerned about the conversion to multiple flats for this street which was felt to be inappropriate and could set a precedent. The degree of change and the extent of loss of historic fabric was unacceptable in its current form.

## 17/22 City Centre Vision – Emerging Ambition Document

The Committee noted that the draft document “Ambition” had been published, it was the first stage in developing a new vision for Derby city centre.

The launch of the document marked the start of a conversation about the long-term future of the city centre. The City Council were keen to receive feedback on the issues raised in the document and the ideas identified.

The document had been brought to CHAC to get their comments as a group. There was still an opportunity for individuals and individual groups to comment directly within the 12-week consultation period which started on the 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

CHAC felt it was a very complex and detailed document. It was divided into sections and criteria were available at the end of each section to judge and discuss. The document was open for public discussion, there were a lot of areas to cover but the Committee’s focus could be on the Heritage aspect. The officer highlighted that the draft document was the first stage to develop a new vision, there were several sections with discussion points and feedback from CHAC as a group and individually would be welcomed.

A CHAC member expressed disappointment with the document, and felt it was an inadequate effort by the city which in terms of visual attractiveness appeared to have slipped back behind, Nottingham, Leicester and Lincoln just making fourth place in the East Midlands. There is a view that Derby has been poorly marketed for decades. The document is lacking in ambition and had fundamentally missed the point by stating that there was a need to better agree “the tension” between looking after the heritage of the city and its future. The heritage section needs to focus on opportunity rather than tension. The greatest asset of a place is its heritage, successful cities value heritage, unique assets can be protected, and the city can still develop, regenerate, and have large/tall buildings. However, care is needed regarding the location of tall buildings, for example Paris has areas for tall buildings away from the Eiffel Tower. He felt there should be a re-think on the document and start from a new perspective; the document was not much different from the City Centre Master Plan.

Another CHAC member explained that the Civic Society Group had been asked to contribute and after initially reading the document were frustrated as there were so many strands to comment on. The group agreed to individually read through the document again and make their own bullet point comments which could be co-ordinated/collated and put together into a response. The Officer confirmed that this had been discussed with Planning Policy and that they were able to accommodate the comments made at the next meeting. CHAC felt that this was a good



approach, and as the consultation organisers had given a short extension on timing available for the CHAC response, individual CHAC members could give their views and comments, and these could be collated for the September meeting. It was agreed that all CHAC members should be invited to send individual comments to the Vice Chair who would co-ordinate/collate to ensure consensus. The item would then be discussed at the September meeting.

Another CHAC member welcomed that there was a historic core of the city, there was no name for it currently and suggested "Wardwick". The document was not put together by "Derby" people, the use of names such as the Northern and Eastern Gateway did not reflect the historic names of places that the people of Derby use, such as the Cock Pit or West End etc. The actual words "grass and water" should be used in the document rather than "green and blue" to describe grass and water. The views and contributions of all organisations were welcome.

It was felt that as there was a breadth of issues and because of the nature of the CHAC Committee it should mainly focus on the heritage aspect rather than address all the strands of the document, but it was noted that topics were interlinked.

It was suggested that the Conservation Officer send an email on behalf of the Vice Chair to all CHAC members explaining that a preliminary discussion took place at the meeting in July, and it was decided that individual CHAC members should be asked to give their comments to the Vice Chair who would then collate and co-ordinate to ensure consensus.

**CHAC resolved: That all CHAC members be invited to contribute individual comments on the City Centre Vision document to the Vice Chair who would co-ordinate/collate these to ensure consensus. The item would then be discussed at the September meeting.**

MINUTES END