

ITEM 04

Time Commenced: 17:15
Time Finished: 18:45

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

22 April 2021

Present: Chris Collison – Co-opted Member (Chair)
Councillor Carr – Elected Member
Ian Goodwin – Derby Civic Society
David Ling – Derby Civic Society
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce
Chris Twomey – RIBA (Vice Chair)
Chris Wardle - Derbyshire Archaeological Society
Councillor Wood – Elected Member

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer

30/20 Apologies

There were apologies from Maxwell Craven and Carole Craven – Georgian Group

31/20 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair

There were no late items

32/20 Declarations of Interest

There was one declaration of Interest: Chris Twomey 21/01672//LBA, 22-23 Sadler Gate

33/20 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 04 March 2021

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

34/20 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

35/20 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

36/20 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.

Green Lane Conservation Area

Application No &	21/00406/FUL
Location	Trinity House, 120 Green Lane, Derby DE1 1RY
Proposal	Change of use from offices (Use Class E3) to a house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis)

Resolved: No Objection

The Committee were informed that this was a listed building application for alterations with a change of use to a house in multiple occupation. New en-suite shower rooms (where cornices existed showers rooms would be pods), kitchen, and walls would be created within the building. On the rear elevation new extract vents for the kitchen and bathroom would be installed. There are existing cast iron air bricks.

CAAC felt that there was minimum change to the building but that installation of pod bathrooms should be dealt with carefully, and that it would be good to see the seemingly unauthorised aluminium windows and dormer window replaced at the rear of the building. They felt it was good to see the building brought back into residential use. CAAC asked if there was a possibility of installing a communal extraction system rather than using air bricks. The boarding in of the staircase was queried, and the officer confirmed that the proposal was that the staircase be enclosed in a fire protection wall for Fire Regulation purposes. CAAC felt that the Heritage Statement (HS) was limited and commented upon this.

CAAC had no objection to the proposal but asked that the seemingly unauthorised metal windows to the rear elevation, and UPVC windows to dormer windows be investigated. An improved shared vent solution should also be investigated to avoid the high number of airbricks to the exterior.

Green Lane Conservation Area

Application No &	21/00407/LBA
Location	Trinity House, 120 Green Lane, Derby DE1 1RY
Proposal	Alterations in association with the change of use from offices (Use Class E3) to a house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis) including installation of new en-suite/shower rooms, communal kitchens and removal of two walls

Resolved: No Objection

The Committee were informed that this was a listed building application for alterations with a change of use to a house in multiple occupation. New en-suite shower rooms (where cornices existed showers rooms would be pods), kitchen, and walls would be created within the building. On the rear elevation new extract vents for the kitchen and bathroom would be installed. There are existing cast iron air bricks.

CAAC felt that there was minimum change to the building but that installation of pod bathrooms should be dealt with carefully, and that it would be good to see the seemingly unauthorised aluminium windows and dormer window replaced at the rear of the building. They felt it was good to see the building brought back into residential use. CAAC asked if there was a possibility of installing a communal extraction system rather than using air bricks. The boarding in of the staircase was queried, and the officer confirmed that the proposal was that the staircase be enclosed in a fire protection wall for Fire Regulation purposes. CAAC felt that the Heritage Statement (HS) was limited and commented upon this.

CAAC had no objection to the proposal but asked that the seemingly unauthorised metal windows to the rear elevation, and UPVC windows to dormer windows, be investigated. An improved shared vent solution should also be investigated to avoid the high number of airbricks to the exterior.

Darley Abbey Conservation Area

Application No &	21/00426/FUL
Location	3 Lavender Row, Derby DE22 1DF
Proposal	Single Storey rear extension to dwelling house (storeroom) and roof alterations

Resolved: Objection

The Committee were informed that this was an example of a late 18th century to early 19th century woollen-mill house. The house, which was designed for mill workers, was on a Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site. The application was the reconfiguration of a single storey rear extension. The officer provided photographs of the property and highlighted that there was an unauthorised satellite dish installed. In the lobby the doorway nearest to the wall would become a window; there would be an open plan arrangement between the kitchen and dining room. The roof changes to the extension were explained; the small slope

would be removed, and a mono pitch roof would stretch from the building to the wall. The main wall structure would be increased by six courses of bricks to line up with the wall of the neighbouring property, the existing gate would unaffected. CAAC stated the existing building extension looked new and queried whether it had planning permission. The officer confirmed that it was just the satellite dish that was not authorised. CAAC felt this could be dealt with by pressure or enforcement if needed. CAAC were also concerned at the loss of fabric of part of the existing wall between the house and asked whether it was an original wall. The committee were concerned about the wall. The house was on a Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site, and the wall was very important in terms of the site, and an increase in height by adding modern fabric to an ancient wall should be resisted.

The committee then discussed the roof and asked if the two opposing pitches could be combined by a valley gutter. The officer confirmed that this design had been submitted for consideration. CAAC then discussed the proposal in terms of reducing the impact; they suggested a different solution to retain the current store roof which would remove the need to increase the height of the wall as well as addressing the satellite dish.

CAAC had concerns about the scheme and recommended to object to it in its current form. They felt that discussion would be needed to come to a different solution for the roof, so that there would be no need to increase the height of the wall. There was also a need to discuss the unauthorised satellite dish. CAAC also commented on the limited Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment. If a subsequent scheme was approved there should be a condition on historic building recording, and it was suggested HE level 2 would be needed.

Darley Abbey Conservation Area

Location	3 Lavender Row, Derby DE22 1DF
Proposal	Single Storey rear extension to dwelling house (storeroom) and roof alterations

Resolved: Objection

The Committee were informed that this was an example of a late 18th century to early 19th century woollen-mill house. The house, which was designed for mill workers, was on a Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site. The application was the reconfiguration of a single storey rear extension. The officer provided photographs of the property and highlighted that there was an unauthorised satellite dish installed. In the lobby the doorway nearest to the wall would become a window, there would be an open plan arrangement between the kitchen and dining room. The roof changes to the extension were explained, the small slope would be removed, and a mono pitch roof would stretch from the building to the wall. The main wall structure would be increased by six courses of bricks to line up with the wall of the neighbouring property, the existing gate would unaffected. CAAC stated the existing building extension looked new and queried whether it had planning permission. The officer confirmed that it was just the satellite dish that was not authorised. CAAC felt this could be dealt with by pressure or

enforcement if needed. CAAC were also concerned at the loss of fabric of part of the existing wall between the house and asked whether it was an original wall. The committee were concerned about the wall. The house was on a Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site, and the wall was very important in terms of the site, and an increase in height by adding modern fabric to an ancient wall should be resisted.

The committee then discussed the roof and asked if the two opposing pitches could be combined by a valley gutter. The officer confirmed that this design had been submitted for consideration. CAAC then discussed the proposal in terms of reducing the impact; they suggested a different solution to retain the current store roof which would remove the need to increase the height of the wall as well as addressing the satellite dish.

CAAC had concerns about the scheme and recommended to object to it in its current form. They felt that discussion would be needed to come to a different solution for the roof, so that there would be no need to increase the height of the wall. There was also a need to discuss the unauthorised satellite dish. CAAC also commented on the limited Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment. If a subsequent scheme was approved there should be a condition on historic building recording and it was suggested HE level 2 would be needed.

No Conservation Area

Application No & 21/00471/FUL

Location Northgate House, 46 Friar Gate/Agard Street, Derby,
DE1 1DF

Proposal Change of use to 166 bedroom/cluster studio student accommodation together with replacement of windows and doors, internal alterations, formation of parking spaces for staff, cycle storage and refuse store

Resolved: No Objection

The Committee were informed the application related to a Grade 2 listed building at 46 Friar Gate which had previous alterations, and had a building attached to the rear Northgate House which was a former Tax Office building built in the 1970s. The proposal was to convert internally the Northgate House and the Grade II listed older building, and add external landscaping.

The application had little information about the subdivision of proposed studio flats in the older building no. 46 fronting Friar Gate. There was sparse detail about the layout of kitchen and shower room, fire partitioning, drainage runs, vents and flues, sound insulation M&E/heating etc. There were no skirting boards remaining in no. 46 and there was a need for more information about what was above the suspended ceilings. The Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment was limited.

CAAC were aware that Northgate House was exempt from planning permission when constructed as it was a Crown Building. They asked if any attempt had been

made to improve the external appearance of the building. The officer confirmed it had in terms of external landscaping, and the re-painting of external windows had been discussed. CAAC agreed to comment on the proposal before them and felt that the greenery and focus on planting would help to improve the surrounding area and setting of the building.

CAAC felt it had been helpful that the officer had visited the site and looked at the older part of the building to confirm that it had been stripped out and nothing further could be lost. It had been heavily renovated and historical interest had been destroyed but suspended ceiling checks should be made for cornicing and any other remaining historical fabric; there was a need for HE level 2 historic building recording.

CAAC had no overall objection to the proposal but further information on proposals, with an addendum to the Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment was needed following further analysis, including what is possibly hidden by suspended ceilings etc. The application has proposal items missing within the older 46 Friar Gate building regarding subdivision of proposed studio spaces, location of shower rooms, kitchens and any necessary vents, flues, drainage runs, fire partitioning, sound insulation, M&E/heating etc. There was a need for HE level 2 historic building recording.

No Conservation Area

Application No &	21/00472/LBA
Location	Northgate House, 46 Friar Gate/Agard Street, Derby DE1 1DF
Proposal	Change of use to 166 bedroom/cluster studio student accommodation together with replacement of windows and doors, internal alterations, formation of parking spaces for staff, cycle storage and refuse store

Resolved: No Objection

The Committee were informed the application related to a Grade 2 listed building at 46 Friar Gate which had previous alterations, and had a building attached to the rear, Northgate House, which was a former Tax Office building built in the 1970s. The proposal was to convert Northgate House and the Grade II listed older building and add external landscaping.

The application had little information about the subdivision of proposed studio flats in the older building no. 46 fronting Friar Gate. There was sparse detail about the layout of kitchen and shower room, fire partitioning, drainage runs, vents and flues, sound insulation M&E/heating etc. There were no skirting boards remaining in no. 46 and there was a need for more information about what was above the suspended ceilings. The Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment was limited.

CAAC were aware that Northgate House was exempt from planning permission when constructed as it was a Crown Building. They asked if any attempt had been made to improve the external appearance of the building. The officer confirmed it

had in terms of external landscaping, and the re-painting of external windows had been discussed. CAAC agreed to comment on the proposal before them, and felt that the greenery and focus on planting would help to improve the surrounding area and setting of the building.

CAAC felt it had been helpful that the officer had visited the site and looked at the older part of the building to confirm that it had been stripped out and nothing further could be lost. It had been heavily renovated and historical interest had been destroyed but suspended ceiling checks should be made for cornicing and any other remaining historical fabric, there was a need for HE level 2 historic building recording.

CAAC had no overall objection to the proposal but further information on proposals, with an addendum to the Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment, has needed following further analysis, including what is possibly hidden by suspended ceilings etc. The application has proposal items missing within the older 46 Friar Gate building regarding subdivision of proposed studio spaces, location of shower rooms, kitchens and any necessary vents, flues, drainage runs, fire partitioning, sound insulation, M&E/heating etc. There was a need for HE level 2 historic building recording.

No Conservation Area

Application No &	21/00571/FUL
Location	18 Agard Street, Derby DE1 1YS
Proposal	Demolition of 18 Agard Street. Erection of student accommodation comprising 32 Apartments, together with making good of the rear of No 42 Friar gate and installation of an external fire escape. Erection of separate bin, cycle store and electricity sub-station and setting out parking and landscaping.

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC were informed that a previous application had been approved for this site. This was a new proposal for the demolition of the existing structure, and replaced with a new building, the first three floors would be brick clad and the top floor copper clad. Six solar panels would be attached to the lower roof and fifty-two on the top roof and there would be two smoke vents.

CAAC considered that this scheme was an improvement on the previous application and provided green space at the front. The massing of the building was satisfactory. The materials used and the scale and form of the building were better suited to the context. However, the copper seemed to be unnecessarily drawing attention to the building and it needed to be more restrained. They also asked if the copper would be treated with anti-patination oil to prevent it going green. It was felt that if the building was all brick it would be too heavy, but the proposal could be improved by looking at some material other than copper which would be more subdued. The proposal had good proportion and massing was acceptable.

CAAC had no objection and they thought the scale, massing, layout, and general design of the building to be appropriate, and that it was an improvement to previously approved scheme. However, they had concerns about the scheme detailing in terms of the facing materials; they thought the copper cladding was unnecessary as this was not a landmark building it should be more subdued. They were concerned about material being too bright with reflections and views from Pickford's House, Local Buildings and within Conservation Area. They suggested discussion between officers, agents, and applicants to revise this. They welcomed the green landscaped area to the frontage.

No Conservation Area

Application No &	21/00572/LBA
Location	18 Agard Street, Derby DE1 1YS
Proposal	Demolition of 18 Agard Street. Erection of student accommodation comprising 32 Apartments, together with making good of the rear of No 42 Friar gate and installation of an external fire escape. Erection of separate bin, cycle store and electricity sub-station and setting out parking and landscaping.

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC were informed that a previous application had been approved for this site. This was a new proposal for the demolition of the existing structure, and replaced with a new building, the first three floors would be brick clad and the top floor copper clad. Six solar panels would be attached to the lower roof and fifty-two on the top roof and there would be two smoke vents.

CAAC considered that this scheme was an improvement on the previous application and provided green space at the front. The massing of the building was satisfactory. The materials used and the scale and form of the building were better suited to the context. However, the copper seemed to be unnecessarily drawing attention to the building and it needed to be more restrained. They also asked if the copper would be treated with anti-patination oil to prevent it going green. It was felt that if the building was all brick it would be too heavy, but the proposal could be improved by looking at some material other than copper which would be more subdued. The proposal had good proportion and massing was acceptable.

CAAC had no objection and thought the scale, massing, layout, and general design of the building to be appropriate, and that it was an improvement to previously approved scheme. However, they had concerns about the scheme detailing in terms of the facing materials; they thought the copper cladding was unnecessary as this was not a landmark building it should be more subdued. They were concerned about material being too bright with reflections and views from Pickford's House, Local Buildings and within Conservation Area. They suggested discussion between officers, agents, and applicants to revise this. They welcomed the green landscaped area to the frontage.

City Centre Conservation Area

Application No & 21/00597/FUL
Location 24 Iron Gate, Derby DE1 3GP
Proposal Change of use to office space at ground floor level and four apartments.

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC were informed this was a Grade II listed building in the City Centre Conservation Area. They noted that a detailed Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment had been submitted with the proposal. The main part of the application was to replace the current placement windows with sash arrangements to ensure a means of escape from the building. A further window would be changed to a door. On the elevation with glass blocks, the windows would be changed to sash and rooflights would be installed. A timber sash window would be installed on the east elevation. It was proposed to remove two staircases which had not been shown on the 1968 plan; they were both modern additions. The changes proposed for the third floor were limited but included alterations to stud partitions and the installation of bathroom suites.

CAAC felt that it was a very commendable and a complete scheme and would give new life to one of Derby's important buildings. It was a carefully worked out and complex conversion which would create a range of interesting living spaces and would also maintain much of the historic fabric. CAAC noted that the building had originally accommodated an ancient clockmaking business and could well contain much older fabric; there was a definite need for a level 3 building recording condition and a photographic record.

CAAC noted the thoroughness of information submitted and resolved they had no objection to scheme. They suggested a level 3 building recording condition.

City Centre Conservation Area

Application No & 21/00598/LBA
Location 24 Iron Gate, Derby DE1 3GP
Proposal Alterations in association with change of use to office space and four apartments to include removal of modern internal partition walls and installation of new partitions.

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC were informed this was a Grade II listed building in the City Centre Conservation Area. They noted that a detailed Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment had been submitted with the proposal. The main part of the application was to replace the current placement windows to sash arrangements to ensure a means of escape from the building. A further window would be changed to a door. On the elevation with glass blocks the windows would be changed to sash and rooflights would be installed. A timber sash window would be installed on

the east elevation. It was proposed to remove two staircases which had not been shown on the 1968 plan, they were both modern additions. The changes proposed for the third floor were limited but included alterations to stud partitions and the installation of bathroom suites.

CAAC felt that it was a very commendable and complete scheme and would give new life to one of Derby's important buildings. It was a carefully worked out and complex conversion which would create a range of interesting living spaces and would also maintain much of the historic fabric. CAAC noted that the building had originally accommodated an ancient clockmaker and could well contain much older fabric, there was a definite need for a level 3 building recording condition and a photographic record.

CAAC noted the thoroughness of information submitted and resolved they had no objection to scheme. They suggested a level 3 building recording condition.

No Conservation Area

Application No & 20/01672/LBA

Location 22 – 23 Sadler Gate, Derby DE1 3NL

Proposal Internal and external alterations to form two new residential units to the upper floors and sub-division of the ground floor.

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC were informed these buildings were Grade II listed buildings. This was a Listed Building Application only; a Certificate of Lawfulness had been submitted to change the upper floors from retail to two flats. The building is the former Super Five shop, building number 22 to 23. There are very limited changes to the front elevation just to fit restrictors to the front sash to ensure sill heights satisfy building regulations, to the south east elevation to the courtyard there were some changes proposed which included reducing the width of one window and installing a new double-glazed timber casement to both of the first floor windows, a new window opening and change to the door design was proposed for that elevation also. The north east elevation had a reconfiguration of the fire escape and the removal of a door and window configuration to be replaced with a door and the replacement of an existing casement window with a new double-glazed timber casement window. There was also some slight excavation to the rear with the installation of a new door at the lower level. On the south west elevation the only change was a lowering of the sill level of the three windows and installation of new double-glazed timber casement windows. The inside of the building and what was proposed as part of the changes to the building to form two residential units to the first and second floor were explained by the officer. The main change with the ground floor space was the removal for a modern staircase this would remain a retail unit. On the first-floor level the historic staircase at the front would be retained, the front space would be converted to a living/kitchen area, a sub-division would be created and a bedroom, living room and en-suite shower room created for one unit and living kitchen area and additional bedroom to the other unit. On the second floor the modern studwork would be removed and a shower and en-suite would be installed in an existing store area.

CAAC felt that it was a comprehensive and good scheme and noted the historic staircase would be retained. However, the building was listed as 18th century, this may just be an 18th century front placed on it, but there was a need for building recording. The lack of Heritage statement was queried. The officer confirmed there was one, which covered both 21, 22 and 23 Sadler Gate which was on-line. One member of CAAC stated that according to the Planning Policy Framework, the Historic Environment Review (HER) should be consulted.

CAAC had no objection to scheme but suggested a level 3 building recording (for areas being altered) and a watching brief regarding excavation and earth removal proposed to rear.

MINUTES END