

# ITEM 05

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

## **CONSERVATION & HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE 13 January 2022**

Present: Councillor Sue Bonser  
Councillor Mike Carr  
Councillor Robin Wood  
Maxwell Craven, Victorian Group  
Ian Goodwin, Derby Civic Society,  
David Ling – Co-opted Member  
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce (Vice-Chair)  
Chris Twomey – RIBA (Chair)

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer,

### **40/21 Apologies**

There were apologies from Carole Craven, Georgian Group, Chris Collison, Co-opted Member, Chris Wardle, Derbyshire Archaeological and Historical Society,

### **41/21 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items

### **42/21 Declarations of Interest**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

### **43/21 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 2 December 2021**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 December 2021 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **44/21 Pre-Application advice – Former Aida Bliss Site, City Road**

The Committee were informed that the pre-application was brought to CHAC early to give them an opportunity to give comments on the draft design proposals and the potential impact of these development proposals on Heritage Assets. CHAC noted that the Strategic Housing team are working on the proposal with a view to submitting a full planning application in due course and there was no Heritage Statement yet. The emerging proposals brought to CHAC will enable the Strategic

Housing Team to get an early view from the Committee which can be considered going forward.

The officer explained there was a covering report requesting pre-application advice plus three appendices; a summary and information, plans to examine, visuals and floor plans. The Committee heard that it was a prominent industrial building and site in Little Chester Conversation Area and in the buffer zone of Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage site, near to Grade II Handyside Bridge and two scheduled ancient monuments.

The officer drew attention to the summary which included a brief site history. The officer explained that a full heritage statement of significance and Heritage impact assessment were being progressed and the Heritage assets nearby are highlighted in the summary. The flood risk was highlighted in the summary and the need to elevate the development 1.5m above ground level. The officer explained that this proposal was for housing and some commercial units as well as some open space. Some consultations had been undertaken details were provided in the summary.

Housing proposals included apartments which would be relatively low rise being four storeys in height with the northern block (Block A) being lower. It was proposed to build three blocks which face the river and would be linked by podium decks at first floor level; there would be undercroft parking with electric vehicle charging infrastructure and secure bike cycle stores. The properties would be flat roofed with brick parapets.

There would be houses against the main retained façade which would be separated from the wall by approximately two meters and a raised access walkway would be created just below cill level of the windows. A glazed roof covering would be added to create a covered arcade which front doors of new terraced houses will open onto. There are also houses on the southern side, adjacent to Etruia Gardens, they would be 2 and 3 storeys high.

Commercial units would be located on the northern part of the site. The Committee heard that the acute angle of the retained wall was very challenging to build inside so proposed that this should remain an open area. Some of the steel roof trusses and structural columns should be kept there to reflect the former layout of the main foundry building. The bricked-up windows to the north elevation would be reopened and appropriately screened, and there would be consideration of painting murals on the inside of the retained wall.

The summary also explained the choice of materials and examined several different methods of construction, the basic material being predominantly brick. The officer then highlighted and explained the proposed plan and layout and visuals which had been supplied in an elevated position looking down on the site.

The Chair summarised the main details of the project; this was a neglected building at the western edge of Chester Green. The scheme involved the demolition of most of the buildings on site but retained the main façade facing Chester Green and the piece on the corner with the acute angle at the top,

everything else was new development. The run of town houses behind the existing arched opening wall would be set behind a glass covered arcade area to the front doors. On the southern side town houses would be built, the rest would be apartments except for some commercial units to the north. The proposals had been brought to CHAC early for their initial views.

CHAC liked the proposals which were a big advance on previous applications and made good use of the site without being too obtrusive or over complicated. They would like to see a bit more information on the buildings once detailed applications come through. CHAC liked the idea of open area and suggested that perhaps a small playground could be incorporated at the northern end.

One member of CHAC felt it was an imaginative proposal to do something difficult, particularly in how the large wall was being dealt with. The 74 accommodation units in city were really welcomed as they are badly needed. The courtyard arrangement at the north end was good but perhaps a small café with a seating area could be incorporated in the commercial units assuming there was sufficient light. The officer confirmed that the commercial units included a café, with external seating area and that there was demand for range of other independent businesses such as florist, hairdresser and other specialist retail, creative industry, or small offices.

Another CHAC member felt there were exciting ideas incorporated into the scheme. The gradation of brickwork from ground to up to higher level was a clever idea. The ideas of open space and of a glazed space between the two buildings was good. The light coming from the building through the semi-circular glazed windows during the evening would be spectacular. He was concerned about the arrangements of windows in the building as there seemed to be no relationship between the semi-circular windows and the inner elevation. This should be examined carefully as it would be good to see a better relationship between the two. Similarly, on the 3D image of the rear, the arrangement of windows needs to be more subtle in its industrial context, perhaps even the roofscape itself as the flat roofs seem to take precedence over the pitched.

Another CHAC member was concerned that the west elevation despite being in a World Heritage site, does not seem to be given much weight or attention. The river front in any other context would be acceptable but, in this context, it needs to be exceptionally good rather than quite good. The availability of car parking spaces for all the residents of houses and apartments was also a concern. It was confirmed that parking was available for each individual town house and the apartments would use the undercroft.

CHAC discussed the arcade they felt there were practical considerations to be given since it was open to the elements at both ends and, in the middle, halfway along. It was highlighted that there would be no road in front or private garden in front of the houses, so who would have the responsibility to maintain the arcade will it be individuals or overriding association or organisation that looks after it.

CHAC discussed the boundary wall and gap between residential buildings, wondering if it is too close to the wall. It was a main feature of this design and

really needs to be worked through carefully. It would be gloomy for houses facing a wall behind which are trees and facing more or essentially north as there would not be a huge amount of sunlight there. It could mean that lights in the houses would have to be on all day and there should be solar panels in situ if that was the case. That comment also applies to the treatment of the elevation behind the existing wall which looks like it has very few windows in it.

CHAC queried whether the original openings in the wall were to be glazed or unglazed and if glazed would they be clear or opaque. CHAC heard they would be glazed except for one in the middle that looked to be left open. It was noted that there was an existing doorway which drops down to ground level right in the middle but the walkway was at 1.5 metres above the pavement level so there would be balustrading across there. CHAC hoped that the space would be fully glazed and not opaque glazed so there would be vitality and contact between the green and building itself. It was considered that 2.5 meters was not a vast space between the two so the relationship between façade and building was very important.

In summary CHAC welcomed the proposal and that something was being done with the site. The retention of the principal façade and arcade was also welcomed, although there were reservations in practical terms which had been highlighted during the discussion. There was a consensus that the northern end with the courtyard and the open space could provide an interesting and characterful aspect to the scheme particularly with a strong relationship to a café or community use as part of the commercial offer.

The glazed arcade potentially was attractive, but more could be made of the main elevation behind that wall ensuring that the fenestration in the new wall behind aligns with existing openings and was more generous. CHAC had some concerns about the western aspect, its prominence from the river side view and the impact on the World Heritage Site. There was an expanse of potentially quite unremarkable elevations with lots of flat roofs which needs to be considered.

There were concerns about the practical management and maintenance of the arcade, if it becomes a defining feature of the scheme it should be treated well in the first place and maintained thereafter. The draft proposals were supported by Committee and there was encouragement to work them up with the comments above in mind

**CHAC recommended there should be careful consideration to the western aspect, particularly the three apartment blocks which had the potential to be overbearing and impact on the World Heritage Site but subject to that they had had no objection to the proposals at this stage.**

45/21 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**

## 46/21 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. This was a full report which shows all the different heritage items which can be commented on individually or as part of the organisations the committee members represent. It was not proposed that this report be considered at the meeting today.

**Resolved: to note the report**

## 47/21 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**

<b>Application No &amp; Location</b>	21/01794/LBA Dove Cottage, 7 to 8 The Hollow, Mickleover, Derby DE3 0DG
<b>Proposal</b>	Alterations to include replacement doors and windows, installation of french door, bricking up works, removal of conservatory, installation of a new kitchen and rendering.

**Resolved: No Objection subject to further discussions with the Conservation Officer**

The Committee were advised that the application was for a Grade II listed building in the Mickleover Conservation Area. On the front elevation it was proposed to block up the door with brick and replace the wooden door with a new door and frame. The door at the rear in the extension would be replaced with a stable type door. At the rear elevation the conservatory would be removed, and a window would be converted to a French door, another window would be removed and blocked up.

The Chair summarised the application, removal of a 1980's conservatory, blocking up of windows and doors to the rear and replacement of modern doors with more traditional styles. A window would be replaced with french doors.

A member of CHAC asked if the officer was satisfied that all the information on the proposal had been received. The officer explained there were some queries ongoing, but a letter of response had been received which covered the reconfiguration of the rear extension and changes to the design of the proposed new doors, but the blocking of the original front door had not been addressed. The

officer had asked whether it would be possible to leave the original door in situ and block up on the inside. The applicants had also proposed rendering the rear wall as it was not visible from the front of the property.

CHAC had no objection to the proposals but suggested any historic openings were blocked by recessing the brickwork within the apertures so that they could be “read” and seen to be a former opening. CHAC had concerns about the proposed rendering on the rear elevation and asked if the rear could be painted with appropriate external breathable paint instead. CHAC had no objection subject to further discussions with the Conservation Officer.

## **City Centre Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp; Location</b>	21/01924/LBA Former Derby City Council, Middleton House, 27 St Mary’s Gate, Derby, DE1 3JR
<b>Proposal</b>	Façade cleaning of all elevations of the building

### **Resolved: Objection**

The proposals were for a Grade II listed building in the City Centre Conservation Area on St Mary’s Gate. The application was for façade cleaning of all elevations of the building and the method used, photographs of the front elevation had been submitted and it was planned to use a pressure wash and acid. Essentially an application for façade cleaning, should focus on whether the building needs cleaning and the methodology.

CHAC discussed whether the building needed cleaning and felt it did not. They had concerns about the aggressive method it was planned to use which was described in the statement and the use of hot box, pressure washer and acid. They noted that a sample was undertaken using another system which had damaged the stonework surface. If justified, then there are other cleaning methods that might be more appropriate such as a DOFF system etc. CHAC were also concerned that if the building was cleaned it might damage the mortar joints meaning that subsequent tricky repointing would be needed (which would be difficult due to such a narrow joint). Cleaning could damage the structure and affect the watertightness of the building and would remove its patina of age.

CHAC objected to the principle of cleaning the building and the methodology proposed. The Conservation Officer confirmed that as it is a listed building it should not be cleaned unless there was justification or repairs need to be made. In this case there was a risk of damage to the fabric if cleaned using this method.

## **Friar Gate Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp; Location:</b>	21/01965/FUL & 21/01966/LBA Land at the rear of Burleigh Mews, 100 to 102 Friar Gate, Derby DE1 1EX
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of six apartments (Use Class C3)

## **Resolved: Objection**

CHAC were informed that the site was to the rear of 100 Friar Gate and Burleigh Mews spanning across two sites and was in the Friar Gate Conservation Area. No. 100 is a grade 2 listed building dating back to the mid 18<sup>th</sup> century.

The proposal was for 6 studio apartments which straddle the existing retaining wall forming the boundary between Burleigh Mews and 100 Friar Gate. This allows a natural continuation of the boundary to Stafford House, 1-6 Burleigh Mews whilst maintaining the car parking to the rear of 7-23 Burleigh Mews which is stepped back partly under the building creating a veranda. The building was a raised single storey building utilising the roof space. Fenestration and the positioning of the proposed building meant that existing apartments would not be affected by the proposal.

The Chair summarised the application for the Committee, it was a new build development of 6 studios which bridged the changing levels in the retaining wall to create a split-level arrangement.

A member of CHAC highlighted two issues, firstly that the infill on the gardens of houses in Friar Gate was something that should be avoided as they are residential houses, even though not in residential use anymore, in an important conservation area. Secondly although it was an appealing design it affected the setting of the listed buildings whose rear elevations are just as important as the facades especially No. 99 which was a house of outstanding merit.

Another member stated that the design of the building was satisfactory but the scale and location in relation to the rear facades detracts from the listed building which was what CHAC must judge. CHAC felt that there would be harm to the conservation area and harm to the listed buildings.

CHAC objected to the proposal and recommended refusal on heritage grounds due to harm to the Conservation Area, they did not support the infill of former gardens on Friar Gate and felt that the proposed building would have an adverse impact on the rear facades of listed buildings in a conservation area.

## **City Centre Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp; Location</b>	21/02015/ADV and 21/02016/LBA The Cosy Club, Royal Buildings, Victoria Street, Derby, DE1 1ES
<b>Proposal</b>	Installation of one internally illuminated projecting sign and spotlight Installation of a projecting sign and spotlight

## **Resolved: Objection**

The officer explained that the proposal was on the site of the former Royal Hotel at 128 Victoria Street, which included 22 and 23 Cornmarket, it was a Grade 11 listed building in City Centre Conservation area.

The proposal was for an internally illuminated sign, to be placed on the corner of the building on the Cornmarket side. The proposed sign consisted of individual letters on an aluminium box section support which would be powder coated in a matt finish to match the stone façade. From the aluminium box section there would be fixings to the specific letters spelling out “Cosy Club”. The individual light box letters would be powder coated with gold finish surrounds and internally illuminated. A spotlight was proposed for the base. The Committee noted that the proposal was contrary to the Shopfront and Advertisement guide for Derby City Council.

The Chair summarised the application for the Committee, which was for a large prominent illuminated sign on the corner of a distinguished building, the letters would each be half a metre by half a metre.

CHAC stated that the policy of the committee was to not support internally illuminated signs within a conservation area. CHAC had concerns about the size of the sign, which was massive and overbearing, and felt it would cause harm to the listed building and the conservation area. CHAC objected to the proposal and recommended refusal of the installation of the sign due to harm to the listed building’s significance and the adverse impact on the conservation area.

## **Railway Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp; Location</b>	21/02089/FUL and 21/02090/LBA 1 Midland Road, Derby, DE1 2SN
<b>Proposal</b>	Change of use of ground floor from public house (Sui Generis) to retail (Use Class E) including installation of a staircase and formation of an additional apartment at first floor level (Use Class C3) Alterations in association with change of use of ground floor from public house (Sui Generis) to retail (Use Class E) and formation of an additional apartment at first floor level (Use Class C3) including removal of a staircase and installation of a replacement staircase

**Resolved: No Objection** - subject to further discussion with the officer regarding re-instatement of the corner door and a better way of re-using the central staircase as a part of the scheme could be investigated.

This is a Grade II listed building in railway conservation area. The building dates from approximately 1853. There have been several previous applications for this building, the last came to committee in January 2020 for the retention of change of use of public house to two commercial units at ground floor and four apartments on 1<sup>st</sup> and 2nd floor. The committee did not object to application at that time.



This application is for the same as that previously submitted. The applicant still wants to implement the previous permission of reinstatement of timber vertical sliding sash windows to the rear elevation and the removal of suspended ceilings to the first floor, in addition they are proposing the removal of modern stair between ground and first floor and to install a new stair from ground to first floor and reinstatement where modern stair will be removed. This proposal does still retain the main circular centre stair, there was no change to that. Under conditions of the previous permission there were some repairs undertaken. This application does not seek to use that stair other than the landings on the first floor, the staircase has already been removed on the ground floor. There was a slight change to the elevation in terms of the shop front to accommodate the main door and window to the left-hand side being an entrance to a lobby that goes up a new staircase to the first floor with vinyl applied stickers proposed for windows on ground floor.

This listed building has had many alterations over time. There was previously approved applications for re-instatement of corner door and removal of suspended ceiling, which is still proposed now, a proposed shop on ground floor with access to one apartment above accessed from on the front and another from the rear. The application also seeks to remove a modern stair going from ground to first and install a new stair but retain the circular centre stair and lantern above, but not for use as a stair.

CHAC welcomed the reinstatement of the entrance on the angle but there was a need to ensure the fanlight was over the door and not integral with it. If the fanlight was over the door a Georgian style fanlight would not be appropriate; it probably should have a plate glass one. Overall CHAC had no objection but felt it was regrettable that the circular staircase could not be incorporated into the new scheme but understood this was probably for practical reasons.

CHAC had no objection to the proposals, subject to further discussion with the officer regarding detail on the re-instatement of the corner door and a better way of re-using the central staircase as a part of the scheme could be investigated, although they noted there might be constraints.

MINUTES END