

ITEM 04

Time Commenced: 16:03
Time Finished: 17:13

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2 December 2021

Present: Councillor Sue Bonser
Councillor Mike Carr
Chris Collison, Co-opted Member
David Ling – Co-opted Member
Paul McLocklin – Chamber of Commerce (Vice-Chair)
Chris Twomey – RIBA (Chair)

Officers in Attendance: Chloe Oswald, Conservation Officer,

33/21 Apologies

There were apologies from Cllr Wood, Carole Craven, Georgian Group, Maxwell Craven, Victorian Group, Chris Wardle Derbyshire Archaeological and Historical Society, Ian Goodwin, Derby Civic Society,

34/21 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair

There were no late items

35/21 Declarations of Interest

The following Declaration of Interest was noted:

Chris Twomey 21/01865/LBA and 21/01864/FUL Market Hall, Albert Street, Derby

36/21 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 14 October 2021

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2021 were agreed as an accurate record. It was noted that the name change from CAAC to CHAC had been ratified at the meeting of Council on 24 November 2021.

37/21 CAAC 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

38/21 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

39/21 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.

City Centre Conservation Area

Application No & Location	21/01745/LBA and 21/01744/FUL
Proposal	The Standing Order 28 – 32 Iron Gate, Derby, DE1 3GL Formation of a beer garden, internal alterations to extend the customer area and kitchen layout. Change of use from Use Class E (Offices) to Sui Generis (public house) and formation of a beer garden.

Resolved: No Objection

The Committee were told that the application was for the formation of beer garden and a change of use to public house from offices and that the alterations to the proposals now included numbers 33 to 34 Iron Gate.

In relation to the proposals there were no changes to the front elevation. An existing plan of public house and the Banking Hall plus modern extensions of 33 and 34 was displayed. The proposal in terms of the beer garden included a seating area that had been used as a car park since April 2021. The proposal included pergolas with lighting, trellis, and steel powder coated posts and gates with timber posts and fencing, and a glazed entrance in the customer area but further details had not yet been submitted for this.

The proposal for the rear elevation included a change from a door to a window in the modern extension, two new windows to the side of that modern extension and the conversion of a window to a door at the rear of number 34. The Internal works in the modern extension included a kitchen reconfiguration, plus accessible WC under the staircase. There would be a slight re-alignment of walls to create a large kitchen area. The main changes to the Banking Hall were three new apertures

within the wall linking this building to the adjacent building. Some amended plans had been submitted recently which showed that there had been a Heritage Statement and a plan of 1905 showing alterations to 33 and 35. The proposal included the area at the front of 34 at its existing level with the staircase running back through the building, and a staircase between the wall where the new opening was proposed between the buildings. It was proposed to remove several internal walls towards the back of the building. The new information was displayed showing the 1905 plan transposed with the plan for the new proposals. There were originally windows in the side of number 34 and it was noted that the Banking Hall had been extended in the early 20th century.

The Chair highlighted that the application was for the creation of the beer garden which had been used for car parking, plus some internal changes to number 34. Some of the images are not yet available on the portal, and there was an issue of the absence of an assessment of significance in relation to number 34, which would need to be dealt with in terms of the gap of submission. There are internal alterations including formation of new openings. The Chair asked for comments from CAAC on the proposals.

CAAC noted the sketchiness of the Heritage Assessment. The Standing Order was a very imposing building and was a big presence in the street scene on Iron Gate, although there were no changes to frontage elevations proposed. The changes to main Banking Hall are not too significant, CAAC were happy with the use of the Beer Garden described. It was felt that overall the nature of proposals seemed suitable.

CAAC welcomed the move to bring into use number 34 as part of the premises. However, they had reservations about the forming of new openings between the two premises, and asked if the proposed openings would line up with what were the existing windows. The Officer confirmed that the opening to the front of the building was a new opening. The second one was in line with an original bow window opening but for the third one there was never an opening in this location, it was in line with a chimney breast. CAAC asked if there were any historically significant aspects at number 34 which would need to be looked at. The officer confirmed that the building would need to be looked at as currently only a photograph as shown was available; access would be arranged for next week. CAAC felt that subject to officer inspection of number 34 it was a reasonable proposal and was acceptable.

CAAC had no objection to the proposals but noted that the Heritage Statement was incomplete. It was felt generally that the proposals were welcome including the re-use of no 34 Iron Gate, the proposed changes are broadly proportionate, but they would like more justification in terms of the existing condition of number 34 and the new proposed openings and alterations once officers are satisfied.

City Centre Conservation Area

Application No & Location 21/01617/FUL and 21/01618/LBA
4 Victoria Street, Derby DE1 1EQ

Proposal

Change of use of part first, second and third floors from offices (Use Class E) to three apartments (Use Class C3).
Internal alterations in association with change of use of part first, second and third floors from offices (Use Class E) to three apartments (Use Class C3)

Resolved: No Objection

The proposals were for a Grade II listed building in the City Centre Conservation area, comprising change of use from offices to apartments and internal alterations. There was a Heritage Statement supplied, CAAC were informed there was more significance to the front part of the building; there was a rear modern extension which has very little or no significance. Detailed information had been submitted and useful elevation sheets. There were no changes to the ground floor which provided access from the front elevation up to the first floor. The main work would be the conversion to the two apartments, one on each floor. On the first floor the main changes were the installation of kitchens connecting into existing drainage to the rear of the main living space, and shower WC rooms within the modern extension. Secondary glazing was proposed throughout the building and modern doors would be replaced with three panel traditional doors to match the original design for the building. There was a suspended ceiling in place covering decorated cornices. The installation of noise insulation to certain walls and fire partitioning and noise insulation in between floors were the main impact of these proposals.

The officer explained the two options, the removal of existing suspended ceilings and installing them higher at 145mm (currently 400mm), just below the cornice to provide the necessary fire compartmentalisation and noise separation and to chamfer at the window head so there are not as imposing within the space. The second option was to remove the ceiling to expose the cornice and put the measures within the floor void, this would mean there was a need for a noise mat which would raise the floor levels impacting on doors, door heights, skirting and floorboards. CAAC considered that of the two options the first would be the best option in this case.

The Chair summarised the details of the change of use from offices to three apartments with minimal change but with the aim of achieving fire and acoustic separation. The existing suspended ceiling stands down quite a bit and the proposal would be to reduce that by more than half, but it would still hide the cornice.

CAAC welcomed the scheme which they felt was thorough in detail and the proposals had been put forward well. The suspended ceiling options suggested giving pros and cons was useful, and on reflection they felt the inclusion of another suspended ceiling at a lesser depth was the best option, rather than having a new deck put on the floor with removal of all skirtings and replacement that would inevitably cause more damage to the listed building than just covering over the cornices which will remain intact although there was some damage to them already. But if in the future the ceilings are to be exposed and restored then they

remain as part of the fabric of the building. The scheme was to be applauded and approved.

CAAC agreed that this was a set of appropriate alterations and room layout and the configuration of the building in terms of achieving a viable residential use which was welcomed, there was no harm to the character City Conservation area and the changes seem to be appropriate. The interesting triangular shaped staircase was noted. The approach to the ceiling was appropriate. They felt the secondary glazing would need to be dealt with carefully, in terms of considering the oval window on the main stairwell and some of the other windows which have a lot of features such as stained glass. Secondary glazing needs to be compatible with those features, subject to that CAAC were supportive of the proposal.

CAAC had no objections to the proposal. There was a consensus that this was a well-considered scheme and had limited harm or adverse impact on the listed building or the conservation area. The strategy for re-instatement of the ceiling to meet fire regulations and acoustic separation was accepted as the preferred option of the two presented. CAAC suggested that the secondary glazing should be discussed and checked in more detail with officers to ensure that it was done as carefully as possible.

City Centre Conservation Area

Application No & 21/01865/LBA & 21/01864/FUL
Location: Market Hall, Albert Street, Derby, DE1 2DB
Proposal: Demolition of stair tower. Installation of new internal staircase and associated works.

Resolved: No Objection

CAAC were informed that the proposal included removal of the existing external staircase between Guildhall and the Market Hall and replacing with an internal staircase. The officer explained that this was a Grade II listed building in the City Centre Conservation Area, permission had been granted in January 2021 for an internal stair from the first to the roof level CAAC had resolved no objection to those proposals.

The officer explained there was quite a detailed Heritage Statement and analysis of 1864 original plan which showed that the corner of the building was just an enclosure. As well as the demolition of the 1980's stair and lift tower, construction of a new wall and the re-instatement of windows and doorway was planned to return to what had been in place originally. There was an impact of the new staircase between ground and first floor in terms of the loss of some floor space, the design of the new staircase was metal with a perforated balustrade in grey. The justification was for means of escape from the first to the ground floor as well as providing full access to roof level for maintenance. The officer highlighted the plans that were available online, as well as some photographs which showed where the proposed staircase would be located. The plan also explained how it would line up and the detail of the outer and inside door to the staircase.

CAAC thanked the City Council for dealing with this renovation with such care and also thanked the agents who had done a good job on the Heritage Assessment, not just for this part of the proposal but for the whole refurbishment. They felt the proposal was very sensible and appropriate, losing the 1980s fabric of the stair and lift tower was of no consequence, the only adverse impact being the loss of some floor area. The solution proposed was very appropriate to build within the enclosed area as it was necessary to have a stairway for access to the roof for maintenance as well as to the first floor. CAAC felt it would be interesting at this stage of works to have a tour round for the committee and asked if this was possible to arrange in liaison with the agent.

CAAC had no objection and welcomed the proposal.

Little Chester Conservation Area

Application No &	21/01918/FUL
Location	Parkers Piece Sports Ground
Proposal	Erection of storage unit

Resolved: Further information was needed in terms information on detail, heritage interpretation, artwork, and presentation of information to be considered at a future meeting

The officer explained that the proposal was for a storage unit. In heritage terms it was within the Little Chester Conservation Area. The Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage (DVMWS) site runs along the river at this location adjacent to the site and there is the scheduled Ancient Monument (Roman Hypocaust). Detailed pre-application discussion with Historic England had taken place regarding the location and construction.

The officer explained that as a result of the approved planning application for the Our City Our River Project (OCOR) a number of conditions were attached which required mitigation for the loss of sports facilities, as well as a condition for the implementation of public art interpretative interventions to celebrate the heritage aspects and the river corridor. There are new sporting facilities at Darley Playing Field and the Parkers Piece Pavilion had been refurbished, the cricket ground renovation was almost completed.

The proposal was for a cube which was 11 meters away from the flood wall it would be a four-sided structure 3 meters by 3 meters and 2.5 meters high. A hard surface would be laid beneath and around the unit to anchor it and for pedestrian access. The construction depth would be kept to a minimum in agreement with Historic England. In terms of the on-line plans, there has been a clarification on the distance from the flood wall and the relationship of how it relates to the existing building when looked at from a side elevation. The material for the cube will be Corten steel and stainless steel and cast iron; the exact detail of the information about the interpretation has not been finalised, but different methods were being looked at to create it, such as laser cut Corten, cast iron in relief, also digital links. More photographs of the site as it existed were displayed by the officer, also where the interpretation and the storage unit for equipment for the cricket pavilion were

proposed to be located. The committee were informed that the cricket pavilion had been repaired but because of the amount of machinery needed in a secure location, it was felt that to provide level access onto the adjacent cricket pavilion was the best option. The structure could be removed in future.

A member of CAAC suggested that the building was in keeping with the sports ground use and did not lead to any loss of significance of the site. It was fairly limited in scale, and the way it sits against the wall was not intrusive.

Another CAAC member felt that it would have been better to be included in the pavilion or an extension to the pavilion. They had understood that the existing steel flood wall in place was only to be temporary and a proper wall would be incorporated into the development. The officer confirmed the area of temporary wall described was to the rear of the Aida Bliss site and this was not currently clad but could be in time. This section of wall was clad with Corten in recognition of the previous location of railway industry there.

Another member felt that the building does seem to be incongruous on first sight, but there was signage to be incorporated as it would be used as an information board. However, there was no detail available of how this signage would be affixed to the structure. They felt that it could not be an extension to the cricket pavilion as the proportions of the pavilion are quite delicate and a structure of this design added to it might compromise the building. The structure does seem to be insensitive but if the purpose was to explain the area and give information it could work well as it was more a sign board than a store. There could be laser cut panels with various messages or artwork, but clear detail had not been provided to the Committee.

CAAC asked if it could come back to a future meeting once it has been decided what will be put on it in terms of signage or artwork so that the design could be looked at. The officer confirmed that there was no detail as to design, just the idea of the proposal. CAAC also felt that if it was to be a public information building was poorly located and asked if there were, are there any alternative locations.

CAAC asked for further information on detail, heritage interpretation, artwork, and presentation of information to be considered at a future meeting

Friar Gate Conservation Area

Application No & Location	21/01925/FUL and 21/01926/LBA 11-12 Friar Gate, Derby DE1 1BU
Proposal	Change of use from Restaurant/Officer (Use Class E) to Community/Offices Facilities for Place of Worship (Use Class F) proposed roof over existing passageway and minor alterations to walls to form disabled access ramp between No.11 and No. 12.

Internal alterations in association with change of use comprising opening and ground floor and first/second floor

along party wall between No. 11 and No. 12, roof over existing passageway and minor alterations to walls to form disabled access ramp between No. 11 and No. 12. New staircase and lift to No. 12, stud walls and alterations to existing walls to form openings in No 12.

Resolved: No Objection subject to further discussion on the party wall openings

The officer explained that number 11 Friar Gate was Grade II listed, both no. 11 and 12 are in the Friar Gate Conservation Area, number twelve was not listed. Within this application just looking at internal works to no. 11. This proposal was a change of use from a restaurant to community facilities for a place of worship, roofing over an existing passageway or part of it and minor alterations to existing walls to form a disabled ramp. The change of use was for a community outreach centre for St Werbergh's church, place for officers, youth groups, Sunday School, prayer meetings.

The officer highlighted that the proposals did not affect the frontage of no. 11. The building looks like a three-storey building window, but the middle floor windows are not accessible and are not part of the proposal. The internal works were described. Three doorways are proposed to the party wall between eleven and twelve, two on ground floor and one at the front of the building, the ramp area would be roofed over, a current opening at the base of the stairs would be enlarged in addition on this floor there was a proposed doorway between the multi-use room and the kitchen behind. Some sections had been added to the application showing the door at the front, the area being roofed over with two roof lights and a proposed opening where the window used to be. The reason for the works was to make a brighter and less oppressive transition space when moving between the two buildings. The architects preferred option was to remove the window and open the space. In this area was a proposed ramp to provide access through number eleven and along the passageway to either building. On the first floor there are no proposed changes to no. 11 apart from a bulkhead in no. 12. To the top floor of both buildings there is a link through. There are no other changes apart from the doorways between the buildings.

The chair summarised the application which was for a new community outreach use and included a range of existing spaces. There were limited internal changes and no change externally. The application relates to no. 11 and 12, but the focus was on no. 11 which was the listed building. Comments were requested from the Committee.

A CAAC member felt it was an attractive building from the outside and given that any of the interest on the inside has been destroyed in the past, it was a useful use for the building, and they approved of the proposals. Another CAAC member agreed that there was no negative impact on the character of the conservation area and no material harm to the character or significance of the listed building in that the alterations at number eleven are limited and will bring about a beneficial use they were in favour of the proposals.

However, another member of CAAC concerns about the internal openings, one of which was slotted in at the side of the chimney breast, they queried if it was necessary as it was an important brace to the outside wall from a structural point of view. They were slightly concerned about the puncturing of the party wall at the front to the old passageway to create a new doorway. They did not see the importance as it was positioned so close to the front of the building it may weaken it; it was also opposite another existing door opening into that space. There was also concern about opening up of the well in the ground floor stair area and losing a part of the party wall between the two buildings, they asked if the party wall could be retained to keep the integrity of the division between the buildings.

CAAC had no objection to the proposals, and generally supported the new use as it would bring beneficial change and no harm in terms of the listed building subject to further discussion, and hopefully reduction in removal on the party wall openings which have been flagged above.

Strutts Park Conservation Area

Application No &	21/01949/LBA and 21/01760FUL
Location	Highfield House, Highfield Gardens, Derby, DE1 2DB
Proposal	Conversion of outbuilding to annexe

Resolved: Objection

The officer explained that Highfield House Grade II is a listed building in the Strutts Park Conservation area, and explained the application was for the conversion of an outbuilding to an annexe. Photographs of the outbuilding and existing roof were displayed. There was a Heritage Statement from which showed that the original outbuilding had been extended to the front. There was some stonework which can be seen along the boundary wall and along part of the building on the side elevation. The officer highlighted details of the outbuilding in terms of the roof and the floor, on the right-hand side of the floor there were stone flags with brick pavers to the centre and left-hand side. There was a timber stall divide remaining. The proposal externally was to replace the existing doors with glazed ones, there was no detail as to whether the windows were being replaced. There will be an installation of a roof lantern and to the side elevation there was a proposal for a new window. Inside the building the existing floor plan and the proposed was displayed. There was limited information on drainage, and about vents or flues, several apertures are proposed to link spaces in the extension.

CAAC felt this was quite an important building in Derby having been designed by Leaper, a well-known amateur architect. This proposal has little merit, it was weak in supporting statement, the detail of the design work is poor. Would like to see a lot more supporting detail particularly in terms of the floors and if the existing floor stones and flags will remain and be re-laid. The details of the new doors are incongruous to the building. The other item which was of interest was the stall separator which could be re-used within the conversion. No problem with conversion but needs more attention to detail. No objection to principle of bringing the building into a residential use as an annexe to the main building but feel there

needs to be a lot more thought about the detail of the scheme and how it can be achieved. CAAC also suggested thinking about installing a pitched roof. CAAC objected to the proposal. They were content with the new use of the outbuilding in conjunction with the existing house but felt that there should be a more sympathetic design and clarification on the retention of historic features.

MINUTES END