

# ITEM 04

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

## **CONSERVATION & HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE 3 March 2022**

Present: Councillor Sue Bonser  
Councillor Mike Carr  
Councillor Robin Wood  
Chris Collison, Co-opted Member  
Carole Craven, Georgian 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

### **48/21 Apologies**

There were apologies from Councillor Robin Wood, Maxwell Craven, Victorian Group, and Chris Wardle, Derbyshire Archaeological and Historical Society

### **49/21 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair**

There were no late items

### **50/21 Declarations of Interest**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

### **51/21 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Meeting held 13 January 2022**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

### **52/21 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**

## 53/21 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**

## 54/21 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.

The officer explained there were three planning applications and 30 applications for listed building consent to works to a number of listed buildings in Darley Abbey. These won't be looked at individually as there is some repetition within these applications, so it was intended to look at the 3 planning applications first followed by the listed building consent applications for specific rows and streets. Under the Our City Our River (OCOR) project there has been several flood resilience measures that have been undertaken alongside the River Derwent in the City. The whole site falls within the OCOR flood alleviation scheme area and have been identified as needing property level protection from flooding that can be seen on the original application for OCOR. The report covers the design options for the area and why Property Level Resilience (PLR) measures are needed for the area; the OCOR scheme gained planning consent in 2015. The properties are in flood zone 3 which is high risk of flooding at greater than 1% so that is 1 in a 100 chance of flooding annually from the river. An analysis for each property has been undertaken in terms the property and of risk. These works are measures to reduce the frequency of flood water entering the properties. Climate change and as a result of work on flood defences downstream this has meant that there is now risk to these properties of water backing up.

### **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

<b>Application No &amp;</b>	21/01993/LBA
<b>Location</b>	1 & 2 Darley Street, Derby, DE22 1DX
<b>Proposal</b>	Installation of replacement doors and window, painting and rendering of walls in connection with flood resilience works.

**Resolved: No Objections**

These properties are not listed but are covered by article 4 so changes to doors and windows to the front elevation or facing the highway.

## 1 Darley Street Number front door and window

The application runs through other different elements proposed including:

- sealing cable and entry points
- providing the owner with dewatering pump
- repainting masonry at low level where existing
- sealing up render lip
- re-pointing at low level and
- addition of service non return valve on drainage to stop possibility of water backing up pipe work.

Level of detail in terms of the material acoya and tricoya and plywood for construction of door was discussed. The door and door frame are to be replaced to form a robust seal. The proposals are to replace on a like for like basis or to match existing doors, but the new doors would have flood resilience. Where possible they will re-use existing door furniture. The door unit glazing are 24mm thick which is required for flood resilience.

2 Darley Street change to door and side window. The door to the front is a stable door which was changed recently but without permission. Planning colleagues will examine. In effect they are seeking permission for a stable door which is flood resilient.

## Darley Abbey Area

**Application No &** 21/01994/LBA  
**Location** 11 & 12 Darley Street, Derby, DE22 1DX  
**Proposal** Installation of replacement door and windows in association with flood resilience works

### **Resolved: No Objections**

11 Darley Street – front door is proposed to be replaced. Several works to the rear and side of the building many which replicate those already mentioned.

12 Darley Street – to replace front door like for like in terms of design and a front window due to the low sill height and it was felt there was a need for a flood resilient window.

## Darley Abbey Conservation Area

**Application No &** 21/01995/FUL  
**Location:** The Paper Mill, Darley Street, Derby DE22 1DX  
**Proposal:** Installation of replacement door as part of flood resilience measures

### **Resolved: No Objections**

The Committee heard that this was a historic building with several extensions. The proposal was to replace four different types of doors, two of which are boarded over. There may be some possibility of re-instating a boarded plank door to match others rather than the board which is currently over the two doors.

### **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00080/LBA, 22/00068/LBA, 22/00075/LBA, 22/00069/LBA, 22/00070/LBA, 22/00095/LBA, 22/00064/LBA  
**Location** 5,6, 6a,7,8,9,9a and 10 Darley Street, Darley Abbey, DE22 1DX – the buildings are Grade II listed

**Resolved: No Objections**

### **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00086/LBA, 22/00076/LBA, 22/00077/LBA, 22/00071/LBA, 22/00097/LBA,  
**Location** 1- 5 Poplar Row Derby DE22 1DU - the buildings are Grade II listed  
**Proposal** Installation of flood resilience measures

**Resolved: No Objections**

### **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00081/LBA, 22/00090/LBA, 22/00091/LBA, 22/00073/LBA, 22/00064/LBA, 22/00074/LBA, 22/00087/LBA, 22/00082/LBA, 22/00092/LBA, 22/00093/LBA  
**Location** 1 to 12 The Square, Darley Abbey, Derby DE22 1DY  
the buildings are Grade II listed  
**Proposal** Installation of flood resilience measures

**Resolved: No Objections**

### **Darley Abbey Conservation Area**

**Application No &** 22/00084/LBA, 22/00065/LBA, 22/00094/LBA, 22/00088/LBA, 22/00066/LBA, 22/00085/LBA, 22/00067/LBA, 22/00063/LBA  
**Location** 1 to 8 West Row, Darley Abbey, Derby DE22 1DY with rows of privies opposite – the buildings are Grade II listed  
**Proposal** Installation of flood resilience measures

**General information on the listed buildings on the streets above was provided**

**Resolved: No Objections**

CHAC heard about the listed buildings of which there are a number in Darley Street, West Row, the Square (Flat Square) and Poplar Row. The general elements of the proposals for these were highlighted, with more detail available online. General elements included sealing cable entry points, repainting masonry dewatering pump replacing air bricks, installing service non return valves (which could be painted black if necessary), sealing up render lip, re-rendering using sealant on brick joints at low level, some instances there was raising of boiler and tumble dryer vents higher up the walls proposed, in some cases replacement bricks at lower level, on some properties it was suggested using a brick sealant up to 600ml on certain walls, doors and windows proposed to be replaced.

The officer highlighted historic doors, frames and windows on the streets

- Darley Street – some examples of historic frames and doors, and windows which were proposed to be changed
- Poplar Row - CHAC heard that Poplar Row has an existing historic frame and door at number two and there is an array of modern but similar style doors which were proposed to be replaced
- The Square – there has been a lot of change, there are a few historic/older doors and a couple of surviving frames remaining. Some photographs of the existing doors were displayed, some of which were older traditional doors, where they were proposed to be replaced like for like.
- West Row – a couple of door frames where original peg joints can be seen at number 2 and 6, number 2 has a boarded door. The door has been replaced at No. 5 without permission, CHAC views on that door would be useful. A window on West Row due to low sill level was proposed to be replaced.

### **Reasons and what has been considered**

The officer highlighted the options considered for use of doors instead of demountable flood boards. The applicant considered that doors were a more favourable option, because boards would need to have a visible framework to enable them to be fitted into the opening. The threshold would also need to be ground down, the board option meant residents would need to be available anytime day or night to fix in place and store it. Many owners prefer doors as they felt unable to lift and fit boards in place. Passive prevention measures were therefore looked at. UPVC flood doors offer better flood protection, but wooden flood doors have been proposed to match the existing doors. Clarification was supplied on re-pointing and lime mortar could be used in some instances, the brickwork on buildings would be painted at the low level the same colour and new render could be undertaken to match the existing. Also talked about flood resistant air bricks.

### **CHAC discussion in relation to all applications listed above**

The Chair summarised the information given. The applicants are looking at flood resilience measures that largely comprise the introduction of flood resilient doors using a sort of modified timber Acoya and Tricoya, sealing pipes and cable entries, some pointing, some decorations, some modern mastic underneath the render, replacement of existing air bricks with white plastic flood resistant air bricks

CHAC highlighted the issues in areas subject to flooding by water and sewage, which caused long term distress and effects to families and homes, and the time taken to restore properties back to habitable use. Repeated flooding of properties meant that insurance became unavailable, ultimately properties became uninhabitable and derelict. From a conservation and world heritage view CHAC should be in favour of works that avoid that outcome, the property led approach was the right one, and avoided boards and barriers outside of properties which are disruptive to the character of an area.

A member supported the detailed thinking of sealing small openings and non-return valves on drains but was hesitant to support the approach to replacement of windows and doors, which was based on people's individual preference and could be not in keeping with the character of the area. It was suggested that every attempt should be made to explore historic value, and if a door was of particular value some adjustment should be made to the door to ensure it was flood resilient. The scheme should be used to try to achieve an improvement on the situation as the character of the area would be enhanced by a harmonious and consistent approach.

The officer explained that follow up information had been sought from the applicant who had explained that it would not be possible to replace a frame and keep original door within it; the door and frame would both have to be replaced to guarantee flood resilience.

A member queried the decision on whether the original doors should be retained, and asked whether the cost difference for replacing an original whole door and putting in place flood defences had been explored.

Another member highlighted again the devastation that flooding can cause and that an historic building was likely to lose more fabric if flooded. A door and frame need to be replaced together to form a decent seal. The properties in the area all have a variety of doors but actual original doors cannot be identified.

Another member believed the scheme should be one of enhancement rather than repeating what was in currently in place. It would be an opportunity to bring back what the estate might have looked like in the past if all the doors looked similar. Several features on the properties were also highlighted for retention, which included over the top of the door inserts above the arches, number/letter plates which would all give a harmonious effect; no issues were identified with using lime mortar and sealing of properties.

A member expressed support for the scheme to protect properties and households but was not in agreement to change in respect of conformity as the area was attractive with its variety of colours and doors. She suggested providing a range of

appropriate, acceptable styles of doors for residents to choose from. This approach of a range of doors of approved design, simple and suitable for the area was also supported by another member.

CHAC understood that these cottages had developed over a period, and research would need to be undertaken to find out what doors they would have had. Poplar Row was slightly different and did seem to be uniform, it still has original doors, but most of the Square has acquired different doors over the years.

The Chair asked for evidence in respect of the argument for uniformity. The officer explained that the buildings on Darley Street were late 18th century and early 19th century. West Row and Flat Square were built in 1792. The houses on Poplar Row are early 19th century some were related to the Evans family development and have a boarded front door appearance; some were older and had panelled doors.

A CHAC member re-iterated his concerns that, if there were doors or frame of historic interest, they should be protected by alternative means using flood barriers and defences. It was highlighted that re-instatement of original doors would mean that CHAC would have to carry the responsibility of a house flooding; there was also a danger of having a piece-meal look to the whole area.

The Chair read out a contribution statement from another CHAC member who had been unable to make the meeting. "These are all proposals to safeguard the properties in question from flooding, by replacing the existing doors with doors capable of resisting flooding, Fortunately, and unusually, these applications are covered by an adequate Historic Impact Assessment. This indicates that the proposals are unlikely to have a significant impact on the fabric of the buildings, the majority of the original doors having long since been replaced. I accept this conclusion.

My only question to the committee is, why are similar safeguards seem being expended to the most important historic asset on the west side of the river, namely the Abbey Inn? I concede that any proposal to safeguard the Inn will entail an application for Scheduled Monument Consent and the direct involvement of Historic England".

The officer advised that the response from the applicant when asked was that discussion had taken place with the Heritage England Advisor for scheduled monuments in this area on possible works to make the Abbey Inn flood resilient. They were advised that the only approach would be for small walls and flood gates around the steps on Darley Street, and it was felt that the existing stone structure and floors were flood resilient and had withstood floods over a long time, so that was why there were no specific proposals regarding this building.

Support was expressed by a CHAC member for making the houses flood resilient without any pro-active measures needed to be taken by the householders, such as erecting flood defence measures outside the property when there was a risk of flooding. Another member was pleased that flood barriers would not be installed. It was noted that there had been no recent flooding of this area.

The Chair stated that overall CHAC supported the measures to safeguard and protect historic properties from flood devastation, so all the measures were to be welcomed.

CHAC supported the property led approach. The notion of creating resilient homes and avoiding flood barriers and defences in the wider townscape and landscape was also to be welcomed.

CHAC asked whether historic fabric can be retained and ensuring sure that option was explored as fully as possible, notwithstanding the issues discussed above. Respecting joinery details such as inserts above doors and number plates etc needed to be taken on board so that any replacements are as faithful as they can be.

There was a key point was in relation to betterment in this scheme, which was welcomed by all. There seemed to be an opportunity to achieve some betterment across the whole piece, to provide more consistency and a significant opportunity to regularise doors to a degree to create a greater sense of unity and harmony. This could be in an appropriate range of doors so guarding against the replacement of inappropriate doors that have been added at some point. It should not be just a simple like for like approach but a thoughtful one to ensure there is some betterment coming from this scheme.

**CHAC raised no objections and stated their strong support for the proposed scheme.**

## 55/21 George Rennie City Heritage Award Report 2019-2021

George Rennie City Heritage Award has been running annually in memory of George Rennie who was a longstanding officer for conservation who passed away in 1999. The award is made by this Committee, the last one was in 2019 for the year 2018. Because of the Pandemic several years have been missed. It was felt it would be a good time to discuss award at this meeting. Committee were asked whether they want to undertake the awards and if so to consider what buildings or projects they like to nominate. CHAC were also asked to think about the Awards Ceremony itself.

The projects that had received an award in 2018 were highlighted, these were

- The Shop fronts on Victoria Street – main award
- Annie's Burger Shack
- St James Yard – repair and re-use

Preceding years awards could be made available if needed.



CHAC heard that the recommendation was that the awards be run again this year and that and nominations should be sought from the committee for the first meeting in the municipal year 2022-23 and to give the awards in the summer.

CHAC agreed they would like to re-start the award process. One member queried whether they awards would be for 2020 and 2021 respectively or would both years be combined. There was a need to look back to the last time the award was made and ensure that all buildings or projects since then are included. A member felt that it was dependent on what projects were put forward by members. The decision of how to group the awards either as the period 2020-21 or over their specific construction period could be made.

CHAC heard that the Civic Society Awards had been held earlier this year, they had not been held for the previous year, and not much had been completed in 2020 so the two years were combined with one award for each category. CHAC suggested it would be good to have the list as a starting point, but they would make their own recommendations.

Civic Society Awards:

- Main award Silk Mill Museum of Making
- Highly commended – Bemrose school, however this was not listed or in a conservation area so it may be outside CHAC's remit.
- Two commendations – Chapel on corner of Green Lane and St Peter's Churchyard. The other was houses recently refurbished and converted into flats in St Mary's Gate (24 to 26)

CHAC were asked to think about projects or buildings that are worthy of a nomination and bring them back to the Committee for consideration. Officers were also to add to the process of bringing nominations for consideration.

MINUTES END