Agenda Item 6

SHEFFIELD CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP

Meeting held 17th October, 2017

Name	Organisation
Dr. Philip Booth (Chair)	Co-opted Member
Dr. Jo Lintonbon	University of
(Deputy Chair)	Sheffield
Prof Clyde Binfield	Twentieth Century Society
Mr. Patrick Burns	Co-opted Member
Liz Godfrey	Civic Trust
Mr. Howard Greaves	Hallamshire Historic
	Buildings Society
Mr. Graham Hague	Victorian Society/
	South Yorkshire
	Industrial History
	Society
Dr. Roger Harper	Ancient Monuments
	Society
Mr. Philip Moore	Sheffield Society of
	Architects
Mr. Andrew Shepherd	Society for the
	Preservation of
	Ancient Buildings
	5

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Rob Darrington (Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors), Mr Tim Hale (Chamber of Commerce), Mr Bob Hawkins (Council for the Protection of Rural England), Mr Bob Marshall (Royal Town Planning Institute) and Mr Jan Woudstra (Landscape Institute).

2. MINUTES

PRESENT;

The minutes of the meeting on 19th September, 2017 were approved as a correct record, subject to the substitution:-

(a) in item 4(b) of the word "meeting" for the word "conference";

(b) in item 7.2, of the words "Mr Hale and Ms Godfrey declared an interest in the above item" for the words "Mr Hale declared an interest in the above item"; (c) in item 7.3, of the words "would provide more units than the building was capable of providing" for the words "was more than the building was capable of holding "; and

(d) in item 7.6 the words "the proposed use was more than the building was capable of providing" for the words "the proposed use was more than the building was capable of holding "

Arising therefrom, the Group (i) noted that:-

(A) following the receipt of a further email in respect of photographs of Claremont House, Mr. Greaves had contacted the Police;

(B) the process of assessing expressions of interest in Mount Pleasant, Sharrow Lane was continuing;

(C) Mr. Hague had attended the talk by Miss Ruth Harman at the recent Off the Shelf Festival, in the City and had considered it to be stimulating. He welcomed the forthcoming publication of the Pevsner Guide, to which it related;

(D) there had been no development with regard to Bennet Cottage and there would be no meeting with the developer, until amended plans were submitted. The building was not listed, so the key aim was to ensure that the best possible design was achieved. The Chief Planning Officer had requested drawings to indicate its visibility, in order to assess its compliance with the Development Plan and its impact on the Green Belt;

(E) there had been no response, from the developer, to correspondence regarding the Lion Works; and

(F) there had recently been an article in the local press regarding the access to Chapel Walk. A lot of repairs were being carried out on Fargate. Prior notification of the works had been submitted. Chapel Walk, which was still accessible from Fargate, would lend itself to conversion to an arcade; and

(ii) extended its sympathy and advice to Mr. Greaves and expressed its concern at his treatment, with regard to the photographs of Claremont House.

4. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair reported that he and Ms. Godfrey had attended the recent launch event at Sheffield Hallam University, for the Heritage Strategy prepared by Joined Up Heritage Sheffield (JUHS), which was available online. He had mixed feelings about the event, particularly regarding what appeared to be the emphasis on the role of heritage in promoting the economic development of the City, although the Strategy itself does not have that emphasis. The Strategy does refer, Appropriately, to the distinctiveness of the City and how to nurture and protect it. There were also the questions of who would implement the Strategy and how it would work.

Liz Godfrey stated that a Heritage Strategy Board would be set up. JUHS would become a charitable incorporated organisation. The Board would move the framework on, to become the strategy of JUHS.

It was assumed that the City Council would want to become involved in its work. A Heritage Strategy Officer of Nottingham City Council had given a presentation at the launch event, on working with organisations such as JUHS. Heritage England had indicated that it encouraged the formation of a strategy by such organisations. JUHS would keep in contact with Heritage England, which had given funding to the equivalent organisation in Nottingham.

5. CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER'S REPORT

The Group noted that there was nothing to report under this item of business.

6. SHEFFIELD SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN PANEL

The Group noted that there was no scheduled meeting of the Sheffield Sustainable Development and Design Panel.

7. HERITAGE ASSETS

The Group considered the following applications for planning permission affecting heritage assets and made the observations stated:-

7.1 Public realm improvements to Fitzalan Square and enhancements to access to Esperanto Place, including demolition of 31-35 Arundel Gate and existing structures, tree felling and re-arrangement of highway. (Case number: 17/04081/RG3)

The Group welcomed the intention to carry out improvements, in principle, but felt concern at the present proposals. The Group requested further detail of the scheme. The Group recommended that the cycle route be located around the edge of the pedestrian area, rather than through it.

7.2 Alterations and extensions to North Lodge Gatehouse, to form a dwelling house, at Kenwood Hall Hotel, Kenwood Road (Case number 17/03945/LBC and 17/03944/FUL).

The Group noted that the Lodge had been at risk for some time. The Group felt that the proposed car park in front of the Lodge would set a dangerous precedent and that a car park would have a very different effect on the building, than would traffic passing through the arch. The Group felt concern at the proposed infill glazing for the arch and felt that an alternative form of glazing should be employed, possibly using a glass and wood combination. The Group had no objection, in principle, to creating the new route to the hotel, provided it was done with careful treatment.

7.3 Application under Section 73 to allow for demolition and rebuilding of retained mill building and to vary conditions 2 (approved plans), 3 (samples), 4 (large scale details), 7 (commercial units), 8 (cafe/bar), 9 (hours of use of cafe/bar) and 19 (green roofs) of planning permission 6/0198/SQL, (amended description and plans received 27/9/2017) in respect of the erection of a car park at the site of the Bernard Works, Sylvester Gardens.

(Case number 17/00604/FUL)

The Group accepted with regret the necessity of demolishing the existing building, but did not feel able to obect to the proposed rebuilding. The Group recommended the use of black mortar. The Group felt that the existing features, particularly the cast iron columns, should be recorded and should be reused as far as possible.

Note; Mr. Moore declared an interest in the above item and left the meeting for the duration of its consideration by the Group.

8. UPDATE

The Chief Planning Officer gave an update report on various matters and the Group noted that :--

(a) there was nothing further to report with regard to Claremont House and Carbrook Hall; and

(b) there had been a further breakin at Loxley Chapel. A dangerous structure notice had been served on the owner, to ensure that scaffolding would be re-erected to support a chimney on the building.

9. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Members of the Group reported on development affecting heritage assets and conservation areas and the Group noted that: –

(a) the Chief Planning Officer would investigate and report back on the position regarding the Farfield Inn, Neepsend;

(b) a recent edition of the Asian Times contained an article on the potential for development of the Central Library, Surrey Street; and

(c) former Councillor Bill Michie, who had been one of the first Councillors to recognise the importance of its heritage to the City, had died recently.

The Group noted the information.

10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Group noted that the next meeting would be held on 21st November, next.

(Note; the above minutes are subject to amendment at a future meeting.)