

Agenda Item 6

SHEFFIELD CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP

Meeting held 21st August, 2012

PRESENT:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
	Dr. Philip Booth (Chair)	Co-opted Member
	Mr. Tim Hale	Sheffield Chamber of Commerce
	Mr. Patrick Burns	Co-opted Member
	Mr. Rod Flint	Georgian Group
	Mr. Howard Greaves	Hallamshire Historic Buildings Society
	Mr. Graham Hague	Victorian Society
	Dr. Roger Harper	Ancient Monuments Society
	Mr. Bob Hawkins	Council for the Protection of Rural England
	Mr. Stanley Jones	Hunter Archaeological Society
	Mr. Philip Moore	Sheffield Society of Architects
	Dr. Malcolm Tait	University of Sheffield

.....

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs. Christine Ball (Civic Trust/South Yorkshire Industrial History Society) and Prof. Clyde Binfield (20th Century Society).

2. **MINUTES,**

The minutes of the meeting held on 24th July, 2012 were approved as a correct record, subject to:-

(a) the addition in the apologies for absence, of the words "Mr. Bob Hawkins (Council for the Protection of Rural England)"; and

(b) the substitution:-

(i) in item 6(a) of the words "on Collegiate Crescent" for the words "on Broomhall Road",

(ii) in item 7(c), the words "Abbeydale Grange" for the words "Abbeydale Hall";

(iii) in item 7(d), the words "at 249-251 Pitsmoor Road" for the words "now mentioned, at Pitsmoor Road"; and

(iv) in item 7(f), the words "Corten steel had been used for the residential development adjoining" for the words "Core 10 steel material had been used for development at"

and, arising therefrom, the Group (A) noted that:-

(1) the number of permanent conservation officer posts had been reduced by 5% this year and the greatest reduction had been in the number of posts relating to archaeological aspects of conservation work;

(2) the vacant post of Conservation Officer had not been deleted, but the City Council was carrying out a review of its budget. The value of the post was accepted and efforts

were being made to cover the post as far as possible, for example through input by the officers of the Development Control Section;

(3) the former St John's Methodist Church, Sharrow Lane, was being dismantled and the materials were being offered for sale. The floors had already been sold;

(4) the majority of the work regarding the Local List had been carried out when the Conservation Team had been at full complement. There was now insufficient capacity to make the necessary site visits, for the purpose of completing the List. Local listing in itself did not ensure control of demolition and would not have protected St John's Church, which was not in a conservation area.

The heritage assets which were included in the Local List were not of sufficient quality to be listed, nationally, but they would be afforded some protection in the case of the alteration, rather than the demolition of assets. It could be profitable to concentrate resources on work relating to designated heritage assets, rather than spreading them thinly across a broad spectrum of casework;

(5) English Heritage had turned down, on review, the application by Mr. Greaves for the listing of the Vicarage of St Oswald's Church and had recommended that application be made for the building to be added to the Local List;

(6) vicarages were not within the remit of the Sheffield Diocesan Advisory Committee for Buildings, even when they were located within conservation areas and they were dealt with by a separate Committee;

(7) the Head of Planning would hold a meeting on 23rd August, with the architects for the development of the University of Sheffield's Jessop West site. The development would be submitted to the Group as a full planning application; and

(8) the developer of the Crookes Valley Methodist Church had followed the correct procedure, for the discharge of conditions relating to a planning approval regarding the building, which would not be available for use by the start of the forthcoming academic year; and

(B) (1) expressed its concern that approval could be given for the demolition of the Edwardian wing of the former Jessop Hospital, which would be unjustified and would have a damaging effect on the nearby St. George's Church and (2) requested that the architects be invited to make a presentation to the Group, regarding the development.

3. **CHAIR'S REPORT**

The Group noted that the Chair (Dr. Booth) had nothing to report under this item of business.

4. **HEAD OF PLANNING'S REPORT**

The Head of Planning submitted a consultation document entitled 'Improving Listed Building Consent' which the Department for Culture, Media and Sport had issued, together with an initial draft response to the document. The Group:-

(i) noted the information;,

(ii) placed on record its consideration that:-

(A) the proposals were poorly thought out and based on a false premise that there was a greater need to quicken the process of obtaining listed building consent, than to meet the obligations of protecting heritage assets and take into account popular feeling regarding those assets;

(B) there was a clear disparity between the work of English Heritage, in carefully assessing buildings prior to their listing and the proposed procedure for diminishing that listing, which implied a fundamental misunderstanding of the regulation process;

- (C) the proposal to use accredited agents was deeply disturbing; and
- (D) the proposals indicated a clear misunderstanding of the work of a planning authority as, for example, in the proposal to permit deemed listed building consent on the basis that most applications were for trivial matters;
- (iii) requested the Chair (Dr. Booth) to write to the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport and state the Group's objection to the proposals, incorporating the response of the City Council now submitted and suggest that appropriate fees be charged for determining listed building applications, particularly in view of the fact that the proposed changes would lead to a great deal more work for planning authorities, which would require the allocation of considerable resources; and
- (iv) invited the Members of the Group, through their respective organisations, to support the position of the Group by making their own submissions to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

5. **SHEFFIELD SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN PANEL**

The Group noted that the next meeting of the Sheffield Sustainable Development and Design Panel on 6th September, 2012, had been cancelled.

6. **HERITAGE ASSETS**

The Group considered the following applications for planning permission for development affecting Heritage Assets and made the observations stated:-

- (a) **Part demolition of existing redundant underground reservoir and erection of 5 three-storey dwellinghouses at Carsick Service Reservoir, Carsick Hill Road (Case Number: 12/02126/FUL)**

The Group felt that the development would lead to the loss of much of the wall boundary, which made a significant contribution to the character of the conservation area. The Group considered that the information, which had been submitted, was insufficient and misleading. The Group felt that the proposed materials, generally speaking, were acceptable but upvc was unacceptable in a conservation area and the walling materials were also unacceptable. The Group considered that the proposed hardstandings were too harsh. The Group recommended that the developer hold discussions with Officers representing the Director of Planning, prior to any resubmission of the application.

- (b) **Erection of 11 dwellinghouses in 4 x 3 storey blocks with landscaped communal gardens at 328 Fulwood Road (Case Number: 12/02173/FUL)**

The Group considered that the drawings did not show the relation of the development, to the nearby listed St John's Church and Notre Dame School and a drawing showing a section of the landscaped area, should be submitted. The Group welcomed the proposed retention of trees on the site and recommended that the line of the houses be drawn back from the road in order to minimise the impact on the Church and on Fulwood Road. The Group felt that the materials were unacceptable and should

acknowledge the materials of the nearby buildings. The Group considered that there was no rationale for the rectangular lawn, at the centre of the landscaped area. The Group also recommended that the development be given the name of the Victorian residence formerly on the site, namely Tipton Grange.

(c) **Erection of single-storey annexe to church at St John's Church, Ranmoor Park Road (Case Number: 12/02238/FUL)**

The Group stated that, in principle, it had no objection to the development.

(d) **Internal alterations to form 2 units to be used for (Use classes A1 - Shops, A2 - Financial and Professional Services, A3 - Restaurants and Cafes) purposes and refurbishment of offices at first floor level (A2 - Financial and Professional Services and B1 - Business) and alterations to entrance doorways, at 17 Church Street as retail unit. (Case Number: 12/02137/LBC)**

The Group considered that the current proposal for the conversion of 17 Church Street was an improvement on the previous scheme, in that the domed banking hall would still be visible after the subdivision of the space, although it regretted that there was a need for any subdivision of the hall. No proposals for signage were attached to the application, but the Group remained very concerned about the impact that signage would have, on the very important Church Street frontage opposite the Cathedral. The Group recommended that a signage strategy regarding the site be obtained and requested that it be submitted to the Group.

7. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Members of the Group reported on developments affecting Heritage Assets and Conservation Areas and the Group noted that:-

- (a) Mount Pleasant had recently been sold. No scheme had been submitted, as yet, but it was possible that the building would be developed as offices or residential accommodation. The Head of Planning would investigate whether there was a photographic record of the building;
- (b) as yet, no new scheme had been submitted for development at the former Salvation Army Citadel, Cross Burgess Street which was linked to the Sevenstone development;
- (c) the Heeley Bank Road, Woodhouse Road and Tinsley Park Schools were for sale;

- (d) planning permission had been granted for a development of a contemporary design, rather than a pastiche, at Ballard Hall;
- (e) an application had been received, for the demolition of the Pearl Works, Eyre Lane;
- (f) a book on the architecture of the Board and early Council schools, within the City, would be published next October and a book launch was to be held on 4th September;
- (g) the intention to re-open the former First Class Dining Room at Sheffield Station as part of the Sheffield Tap public house was welcomed and the Group expressed an interest in seeing the proposal. A meeting of the Victorian Society would be held there next month;
- (h) a church building at Southey Rise, which had been designed by W.J. Hale, was for sale;
- (i) the launch event of the opening of apartments at the former Croft Buildings, would be held on 7th September.

(NOTE: The above minutes are subject to approval at a future meeting of the Group).

This page is intentionally left blank