

SHEFFIELD CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP

Meeting held 13th December, 2016

<u>PRESENT;</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
	Dr. Philip Booth (Chair)	Co-opted Member
	Mr. Tim Hale (Deputy Chair)	Sheffield Chamber of Commerce
	Prof. Clyde Binfield	Twentieth Century Society
	Mr. Patrick Burns	Co-opted Member
	Mr. Howard Greaves	Hallamshire Historic Buildings Society
	Mr. Graham Hague	Victorian Society/ South Yorkshire Industrial History Society
	Mr. Bob Marshall	Royal Town Planning Institute
	Mr. Philip Moore	Sheffield Society of Architects
	Mr. Andrew Shepherd	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Liz Godfrey (Civic Trust), Dr. Roger Harper (Ancient Monuments Society), Mr. Bob Hawkins (Council for the Protection of Rural England), Dr. Jo Lintonbon (University of Sheffield) and Dr. Jan Woudstra (Landscape Institute).

2. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th November, 2016 were approved as a correct record subject to the substitution in item 2(g) of the word "Bluecoat" for the word "Bluecoats" and in item 8(d) of the words "appeared to have been" for the words "had been".

Arising therefrom, the Group noted that:-

- (a) representatives of Historic England had indicated that it was not possible to say, categorically, why the City Council's local heritage zone application for Castlegate had been refused, but only ten bids had been successful, including two in Yorkshire; and
- (b) the Loxley Chapel had been demolished and it appeared that cast iron columns had been stolen from the building at that time;

3. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair (Dr. Booth) reported that he had attended the meeting of Joined Up Heritage on 22nd November last. It had been stated that there would be a programme of workshops during the winter from which a heritage strategy would be produced. The point had been made at the meeting that the strategy must link with the Sheffield Local Plan, along the lines of the equivalent for Nottingham, which had been endorsed by councillors and officers. There had been no indication at the meeting, that Joined Up Heritage would wish to be represented on the Group, but this could be considered if it adopted a constitution. Dr. Booth had recommended that Joined Up Heritage make contact with Fiona Marshall, Acting Head of Planning. Members of the Group could attend meetings of Joined Up Sheffield.

The Group noted the information.

4. REPORT OF ACTING HEAD OF PLANNING

The Acting Head of Planning reported that Simon Green had resigned from his post as Director of Place with Sheffield City Council.

5. SHEFFIELD SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN PANEL

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

6. JOINED UP HERITAGE SHEFFIELD

Mrs. Valerie Bayliss and Mr. John Bradley gave a presentation on Joined Up Heritage Sheffield (JUHS). In response to questions, they stated that:-

(a) the aim of JUHS was to achieve a better resourced and connected offer, in terms of Sheffield's heritage. The fact was that the City was underperforming; the part that its heritage played needed to be identified and communicated within and outside it. Buildings at risk should be protected through constructive, conserving and enhancing design;

(b) other local organisations, including the University of Sheffield, the Chamber of Commerce and the local media had shown interest in JUHS;

(c) at the moment the organisation only had terms of reference to work to. Next year it would adopt a constitution; various models for this were being examined. It might become a charitable organisation. The City Council had appointed a Councillor as its Heritage Champion. JUHS was aiming to gain his attention and would seek to make contact with other key gatekeepers;

(d) a number of subgroups had been established, for example relating to data on heritage issues and the Sheffield Plan. The pressure on resources within the City Council was clear. JUHS was

willing to maintain the Sheffield Local List. The Leeds Local List was maintained by heritage enthusiasts;

(e) the term “heritage” was inclusive; its scope was wider than the well known places such as Kelham Island. The aim was to give it a good narrative. Creative thinking was required, using all relevant buildings, such as those at Neepsend, with a view to demonstrating the positive effects of heritage work in terms of the health and wellbeing of residents. There were distinct communities and substantial diversity, which led to people taking interest in heritage issues. Many young people, however, felt they had little connection with the City. It was considered that a strong, joined-up effort could encourage them to take more interest in heritage issues;

(f) there had been no contact with the Sheffield City Region’s Local Enterprise Partnership. Heritage Lottery funding would give JUHS a year to become fit for purpose and then a long term future could be set for it;

(g) the military heritage, such as the First World War trenches at Lodge Moor, was as significant as the industrial heritage, but “heritage” meant more than the built environment. The objective was to create an overall framework within which individual organisations could work. The Heritage Strategy would acknowledge what already existed;

(h) as yet, JUHS did not have a website. It was considering what to say to the press about its aims; and

(i) Members of the Group would be welcome to attend the proposed workshops, but they should contact JUHS first, as attendance would be by invitation.

The Group thanked Mrs. Bayliss and Mr. Bradley for their presentation and noted the information.

7 HERITAGE ASSETS

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

1. Painting of a temporary wall mural at G.H.Stansfield, 56 Garden Street (Retrospective application). (Case No. 16/04288LBC).

The Group commended the vigilance of the Council’s officers in this case. The Group deplored the failure of the University of Sheffield to apply for listed building consent in the appropriate manner. The Group felt that the development was acceptable, but it did not set a precedent for mural painting elsewhere in the City.

2. Use of former public convenience area (Use Class B1/D1), at Surrey Street, as a bar (Use Class A4) with associated internal refurbishments and pavement light. (Case No.16/04469/LBC).

The Group felt that there was no objection, in principle, to the

development. The Group considered however, that there were concerns regarding the issues of ventilation, disabled access, signage above ground level, especially on the balustrading and any discovered internal features, which could be difficult to resolve.

**3. Demolition of stables and extension to existing barn, to form dwelling at Hole In The Wall Farm, David Lane.
(Case Number 16/03048LBC)**

The Group felt that the development was a visual intrusion into the Mayfield Valley, which would not preserve or enhance the listed building. The Group considered that the development was not commensurate with the character of the barn and that any extension of the barn should be longitudinal. The Group felt that the submitted drawings were poor and the heritage statement was inadequate. The Group considered that the desired extra accommodation could be achieved in the garage area or the garden area, but there would be no objection in principle, to conversion of the barn, if properly done. The Group felt that, at present, the footprint was not in accord with the agricultural layout of the farm and the detailing was inappropriate. Moreover the extension would occupy a prominent position in the Valley.

(Note: Mr. Hale declared an interest in item 3. above)

8. UPDATE

The Acting Head of Planning reported that:-

(a) amendments to the St. Vincents' planning application had been submitted. The University of Sheffield had withdrawn from the scheme, but the developer still aimed to convert the church. Historic England had taken interest in the development and was weighing up the public benefit of it against its viability, The Acting Head of Planning was attempting to achieve as much public realm as possible within the development;

(b) negotiations were continuing regarding the developments at Hollis Croft. The Acting Director of Planning had (i) requested the developers to submit illustrations of the impact of the development on the courtyard and the listed buildings and (ii) suggested the construction of a wall, without detailing, rather than the proposed gable; and

(c) the Acting Director of Planning had requested a structural survey of Spout House Farm. As yet there had been no meeting with the executor of the tenants, who was investigating the possibility of there being an insurance policy regarding the property. Consideration was being given to issuing a repairs notice, as the property was in a poor state of repair.

The Group noted the information, expressed its dismay at the complicated situation regarding Spout House Farm and its hope that

resources would be made available to save the future of the building,

possibly through emergency grant aid from Historic England.

9. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

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

- (a) members of the Group would investigate the condition of Davy House, Castle Street and Haymarket and its description in the Pevsner Architectural Guide to Sheffield, by Harman and Minnis;
- (b) the Acting Head of Planning would (i) investigate and report back on (A) works at the entrance to the Mappin Building, Mappin Street and (B) a proposal by the University of Sheffield to demolish workshops close to listed buildings at Shepherd Street and (ii) notify the appropriate Building Control officers of the poor condition of a wall at 440 Glossop Road;
- (c) there had been pre-application meetings regarding the former horse hospital at Blonk Street. The Group would consider the planning application for the site when it was submitted;
- (d) there was substantial concern within the City regarding the future of the Central Library, Surrey Street;
- (e) Dr Martin Purdy, former Architect to Sheffield Cathedral, had died recently; and
- (f) the former Little Chapel, Wadsley Bridge, had been cleaned satisfactorily.

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

This page is intentionally left blank