

**Application No. DER/11/10/01370 - Red Cow PH, 2 St. Edmunds Close,  
& Location: Allestree, Derby**  
**Proposal: Various internal and external works to Public House  
including Pergola's and insertion of doors**

These comments are made in the light of the relevant National and Local Planning Policy such as the Planning (Listed buildings and conservation area) Act 1990, PPS5, PPS1, The City of Derby Local Plan Review (January 2006) including policies E18 and E19.

#### General

The application property is a grade II listed late 18th century/early 19th century building. It is situated within the Allestree Conservation Area. The oldest part of the building is located to the north of the site. It is two-storey with a painted brickwork exterior and has 3 no. ground floor and first floor sash windows. The building has a number of modern additions to its southern elevation, which are not included within the listing description.

These applications are for planning permission (DER/11/10/01369) and listed building consent (DER/11/10/01370). They relate to various internal and external alterations to this grade II listed building, which are summarised below along with my consultation comment in *italics*:

#### External:

- Removal of the existing external drinking area and creation of a new yard using 1.8m fencing and double gates. *I suggest looking at the alignment to go straight across to reduce the visual appearance of clutter and of the different extensions to the rear of the building.*
- New first floor exit, created across flat roof and external staircase *Details need to be submitted for us to assess this. What is the fire escape stair going to look like? There is limited head room for means of escape and are rails needed? This needs clarifying.*
- Removal of existing glazed roof light *I suggest that this is acceptable as this is a modern addition.*
- Erection of pergola structure on southern side elevation (timber with polycarbonate roof) *There is an existing one in situ (without polycarbonate) but suggest that there are better materials and solutions here – e.g. a timber open lean-to with matching roof tiles to the main listed building.*
- The removal of 3 no. doors at the rear of the building and replacement with bi-folding doors. *This is acceptable as a modern extension.*
- The blocking up of 2 no. windows to the side of the new 'courtyard' and replacement with false shutters. *It is not clear as to how this is being proposed.*
- Removal of existing glazed patio doors and replacement with new false painted timber doors. *This is acceptable as within a recent extension.*
- New air intake unit on flat roof. *This is acceptable as there is one that exists however other changes may mean that this has to be amended.*

- Repositioning of existing catering extract grill on rear elevation. *The grill is too large proportionally to the elevation – suggest that the flue in this area will have to be re-looked at and this may mean that this is not needed.*
- Fence details to roof around intake vent. *Suggest that the fence is limited to just screening the vent flue.*

#### Internal:

- Removal of lobby within the newer section of the building *This is acceptable as not in the listed building*
- New opening between the old lounge bar and public bar. *I suggest not having it or limiting to doorway width – need a reasoned argument why this is needed.*
- New bar counter and back fitting *Ok but need to retain more of the original walls*
- New opening between existing kitchen and rear restaurant area. *Not appropriate as a significant wall. I would suggest that they look at whether a doorway could be accommodated.*
- Extraction flue through first floor corridor of listed building – *This is totally inappropriate. The first floor corridor is significant and should be retained, as is the lime ash floor that forms the floor to the rooms within the first floor so holes within it should be avoided.*
- *The applicants propose the removal of items of architectural and historic interest such as - oak posts, masonry wall, thrall and feeding troughs etc - this is wholly inappropriate.*
- *Part of masonry wall at corner of bar should be retained.*
- *1<sup>st</sup> floor new corridor created but it is likely that this will not be necessary if original corridor is retained.*
- *I note that the kitchen is proposed to be moved to the front range. I think we need convincing that this is necessary if the kitchen to the rear range is not affected.*
- Realignment of stud wall adjacent to existing ground kitchen – *this is acceptable as a modern stud wall.*
- Insertion of window in between bar flexi and dining flexi – *this is inappropriate alteration and seems to be unnecessary.*
- Stud partitions in cellar – *I have no problem with the addition of stud partitions within the cellar.*

General interior and exterior decoration throughout. *Confirmation of paint colour and type will be needed. Existing unpainted timber and brickwork should remain unpainted.*

#### Recommendation

The proposal is wholly inappropriate and makes a substantial negative impact on elements of the listed building which are very significant. The proposals also have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. I object to both the planning application and listed building application and I suggest we refuse these applications.

C. Oswald – Conservation Officer 11.01.11