



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL HELD ON Wednesday, 14 January 2026

Meeting Started 5:15 pm

Attendees

R. Gill (Chair), N. Feldmann (Vice Chair), Cllr. S. Barton, C. Hossack (LIHS), S. Hartshorne (TCS), S. Bird (DAC), P. Ellis (VS), D. Fountain (LSA), S. Bowyer (LCS), M. Taylor (IHBC), M. Richardson (RTPI), K. Walters (LRSA), D. Martin (LRGT), K. Agyei (Student)

Presenting Officers

J. Webber (LCC)
B. Gomme (LCC)

321. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

M. Davies (RICS), S. Sharma (DMU), S. Yazdan-Joo (Student)

322. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

323. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Panel agreed the notes.

324. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A. Development at 94-98 Regent Road Planning application 20251441

The panel began by emphasising the quality of existing architecture within the street, with attention paid to the corner building, a 1960s modernist office block by Anthony Drew-Edwards, and the Victorian terraces to the east of the application site, designed by Joseph Goddard. The application buildings were also praised for their architectural merits, such as how the right-hand building, Readson House, respects the scale of the adjacent Victorian buildings and their distinctive roofscape. It was concluded that both application buildings had carefully considered frontages and massing that positively contributed to the streetscape, but panellists felt that each building needed to be treated separately.

Beginning with the principle of development, the change of use to residential accommodation was viewed as positive and adding a roof extension to Prospect House (the left-hand building) could be possible.

However, the panel had significant concerns over the design of the development itself. The roof extensions were seen as too boxy and lacking in subservience. It was felt that a roof extension of the scale proposed to Readson House would upset the relationship with the Victorian gabled buildings and create visual dominance, something which had been carefully considered when Readson House was built. A roof extension to Readson House is therefore unlikely to be supported. To avoid harming the character of the street, the roof extension to Prospect House needs to be set back and the design reconsidered, with features such as the proposed windows seen as too small and the proportions unbalanced. There were further concerns raised over the choice of materials used on both the roof extension and the new facade, which the panel believed would jar with the existing materials of the buildings, in particular the choice of vertical hanging roof slates, aluminium capping, the uncharacteristic application of render, and the choice of new bricks. The redevelopment of the frontages was criticised by panel, as it would result in the considerable loss of character of the existing buildings. For Prospect House, the horizontal emphasis created by the fenestration would be lost and the extensive masonry surfaces would alter the orientation of the building. This is particularly emphasised through the treatment of the ground floor, which would lose its active frontage and create an unwelcoming impression at street level. Also, at Readson House, the remodelling of the projecting bays was considered an unacceptable loss of an original feature.

Overall, the panel summarised that the proposed development is overworked and unnecessary, which would result in more harmful and lower-quality frontages with extensions that are unrefined and risk dominating the Victorian terrace next door. A more sensitive approach is needed that retains much more of the existing frontages and is more respectful of the established architecture, both within and surrounding the site, while new additions need to be of a higher standard of detailing.

Objections

B. Development at 16 Morland Avenue Planning application 20251593

The panel again began by discussing the quality of the existing morphology and character of the site and its surroundings. Morland Avenue was considered to have a high-quality townscape, with a strong sense of architectural character, and no.16 was seen as among the best buildings within the street. Being the largest house on the biggest plot and located at the apex of the corner, it is also one of the most visible.

There was consensus that the proposed development is unacceptably harmful

to the host building and any extension needs to be far more sensitive to its character. The extension were considered to be too bulky and would obscure or involve the loss of valuable original architecture, including a historic garage. Particular attention was paid to the detailing of the proposed extension; the host building is already complex and has rich detailing that helps break down the mass and add visual interest. The new design failed to respond to the original architecture, with features such as parapets, windows, roof valleys and bargeboards all seen as incorrectly scaled or considered. The detailing around how the upper floor room would work was also questioned. The new garage had squat detailing and again was not sufficiently contextually responsive.

In summary, the panel objected to the proposed development on account of the unacceptable loss of historic detailing, the scale of development and the detailing of the new additions.

Objections

The panel made no comment on the following applications:

1 Westbridge Close, Westbridge Place

Planning application 20251742

Internal alterations to Grade II listed building

344 Fosse Road North, Fosse Medical Centre

Planning application 20251772

Demolition of single storey extension to rear; construction of two storey extension at rear; dormer to side; installation of solar panels to side and rear of medical centre (Class E)

344 Fosse Road North, Fosse Medical Centre

Planning application 20251773

Demolition of single storey extension; construction of single storey extension at rear of medical centre (Class E)

3-5 Salisbury Road

Planning application 20251752

Change of use from university teaching and administration building to

fifteen student flats (15 x studio) (sui generis), bin and cycle stores to side

2 Atkinson Street

Planning application 20251823

Change of use of part of ground floor, first and second floor from auto repair shop and factory (Class B2) to eight flats (5x studios, 2x 1-bed, 1x 2-bed) (Class C3); construction of four dormer extensions at front; alterations

Land at Bloods Hill, Kirby Muxloe

Planning application 20251951

**EIA Scoping Opinion in respect of: Application No: 25/09/EIASCO
Description: Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Opinion for residential development of up to 390 dwellings**

Meadow Court, Old Church Street

Planning application 20251740

Construction of detached single-storey outbuilding; construction of two storey side extension; first floor extension to care home; alterations(Class C2)

Burnham House, 20 Elms Road

Planning application 20251626

Installation of solar panels on part of roof of flats (Class C3)

Knighton Park Road, Knighton Court Block A (Flats 1-17) & Block B (Flats 18-35)

Planning application 20251979

Replacement of cast-iron rainwater & soil pipes at rear elevations of Blocks A & B with a cast-iron effect UPVC system

7-9 Horsefair Street

Planning application 20251821

Installation of four internally illuminated fascia signs; one externally illuminated projecting sign at front and rear of restaurant (Class E)

17 Halford Street

Planning application 20251574

Change of use from Class E to hot food takeaway and eat in (sui generis), including outdoor seating area with retractable awning and barrier.

181 Narborough Road, Pine Leigh

Planning application 20251982

Change of use from dwellinghouse to three self contained flats (2 x 3 bed & 1 x 1 bed); replacement of timber windows to UPVC at rear.

Meeting ended at 18:40

Next meeting proposed for Wednesday 11th February 2026