



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 30 NOVEMBER 2005 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill – Chair

R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor Henry

Councillor O'Brien

T. Abbot	-	Royal Town Planning Institute
S. Bowyer	-	English Heritage
S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
J. Burrows	-	Leicester Civic Society
S. Dobby	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation
M. Elliot	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge
P. Swallow	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge
D. Smith	-	Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society
R. Roenisch	-	Victorian Society

**Officers in Attendance:**

J. Crooks	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
J. Carstairs	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
M. Reeves	-	Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity Department
D. Windward	-	Development Control, Regeneration and Culture Department

\* \* \* \* \*

**46. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies from S. Britton, K. Chhapi and D. Smith.

**47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **48. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 19 October 2005 be confirmed as a correct record.

#### **49. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

#### **50. DECISIONS MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL**

John Burrows enquired whether the Panel could be informed if an application is refused and a subsequent appeal is made. Officers commented that this could be done where possible but it was not always brought to the attention of Officers.

#### **51. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**rThe Chair agreed to accept the following two late items:-**

##### **1 Knighton Park Road Enforcement Action**

The Panel had previously considered an application for an extension last year. The work was carried out but it didn't meet with the plans, uPVC doors and windows were installed, wooden mock sash windows were also installed. Other materials such as the wrong type of brick was used. The quoins on the corner of the building were also covered up by the extension. There was also a new set of steps and balcony added to the front of the building in out of keeping materials. The applicant felt that this work was allowed under permitted development rights. The Panels views were sought with regard to enforcement action.

The Panel gave full support to enforcement action for 1 Knighton Park Road. They considered that the extension as built and the unauthorised porch and front steps, to be detrimental to the character of the building and the conservation area. The extension should be rebuilt to the specifications shown on the approved plans.

The Chair agreed to write a letter on behalf of the Panel expressing their concerns to inform the public enquiry.

##### **St Pauls Church, Kirby Road Pre App Enquiry Conversion to 26 flats**

The Director said that a pre-application enquiry had been received to convert the Church into 26 flats and two offices. The conversion would mean the insertion of four internal floors, with 64 rooflights, ground floor windows would

be dropped and the stained glass windows would be moved around the building. There would also be a glass spire installed on top of the tower.

The Panel accept the principle of a conversion in order to secure the future of the building, however they felt that an open office type of use would better suit the building and that the building had not reached the critical stage for an extreme conversion such as this, that would damage the building permanently.

They considered that the proposals were completely inappropriate and intensive and would damage the internal and external character of the listed building.

#### **A) NATWEST BANK**

##### **Planning Application 20051943 & Listed Building Consent 20051948 Internal & external alterations**

The Director said the application was for the refurbishment of the interior of the bank, some minor external alterations including modifications to existing signage and additional signs.

The Panel were happy with the internal alterations but the original panelling should remain in the public banking hall. The signage was thought to be excessive and the banner signs and atm sign should be removed from the proposal. They did not like the new shopfront and would like to see a traditional shopfront like that on the Horsefair Street elevation.

#### **B) BISHOP STREET, REFERENCE LIBRARY**

##### **Planning Application 20052061 Lift shaft**

The Director said the application was for a proposed new lift shaft on the external rear elevation of the building.

The Panel were happy with the principle of an external lift but required more details. They would like some improvements to the external design such as a better finished cap.

#### **C) 5 CAMDEN STREET**

##### **Planning Application 20051618 Change of use, extension**

This application is for the conversion of the building to 19 flats. The proposal involves a rooftop extension and new UPVC windows.

The Panel felt that the proposed development was acceptable in principle but felt that the number of units was excessive and a smaller number of larger units would be more desirable. They did not wish to see uPVC windows installed and the rooftop extension was thought to be detrimental to the buildings character and in particular the pitched roof was out of character with the rectangular theme of the building.

**D) STANLEY ROAD, EASTFIELD**  
**Listed Building Consent 20051869**  
**Partial demolition of listed building**

This application is for the demolition of the linking section between the Victorian house and the 1950s extension. The Panel made observations on the redevelopment of the grounds including the whole demolition of the 1950s extension at the beginning of the year.

The Panel accepted the need for the partial demolition of the rear extension providing the scarring left on the main historic building was properly repaired and restored.

**E) 2 SAXBY STREET, LAND ADJACENT**  
**Planning Application 20051894**  
**Three storey flat block**

The Director noted that the application is for a new three storey block of six flats on the site currently occupied by South Leicestershire Garages.

The Panel accepted the principle of the new build however they had some reservations about the design. They recommended that the new building be brought forward to match the building line in the rest of the street and that a car park be sited to the rear perhaps with an arched drive through in the centre of the building. The building was also thought to be too low in relation to other buildings in the street the traditional style appearing out of scale. No objections to the demolition of the garage.

**F) EVINGTON VALLEY ROAD/ETHEL ROAD, FORMER DUNLOP WORKS**  
**Planning Application 20051687**  
**Redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the redevelopment of the southern part of the former Dunlop works site with a new school. The proposal involves the loss of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century factory. The later 1950s building to the north of the site does not form part of the proposal.

The Panel do not wish to see this historic building lost and felt that it could be successfully incorporated into the design of the new school especially as the scale and proportions of the element facing Evington Valley Road was of a similar scale.

**G) SANVEY LANE, REAR OF 49-57**  
**Planning Application 20051378**  
**New development**

The Director said that this application was for a pair of semi-detached houses on land to the rear of 49-57 Sanvey Lane.

The Panel felt that the view through the car park from Sanvey Lane to the church spire was important and should not be lost. They also felt that cramming two houses in this location was over-development.

**H) LAND ADJACENT 15 ANDOVER STREET  
Planning Application 20050633  
Redevelopment**

The Director said that this was a vacant site at the junction of Andover and Lincoln Street. The Panel considered an application for the development of the site for fifteen flats with caretaker accommodation in June of this year. This is a revised scheme for 12 flats.

The Panel accepted the principle of a new building in this location but the design has to be improved and in particular the elevation that is viewed from along Lincoln Street.

**I) 1 WESTBRIDGE CLOSE, LAND REGISTRY OFFICE (FORMER PEX MILLS)  
Listed Building Consent 20051994  
Internal glazed partitions**

The Director said that the application was for the installation of glazed partitions within the interior office space.

The Panel had no objections

**J) 30 MARKET PLACE & 28 CANK STREET  
Advertisement Consent 20052081  
Signs**

The Director said that the application was for new signs to both the Market Place and Cank Street elevations. The work has already been carried out.

The Panel had no objections

**K) 22 & 22A SILVER STREET  
Planning Application 20052114  
Alterations to shopfront**

The Director said that this application was for alterations to the shopfront.

The Panel considered that the proposal did not preserve or enhance the character of the building which is a fundamental criteria in considering alterations to historic buildings. They noted that the work was already in progress and recommended that the timber doors and windows above them should be reinstated.

**L) 22 MILLSTONE LANE  
Planning Application 20052091  
Spotlights**

The Director said that this application was for spotlights to illuminate the front elevation.

The Panel were happy with the principle of lighting the façade. However the number of lights should be reduced to a maximum of five with none over the first floor bay window. The lights should be as small as possible and situated centrally between the eaves brackets.

**M) 58 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20052058**  
**Alterations to shopfront**

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the shopfront.

The Panel noted that all three of these shopfronts in this quirky 1930s front extension were original and the proposal would damage the character of the building. They also did not see the need for the alterations as far as access is concerned as the shop already enjoys level access.

**N) 79 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20052125**  
**Alterations to shopfront**

The Director noted that the application was for alterations to the shopfront.

The Panel accepted the need for changes to facilitate access requirements but considered that the proposed shopfront design was poor. As the whole lower section would have to be remodelled, a more traditional style shopfront should be designed that reflects the style and proportions of the building in which it is located.

**O) 208 ST SAVIOURS ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20052070**  
**Replacement windows**

This application is for the replacement of the existing windows, which were fitted in the 1980s with a working sliding sash UPVC window matching the design of the original 19<sup>th</sup> century frames.

The Panel conceded that the windows to be installed would be a cosmetic improvement in this case but reiterated their stance that UPVC is an unacceptable material for use in an historic building.

**P) 224 EAST PARK ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20052070**  
**Fence and vehicular access**

The Director said that the application was for the use of the front garden as a car standing area and erection of a 2 metre high fence to the side boundary at

the front of the house.

The Panel did not wish to see the loss of the front picket fence or the use of the front garden as a car standing area. They also considered the boundary fencing to be out of character.

**Q) 9 SOUTHERNHAY ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20051830**  
**Detached garage & conservatory**

The Director said that the panel had made observations on a new house on this site in the past. It was first approved in 1988 (19981801) and renewed every five years, most recently in 1993. This application is for a new detached two storey garage and a conservatory extension for the proposed house.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposed garage but suggested that the conservatory could not be properly considered until the house was built.

**R) 174 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20051883**  
**Replacement windows**

The Director said that the application was for new UPVC windows to replace the existing windows at the rear of the building.

The Panel do not wish to see the use of uPVC in historic buildings.

**S) STONEYGATE ROAD, TELEPHONE EXCHANGE**  
**Planning Application 20052034**  
**Telecommunications mast & equipment**

The Director said that the application was for a telecommunications mast, three antennae and associated equipment cabinet.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposals

**T) 42 MAIN STREET, EVINGTON**  
**Planning Application 20051672**  
**Rear extension**

The Director said that the application was for a single storey extension to the rear of the restaurant.

The Panel noted that the exposed flue from a previous approval was not fitted as per the approved plans. It was also noted (by Councillor O'Brien) that other conditions set out on the previous planning consent had not been adhered to.

The Panel requested that these be investigated before giving any consideration to the current proposal

**U) ST NICHOLAS PLACE**  
**Planning Application 20051991**  
**Information panel**

The Director said that the application was for a new freestanding internally illuminated information panel set within the pavement outside 104 High Street. The Panel have considered a number of these throughout the City Centre over the last 18 months.

The Panel felt that a more sensitive location should be investigated.

The Panel

**52. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

62-64 Churchgate

Officers noted that 62-64 Churchgate had been de-listed. Whilst undertaking work it had become apparent that the building was approximately a hundred years younger than previously thought. The owner was now intending to demolish the building.

General Hospital Building

The General Hospital building had been turned for listing. The reasons given were that too many alterations had taken place on the building, such as the windows had been replaced. There were also better examples of that sort of building elsewhere in the country. It was noted that representatives from the hospital had offered to attend the next meeting to give the Panel a presentation on their development plans.

**53. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.35 pm.



