



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 11 JANUARY 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Lawrence – Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor Henry

Councillor O'Brien

S. Bowyer	-	English Heritage
J. Burrows	-	Leicester Civic Society
S. Dobby	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation
K. Chhapi	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
P. Draper	-	Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
A. McWhirr	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
R. Roenisch	-	Victorian Society
D. Smith	-	Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society
P. Swallow	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge

Officers in Attendance:

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

* * * * *

61. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from T. Abbott and S. Britton.

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Garrity declared a general interest as Chair of the Development Control Committee. She undertook to express no opinions on any of the matters being discussed on the agenda.

Councillor Henry declared a general interest as a potential substitute member of the Development Control Committee. She undertook to express no opinions on any of the matters being discussed on the agenda.

63. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Kanti Chhapi pointed out that the minutes of the previous meeting didn't include the declaration he made and that the wrong organisation was included for his attendance.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 14 December be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the amendments as noted above.

64. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

65. LEICESTER HOSPITALS REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Chair welcomed representatives from the Leicester University Hospitals Trust and their Architectural representatives.

It was noted that the timetable for the application would be that the outline application would be submitted by the end of January. The outstanding matters would be submitted in May. It was stated that the Panel would receive a further presentation on more detailed matters at the March meeting.

It was explained that Conservation plans had been undertaken at the General Hospital and Royal Infirmary sites. These were to assess the quality of the historic buildings on the sites. The social and historical significance of the buildings was considered, not just the architectural. Consideration was also given to the possibility of listing the North Eldington Infirmary building on the general site and the extent of the boundary of the listed building on the Royal Infirmary site.

It was noted that the building on the General site was not considered to be of listable quality, but it did retain a number of attractive features. It was intended to retain this building.

As part of the consideration of the boundary of the listed building, the significance of the Chapel was considered. It was noted that a balancing consideration needed to be given to modern clinical needs and retaining historic buildings. A catalogue had been made of the fixtures and fittings contained within the chapel and it was intended that these would remain on site.

The plans for the three sites were along the following lines:-

At the Glenfield Hospital it was intended to retain the mansion in the centre of the site. Clinical accommodation would be doubled at the site. A new building would be provided on the existing car park. Three storey blocks would be built for a new women's hospital and for renal and general medical. A new lab building would be built for cardio research. There would be a two storey car park for staff. The existing hospital would be refurbished.

At the General Hospital site it was intended to keep the 1903 building as the central building. The original entrance to the at the south of the building would be re-used. New space for further developments on the site was sought and it is intended to use the existing car park and a small part of the site that could be demolished. The centre for planned care and rehabilitation would be on the site. The existing women's wards would become the administration buildings which would be away from public areas. Teaching facilities would also be developed on the site.

At the Royal Infirmary site it was intended to build a new children's hospital. This would need to be near the Accident and Emergency department, which would be why the chapel would need to be demolished. It was also planned to rationalise the car parking, including a new multi storey car park. It was generally proposed to remove the bad architecture from the site and bring a more ordered layout.

More detail on these proposals would be provided at the March meeting.

Members of the Panel expressed doubt that the artefacts from the Chapel would remain on the Royal Infirmary site. Concerns were also expressed that patients spiritual needs would not be catered for. Hospital representatives commented that it was intended to retain artefacts on site wherever possible. A full assessment on how this was to be done was yet to take place. Members of the Panel recommended that conditions be put on the planning application ensuring that it did take place.

Members of the Panel enquired about a mitigation strategy for the chapel. It was noted that a number of groups would be interested in the features of the chapel and what would happen to them in the future. Hospital representatives stated that a meeting took place last year with the League of Nurses, out of which came the request to catalogue the artefacts in the chapel. The follow up meeting on a way forward was yet to happen. It wouldn't be dealt with until March. The conservation plans would be produced at the Panel would be welcome to consider them. Discussions have been held with the Bishop of Leicester on a suitable way forward.

Members of the Panel queried about the plans for a replacement chapel. Hospital representatives explained that the plans were being drawn up to create a Christian and multi faith facility at the centre of the site. A working group was considering the detail of this proposal.

Members of the Panel asked about the elements of the general hospital that would be retained and whether original features could be returned where they

have been lost. There would be some losses to the original building where there had been widescale alterations, but retention where possible was considered important. The conservation plan recommends that where possible, original features should be returned. The Panel felt that the important issue with this building was that surrounding buildings didn't drown it out. It noted that the building would be flanked by car parking.

The Chair thanked the Hospital representatives for their attendance and commented that he looked forward to their return in March.

66. DECISIONS MADE BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

The Service Director, Environment submitted a report on decisions made by the Development Control Committee on planning applications previously considered by the Conservation Advisory Panel.

RESOLVED:

that the report be received and the decisions taken, be noted.

67. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 13 SOUTHAMPTON STREET

Planning Application 20052293 Conservation Area Consent 20052294 Demolition & residential development

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing Spa buildings which were formerly the hide skin and fat market and the redevelopment of the site with a multi-storey building for 87 flats, offices and shops with two bars on the ground floor.

The Panel noted that this building was amongst the oldest and most important industrial vernacular in the area. The demolition of the building should be resisted and that conversion should be pursued to complement other conversion schemes in the area, perhaps as live/work units. The Panel felt that the proposed replacement building would not respect the character of the conservation area or the adjacent listed building.

B) 42/48 BELGRAVE GATE, FORMER ABC CINEMA

Planning Permission 20052172 Redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the redevelopment of the site with buildings ranging from six to ten storeys for residential, hotel, casino, retail, financial and professional services, restaurant and café with basement car parking.

The Panel thought that the proposed new building did not respect the context of the site and would dominate Belgrave Gate. They also felt that the proposal lacked the architectural quality that should be sought for new buildings in the

city.

C) BISHOP STREET, REFERENCE LIBRARY
Listed Building Consent 20052246
Internal Ramp

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed a new lift shaft for the external rear elevation of the building in November. The current application was for a new internal ramped access.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

D) 25-27 BEDE STREET
Planning Application 20052209
Rear extension

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed the conversion of this building to flats at a meeting in the summer of last year. This new application was for an extension to the rear elevation, which would be visible from Braunstone Gate.

The Panel were opposed to the design of the proposed extension as it would ruin the attractive roofline of the building. There was no objection to an extension in principle.

E) 62-64 CHURCH GATE
Planning Application 20052353
Three storey building

The Director noted that the Panel had considered an application for the demolition of the two storey building on the corner of Church Gate and St. Peters Lane and redevelopment with a three storey building in September 1996. It was the resultant archaeological report that led to the building being listed. The building has recently been de-listed and subsequently demolished and the current application was for a new three storey building.

The Panel accepted the principle of the new build and commended the use of natural materials. Concerns were raised over the blank east elevation expressing a desire for more detailing on this elevation. They noted that Leicester had a good history of developing corner sites and they felt that this proposal did not exploit the opportunity afforded a corner plot.

F) 8-10 MILLSTONE LANE
Listed Building Consent 20052338 & Planning Application 20052341
Awnings

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed external alterations to this building at a recent meeting. This application was for awnings to the interior and exterior of the building.

The Panel expressed no concerns over the addition of the awnings.

**G) EAST GATES, HIGH STREET, CHURCH GATE, NEW BOND STREET
Planning Application 20052347
New entrances**

The Director noted that the application was for new entrances to the Shires.

The Panel considered that all the proposed entrances were inferior to the existing. Concerns were raised in particular that the High Street entrance would block views of the old Co-op façade that returns along what used to be Union Street. Therefore it was felt that the proposals did not preserve or enhance the character of the building or the conservation area.

**H) 11 – 13 MARKET STREET
Advertisement Consent 20052049
Signage**

The Director noted that the Panel had discussed new shopfronts to this building at the last meeting. This application was for new internally illuminated fascia and projecting signs.

The Panel made no adverse comments.

**I) 31 MARKET STREET
Advertisement Consent 20052180
Signage**

The Director said that the application was for a new internally illuminated fascia sign and one internally illuminated projecting sign.

The Panel expressed concerns that the work had been carried out without planning permission but thought that the signage was acceptable. They also made observations on the unauthorised shopfront and thought that it was not as good as the one removed. It was noted that the ground floor level character of Market Street, which had one of the finest collection of quality, diverse architectural styles in the city, was gradually being eroded. It was queried whether any funding could be used to improve the shop frontages along Market Street to halt this trend.

**J) HIGHCROSS STREET, RED LION PH
Planning Application 20052053
Change of use & external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the upper floors of the pub to two flats with minor changes to the rear was on the B list at the December meeting. This application was for alterations to the front elevation

which included the removal of the existing bay window and the insertion concertina style windows.

The Panel considered that the proposed alterations to the frontage were detrimental to the character of this historic building and the adjacent Grade II listed building.

K) 24 CAREYS CLOSE
Planning Application 20052319
Antennae and equipment cabinet

The Director said that the application was for three antennae within a chimney shroud and an equipment cabinet on the roof.

The Panel accepted the principle of undertaking the work but felt that the cable runs were unnecessarily convoluted and they should be shortened and located within the left hand corner 'L' of the rear elevation where they would have less visual impact.

L) 8-10 HIGHFIELD STREET
Planning Application 20052328
New Shopfront

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront, external roller shutters and a canopy to the front of the restaurant.

The Panel thought that the symmetrical shopfront was an improvement but felt that the stall risers would be too high and should be timber. The roller shutter was acceptable in principle subject to it being an approved conservation type i.e. chain mail or punched and powder coated.

M) PREBEND STREET, THE BRADGATE HOTEL
Planning Application 20052149
New Porches

The Director said that the application was for two new porches to the front of the hotel.

The Panel were of the opinion that the proposed porches were out of character with the building and would ruin the appearance of the elegant front door. This was considered to be a key feature of the building and therefore the proposal did not preserve or enhance the character of the building or the conservation area.

N) 9 PORTLAND ROAD
Planning Application 20052356
Demolition, rebuild

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of a lean to as the side of the house and the demolition and rebuilding of a single storey building

to the rear.

The Panel were happy with the demolition of the side lean to and the new entrance. It was noted though that consideration should be given to the surface treatment of the newly exposed side elevation, which was currently painted white.

There was some confusion regarding the use of the rear 'workshop' and the Panel wanted more information on the intended use before making any decisions.

**O) 57 RUTLAND STREET
Planning Application 20052405
Antennae & equipment cabinet**

The Director said the application was for three antennae and associated equipment cabinet etc.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

The Panel raised no objection to the following and they were therefore not formally considered.

**P) 44 ST JAMES ROAD
Planning Application 20051885
Replacement windows to rear**

**Q) 34 STRETTON ROAD
Planning Application 20051882
Replacement windows to rear**

**R) 8 GORDON AVENUE
Planning Application 20051886
Replacement window to rear**

**S) 177 MERE ROAD
Planning Application 20051888
Replacement windows to rear**

**T) 6 AVENUE ROAD
Planning Application 20052332
Rear extension**

68. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Mr Burrows noted that there would be a public meeting on the Old Humberstone Conservation Area within the next two weeks.

Officers also noted that there would a similar meeting to do with the Market Street Conservation Area held at New Walk Centre.

Mr. Burrows queried whether the old Red Cross shop on King Street had received change of use permission to an estate agent. Officers confirmed that they had.

Officers noted that the local plan was nearing completion, therefore the draft Local List would become the official Local List.

69. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.05pm.

