



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 15 MARCH 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garitty

Councillor O'Brien

- | | | |
|-------------|---|------------------------------------------------|
| S. Bowyer | - | English Heritage |
| S. Britton | - | University of Leicester |
| J. Burrows | - | Leicester Civic Society |
| P. Draper | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors |
| M.Elliott | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |
| R Rosenisch | - | Victorian 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 |

* * * * *

77. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from Tim Abbott, Kanti Chhapi, John Dean, Councillor Henry and Alan McWhirr.

78. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Garrity declared a personal interest in the business on the agenda as she was Chair of the Development Control Committee. She agreed to make no prejudicial judgements on any of the items for consideration.

79. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

It was noted that the attendance for the previous meeting was incorrect, this was to be corrected for the final version of the minutes.

It was also felt that at the last meeting the Panel expressed concerns about the 'applications for information' relating to a large number of properties that were having uPVC windows installed to the rear of these properties. Concerns were made regarding the number of them and the principle of the uPVC windows. Concern was also expressed that the applicant was the Council's Housing Department.

RESOLVED:

that, subject to the above amendments noted above, the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 15 February 2006 be confirmed as a correct record.

80. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Membership

The Committee Administrator reported that Nick Bennett, representing the Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust would no longer be attending the Panel. He had given details of a replacement, Ms. D. E. Martin who it was proposed to attend future meetings.

It was also noted that Tim Abbott, representing the Royal Town Planning Institute would also no longer be attending Panel meetings. His replacement was proposed to be John Dean former Chief Planning Officer of Leicester City.

It was noted that Jackie Scott, Chartered Architect would also no longer be attending Panel meetings. She proposed that local architect Chris Sawday be her replacement.

Terms of Reference

The Panel's Terms of Reference were circulated at the meeting.

Steve Bowyer commented that the Terms of Reference didn't detail how the Panel's comments were taken forward. He recommended that a set of working protocols were developed to address this.

John Burrows expressed concerns that the Panel didn't get informed about where a planning application refusal had been appealed. Officers commented that they often didn't know about appeals and commented that it wouldn't help the work of the Panel if they were notified. If further support from the Panel was needed it was sought as had previously happened. Members of the Panel however felt that it would be interesting to know what was happening with regard to appeals.

Steve Bowyer also commented on the Terms of Reference. He commented that they indicated that the Panel advised the Development Control Committee, not officers as was currently the case. Officers commented that the Terms of Reference would need updating to reflect current delegation arrangements.

Concerns were expressed that the way the comments of the Panel were reported in the Development Control papers did not give sufficient detail of the discussions. Officers noted that the comments of the Panel were kept brief to put forward a consensus view which would carry more weight than differing views.

Councillor Garrity said that she welcomed the opportunity to attend the Panel and that it enhanced her knowledge of those applications before the Panel. She noted that Councillors needed update training every year and felt that there may be an opportunity for a CAP representative to address the training meeting.

RESOLVED:

that a meeting be held with the Chair, Councillor Garrity, Judith Carstairs and Steve Bowyer to agree a set of working protocols for the Panel and Development Control.

Letter from Councillor Kitterick

A letter was circulated from Councillor Patrick Kitterick at the previous meeting outlining the reasons why the Labour group didn't attend Panel meetings.

The Panel felt that this letter should be responded to. Rowan Roenisch circulated a number of reasons why she felt that it was important to have Labour Councillors attending the Panel. Overall it was felt that Councillors could enhance their understanding of planning applications by attending the Panel and that it, in no way prejudiced them making decisions on these applications at Development Control meetings.

Rowan Roenisch agreed to draft a letter which the Chair would sign.

81. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Service Director, Environment submitted a report on decisions made by the Leicester City Council on planning applications previously considered by the Conservation Advisory Panel.

Concerns were expressed with regard to the approval, under delegated powers, of 215 Evington Lane, despite there being objections by both Conservation Officers and the Panel. Officers commented that procedures in development control have been looked at in light of this decision. Members of the Panel proposed that their regret at the loss of this building be recorded.

RESOLVED:

(1) that the Panel expresses its regret at the loss of the building

at 215 Evington Lane; and

- (2) that the report be received and the decisions taken be noted.

82. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 134 HIGHCROSS STREET Conservation Area Consent 20052410 Demolition

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the building.

The Panel did not wish to see the main building or the workshop to the rear demolished. They sought further clarification on whether or not the building could be saved and also the redevelopment plans for the site. The importance of maintaining the surviving historical buildings in this area was emphasised.

B) 215 EVINGTON LANE Planning Application 20060218 Three Storey block of flats

The Director said that the application was for a three storey building for twelve one-bedroom flats within the grounds of 215 Evington Lane which had recently been granted Conservation Area Consent for demolition subject to a suitable replacement scheme. The Panel had previously observations for a new build of 16 flats at the end of 2005.

The Panel were dismayed that the detached house had been granted consent for demolition. The proposed flats were considered to be out of scale with the existing house, the design was bland and top heavy and overall would not preserve or enhance the conservation area.

C) 118 CHARLES STREET Planning Application 20060285 Roof extension

The Director said that the application was for an extension to the roof to provide two self contained flats. Consent for the conversion of the upper floors to four flats was approved in the previous year.

The Panel noted that this building was an award winning building by the nationally noted architects Symington Prince and Pike. It was considered that any roof extension would be inappropriate on such a special building.

D) GIPSY LANE, TOWERS HOSPITAL Planning Application 20032022 Housing Development

The Director noted that the Panel had previously considered this application for

twelve houses with associated roads, as well as the listed building application for demolition of buildings within the curtilage of the Hospital, in November 2003. The application was held back pending further amendments that have now been received.

The Panel felt that the amendments to the scheme were acceptable although it was recommended that the rear boundary wall that runs through the site be finished to a high quality as this would be seen from Gipsy Lane.

E) GIPSY LANE, TOWERS HOSPITAL
Planning Application 20032021
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the nurses home to thirty self contained flats. As with the previous application, it had been held back pending further amendments that had now been received. The Panel also considered this application in 2003.

The Panel felt that the amendments to the previous scheme addressed all of their previous concerns.

F) GWENDOLEN ROAD / ETHEL ROAD, GENERAL HOSPITAL
Planning Application 20060226
New development

The Director said that the application was for new five and six storey buildings for planned care and rehabilitation, educational and training and other associated uses, with car parking and vehicular access. The Panel received a presentation regarding the hospital proposals in January.

The Panel were pleased that the historic 1904 building was to be retained but expressed some concerns over the proposed setting of the building which is to be surrounded by car parking. They felt it would be preferable to see the building complimented by similar scale buildings.

G) 12 CHEAPSIDE
Planning Application 20060229, Listed building consent 20060235
Change of use, flue

The Director said that the application was for an internal flue, which would run up through the upper floors and egress through the rear roof slope. The proposal also involved the change of use of part of the ground floor from retail to retail and hot food takeaway.

The Panel considered the proposed works to be acceptable.

H) 209 AYLESTONE ROAD
Listed Building Consent 20060107
Alterations

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the rear outbuildings, replacement timber windows, new french doors and a rear roof light.

The Panel welcomed the replacement window to the front elevation and had no objections to the proposed alterations to the rear.

I) THE NEWARKE, HAWTHORN BUILDING
Planning Application 20060315
Alterations to front entrance doors

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the existing timber doors with automatic sliding doors at the front of the building.

The Panel recommended that the existing fabric be retained with the proposed glass sliding doors set behind. This would allow the wooden doors to be opened back during the day and still provide a glazed foyer within, but would also maintain the character of the building when closed.

J) ST NICHOLAS PLACE, SURFACE CAR PARK
Planning Application 20060237
Internally illuminated freestanding information / advertisement panel

The Director said that the application was for an illuminated freestanding information / advertisement panel. It is a follow up application to one for a panel outside 104 High Street that was previously refused.

The Panel made no adverse observations and congratulated the Development Control officer for negotiating a satisfactory scheme.

K) 23-25 ST NICHOLAS PLACE
Planning Application 20060196
Internally illuminated signs

The Director said that the application was for an internally illuminated fascia and projecting sign. The application was retrospective.

The Panel agreed a reluctant approval but raised concerns that advertisement styles that were inappropriate in conservation areas seemed to gain approval.

L) 65 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20060196
Alterations to shopfront

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the shopfront which meant re-working the front to move the entrance to the middle.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

M) ELMFIELD AVENUE, ELMFIELD GARDENS 6,8,10 AND 12

Planning Application 20060050
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for replacement of the original single glazed Crittall windows with metal double glazed units.

The Panel noted that the new windows were not as well proportioned as the originals, but raised no formal objection to their retention.

N) 49 GIPSY LANE
Planning Application 20060133
Two – Storey extension

The Director said that the application was for a two-storey extension. The Panel had previously made observations on a previous scheme to extend the building in 2004 but that was subsequently withdrawn.

The Panel felt that this proposal was little better than the previous one and considered the size of the extension to be over development of the site. They did not wish to completely lose sight of the old pub by shrouding it with extensions and felt that views of the rear should be retained.

O) 24 NEWTOWN STREET, 36 TOWER STREET
Planning Application 20060335
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the two properties into five self-contained flats. The proposal involved opening up three blind windows and inserting timber sashes.

The Panel were agreeable to timber sash windows being fitted into the three blind windows provided they were proper working sashes and not top hung.

P) 100 WELFORD ROAD
Planning Application 20060201
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for replacement uPVC windows to the rear of the building. The rear was rebuilt in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

The Panel felt that although this was a modern rebuild of the rear section of the building, it was sympathetic to the original building and therefore the windows should be top hung timber replacements.

Q) HUMBERSTONE ROAD, HUMBERSTONE PARK
Planning Application 20060230
New toilet block

The Director said that the application was for a new freestanding toilet block to

the rear of Meadow House.

The Panel was happy with the principal of a toilet block in this location but as it was close to the historic house it should read as an outbuilding, drawing on elements of the main house for its design and materials.

The Chair agreed to accept the following late item of business:-

**TRINITY HOSPITAL
Planning Application 2006
Internal alterations**

The Director said that the application was for internal alterations which included widening a hatch in the entrance, removing walls and infilling doors.

The Panel wished to see the proposed blocking of the doorways achieved by retaining the doors in situ. They also questioned the need to open up the 'serving hatch' vertically as well as horizontally.

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

**R) 42 FOSSE ROAD CENTRAL
Planning Application 2006009
Change of use**

**S) 16 ASHLEIGH ROAD
Planning Application 20060213
Change of use**

**T) 10 STONEYGATE ROAD
Planning Application 20060208
Change of use**

83. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Date of next meeting

It was agreed to move the date of the next meeting from 19 April to 26 April.

Churchgate Conservation Area

It was queried when the conservation area directory would be updated to include the new Churchgate Conservation Area.

84. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting close at 7.00pm.

