



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 26 APRIL 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor O'Brien

- |             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| S. Britton  | - | University of Leicester                            |
| J. Burrows  | - | Leicester Civic Society                            |
| K. Chhapi   | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects   |
| J. Dean     | - | Royal Town Planning Institute                      |
| J. Eaton    | - | Ancient Monuments Society                          |
| D. Martin   | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust           |
| A. McWhirr  | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee              |
| R Rosenisch | - | Victorian Society                                  |
| C. Sawday   | - | Person of Specialist Knowledge                     |
| D Smith     | - | Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society |
| P. Swallow  | - | Person of Specialist Knowledge                     |

**Officers in Attendance:**

- |              |   |   |
|--------------|---|---|
| J. Carstairs | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| J. Crooks    | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| D. Windwood  | - | Development Control, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department       |
| F. Connolly  | - | Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity<br>Department |

\* \* \* \* \*

**85. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies from S. Bowyer, P. Draper, R. Gill and Cllr. Henry.

**86. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Simon Britton and John Eaton declared interests in Current Development Proposals, Appendix E – c) 32/34 Elms Road.

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.

#### **87. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Rowan Roenisch pointed out that her name was spelt wrong on the minutes.

RESOLVED:

that, subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the Panel held on 15 March 2006 be confirmed as a correct record.

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

There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

#### **89. RESPONSE TO QUESTION ASKED AT FULL COUNCIL**

Attached to the papers was a response to a question asked at full Council by John Burrows regarding planning applications approved under delegated powers without the Panel having commented on them.

The response was noted by the Panel.

#### **90. OFFICER INVOLVEMENT IN CAP**

A meeting was held on 4 April 2006 to discuss the working arrangements of the Panel and its relationship to Development Control. The notes of this meeting were attached to the papers and contained some recommendations about the future working arrangements of the Panel. The new working arrangements were planned in view of the reductions approved as part of the recent city council budget.

As part of the new working arrangements it was intended that more information about the applications would be included on the agenda papers, the meeting would start later to allow for time for viewing plans prior to the meeting, there would be no plans on the powerpoint presentation. It was also intended that the meeting would take on a different style with the discussion being of a more question and answer style format.

A member of the Panel noted the current high level of delegation for planning application approvals, but it was queried whether a report was still compiled for each application. Officers confirmed there was a report for each application.

A member of the Panel agreed that the new arrangements could be trialled, but sought assurance that officers would still be able to guide panel members on the applications. Officers confirmed that they would be able to do this.

A member of the Panel felt that this represented a worrying trend as similar

changes were being undertaken to conservation panels in other authorities.

A query was raised about the Panel's involvement in appeals. Officers explained that if they were involved in an appeal process, then they would inform the Panel of their involvement.

On a related matter it was noted that the appeal for 1 Knighton Park Road, which the panel had commented on had been dismissed.

**RESOLVED:**

that the Panel trial the proposed new working arrangements.

**91. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL**

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

It was noted that the report format had been amended to include the views of the Conservation Officers.

**RESOLVED:**

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

**92. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**A) 142 CHARLES STREET, 2 CHURCH STREET (SPREAD EAGLE PUB)  
Conservation Area Consent 20060499 Planning Application 20052437  
Demolition & Redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the Spread Eagle Public House and the adjacent 1950's building and the redevelopment of the site with a seven storey mixed use comprising retail at ground floor level, offices on the first to fourth floors and restaurant / bar on upper floors and basement level car parking. The application was essentially a resubmission of a previous proposal that was considered at the CAP meeting last July.

The Panel were deeply dismayed at the treatment of the Spread Eagle PH. Enforcement action was supported to restore the building. The Panel reiterated its view that the building, along with the police station maintained the 1930s scale in this part of Charles Street, and provided a nice gateway to Church Street and the Churchyard. The new building was too large, would detract from the setting of the listed police station and did not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

**B) 111 – 121 HIGHCROSS STREET  
Planning Application 20060517  
Demolition and Redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing

factory building and the redevelopment of the site with a five storey building for 22 flats with basement car parking.

The Panel accepted the principle of demolition of the existing building. It was however felt that the proposed building was badly designed, too high and completely out of scale with the adjacent two storey listed building. It was also considered to be detrimental to the setting of the church and churchyard. The Panel recommended that the maximum height should be set at three storeys with a design that complimented the adjacent listed buildings.

**C) 32 – 34 ELMS ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060554**  
**Demolition and Redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing student accommodation and redevelopment of the site with 19 houses.

The Panel accepted the demolition of the existing buildings and were generally happy with the new development. They suggested that the main houses on the Elms Road frontage could be set back to be more in line with existing building lines and their design improved by taking elements of the architectural style of the adjacent buildings including the use of whitewashed stucco.

**D) 11 UPPER BROWN STREET**  
**Planning Application 20060510**  
**Change of use from factory to residential, roof extension and external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the building to 20 flats, with commercial storage facilities in the ground floor and a roof extension. The Panel had previously considered applications for the redevelopment of the site.

The panel welcomed the retention of the building and had no objection to the roof extension or replacement windows.

**E) BELGRAVE GATE / ABBEY PARK ROAD / MEMORY LANE WHARF**  
**Reserved Matters Application 20060589**  
**Siting, design and external appearance of college building, car parking, landscaping and public realm works**

The Director said that the application was for reserved matters relating to the redevelopment of the Leicester College site. Outline consent for the redevelopment was granted in Sept 2005.

The Panel considered that the proposed building was 'grim and bulky' and did not preserve or enhance the setting of the nearby St Marks Church and the School Rooms. It was noted that this was a good opportunity to create a new building of architectural excellence that could both compliment the listed buildings and exploit the waterside site.

**F) ST PETERS CHURCH, WOODSHAW RISE, BRAUNSTONE**  
**Planning Application 20060369**  
**Spot lights and security cameras**

The Director said that the application was for lighting and security cameras to the 1970's north porch, 1930's extension, west elevation, buttresses of the medieval tower and south elevation including the Queen Anne porch.

The Panel accepted the need for security cameras but suggested that these be kept to a minimum. They suggested that it would be a good chance to use the lighting to illuminate the building to create a nighttime feature similar to other historic buildings, Lincoln Cathedral was mentioned as an example.

**G) ELMFIELD AVENUE**  
**Planning Application 20060470**  
**Change of use to flats, extensions**

The Director said that the application was on a Victorian house which was in use as part of the Stoneygate School until the land was developed and the main school building was converted to flats. The application was for the conversion of the building to five self contained flats. The proposal included a first floor rear extension and alterations to the roof.

The Panel were of the opinion that the proposed works were excessive and would like to see the building remain as it was with the flat conversion undertaken within the existing fabric.

**H) BARRATT CLOSE, REAR OF 7-11 STONEYGATE ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060438**  
**Garages with flats above**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed this site, most recently in 2003 for a block of flats. The current application was for two flats with garages below.

The Panel noted that the character of this part of Stoneygate was one of large buildings with plenty of surrounding open space. It was felt that putting another building into the site that already has consent for a large block of flats would be out of character with the conservation area and over development of the site.

**I) 12 ST JOHNS ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060529**  
**Change of use, dormer extensions**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the house to a house and two self-contained flats. The proposal involved a dormer extension and a three-storey side extension. This was a revised scheme to the one that

the Panel made comments on last Summer which was subsequently refused.

The Panel considered the proposed alterations to be detrimental to the character of the building and the conservation area.

**J) 41 STONEYGATE ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060548**  
**Extension to side**

The Director said that the application was for a single storey extension to the side of the building, replacement fire escape and forecourt car parking.

The Panel accepted the principle of a side extension but felt that the design should be more complimentary to the design of the house. It was suggested that an internal fire escape should be investigated. They were opposed to the loss of the front garden for a car standing area and commented that the damaged retaining wall should be repaired.

**K) 2 HOWARD ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060553**  
**Flat development**

The Director noted that Panel had previously considered an application for two pairs of houses on this site. The current application was for two three storey flat blocks.

The Panel considered that the approved housing scheme was far better suited to the character of this section of the conservation area than the proposed three storey flat development.

**L) 56 DANESHILL ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060397**  
**Change of use, external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the end town house to seven bedsits. The proposal involved the removal of a chimney on the rear outrigger, a new dormer window to the rear roof slope and additional windows.

The Panel was opposed to the proposed external changes to the property and the number of units proposed.

**M) 16 MARKET STREET**  
**Planning Application 20060478 & Advertisement Consent 20060479**  
**New shopfront & signs**

The Director noted that the building was the classically styled Midland Auction Mart of 1876, one of the buildings of particular note that made up the rich tapestry of styles on Market Street. This application was for a new shopfront and internally illuminated fascia and projecting sign.

The Panel considered that the existing timber shopfront was more in keeping with the building than the one proposed. They were opposed to internal illumination but would accept halo lit signage.

**N) 59 PRINCESS ROAD WEST**

**Planning Application 20060503, Listed Building Consent 20060533**

**Change of use, internal alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the former house currently used as offices to a single dwelling with ancillary office use. The proposal involved internal alterations.

The Panel welcomed the conversion back to a single dwelling and the revisions removing the number of en suite bathrooms. They queried the proposed demolition and suggested this should be re-advertised.

**O) 22 FRIAR LANE**

**Planning Application 20060573, Listed Building Consent 20060468**

**Roof garden to rear elevation**

The Director said the application was for the alterations to the modern single storey extension to rear of the building to create a roof garden.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

**P) 103 MAIN STREET, HUMBERSTONE**

**Planning Application 20060441**

**Detached house**

The Director said that the application was for a new detached house within the land adjacent to no. 103 Main Street.

The Panel considered that the proposed house would not affect the character of the conservation area.

**Q) 2 HALSTEAD STREET**

**Planning Application 20060441**

**Detached house**

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the non original rear windows with similarly proportioned uPVC and the replacement of the side windows, currently ill proportioned louvered windows with traditionally proportioned softwood top hung sashes.

THE PANEL RELUCTANTLY CONCEDED THAT TOP HUNG WOODEN SASHES WERE AN IMPROVEMENT TO THE EXISTING LOUVRED WINDOWS ON THE SIDE ELEVATION. THE PANEL PREFERRED PROPER WORKING SASHES. THE PANEL WAS OPPOSED TO UPVC REPLACEMENTS AT THE REAR.

**R) 1 MAIN STREET, BRAUNSTONE**  
**Planning Application 20060367**  
**Window replacement**

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the ground floor front window with a new single glazed timber window.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

**S) HALL LANE / DISRAELI STREET**  
**Planning Application 20060507**  
**Three storey flat development**

The Director said that the application was for a three storey building for 24 flats.

The Panel considered the scale and height to be acceptable. However they recommended that better design was required. Traditional materials were preferable but more unusual materials could be acceptable as part of a superior scheme.

**T) 151 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20060539**  
**Change of use from church to hot food takeaways and replacement shopfronts**

The Director said that the application was for a change of use to three hot food takeaway units and new shopfronts.

THE PANEL THOUGHT THAT THREE TAKEAWAYS WERE AN UNACCEPTABLE USE OF THIS HISTORIC BUILDING. THE PANEL CONCEDED THAT IF AN ACCEPTABLE USE CAME IN, ALTERATIONS TO THE GROUND FLOOR WHICH WERE SYMPATHETIC TO THE BUILDING WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE - IN ORDER TO SEE THE CONTINUED USE OF THE BUILDING.

**U) LANCASTER ROAD FIRE STATION**  
**Planning Application 20060508**  
**Security fencing and gate**

The Director said that the application was for a new security gate and metal railings to an existing wall to enclose the rear yard area.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

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

**V) 34 SEVERN STREET**



**Planning Application 20060527  
Replacement rear windows**

**W) 3 SEYMOUR STREET  
Planning Application 20060200  
Replacement rear windows**

**X) 5 SEYMOUR STREET  
Planning Application 20060202  
Replacement rear windows**

**Y) 4 – 6 COLLEGE STREET  
Planning Application 20060582  
Replacement rear windows and door**

**Z) 17 LINCOLN STREET  
Planning Application 20060582  
Replacement rear windows an door**

**AA) 5 CAMDEN STREET  
Planning Application 20060458  
Change of use, roof extension**

**AB) 26 MAIN STREET, EVINGTON  
Advertisement Consent 20060456  
Change of use, roof extension**

### **93. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

#### Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the date of the next meeting would be Wednesday 24 May 2006.

#### Enforcement Issues

A member of the Panel queried what follow up work took place to ensure that planning applications were carried out according to the approved plan. Concerns were noted about certain approvals which hadn't been carried out properly such as the Liberty statue and the thatched roof house in Evington.

Officers commented that planning officers checked the materials that were being used for any development. Planning Officers also carried out random checks.

Councillor Garrity commented that there was a reliance on the public to report problems and she encouraged people to raise such matters.

### John Burrows

John Burrows announced that this was to be his last meeting. The Chair thanked John for all his efforts during his time spent on the Panel and that his contributions would be missed by all members.

John noted that his replacement would be Derek Hollingworth. Derek would have a deputy in this role who would be Jenny Westmoreland.

### **94. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.10pm.

