



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
J. Dean	-	Royal Town Planning Institute
P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
M.Elliott	-	Person having appropriate specialist knowledge
D. Hollingsworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
R Roenisch	-	Victorian Society
P. Swallow	-	Person having appropriate 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

* * * * *

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from S. Bowyer and K. Chhapi.

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Garrity declared a personal interest in all the business on the agenda, as she was a member of the Planning and Development Control Committee. She agreed not to express any opinions on any of the planning applications being considered by the Panel.

21. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

K. Chhapi pointed out prior to the meeting that the wrong organisation had been put next to his name in the minutes.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 28 June 2006 be confirmed as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

22. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

23. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Chair noted that the Panel had previously recommended a number of refusals and it was welcomed to see the agreement of the Committee and Officers in this matter.

A query was raised regarding the amendments that were required on the Bath Lane Merlin Works tower block development. Officers commented that the amendments related to a large number of conditions with regard to materials to be used in the construction of the building, details of which, it was expected would be brought to the Panel. Officers also noted that the owners of the site had not been encouraged to pursue a third tower on the site.

24. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 195 NARBOROUGH ROAD

Conservation Area Consent 20061103 & Planning Application 20061104 Demolition and redevelopment

The Director noted that the Committee had previously considered an application for the demolition of the rear coach house, which had recently been damaged by fire, and the redevelopment of the site with a three storey block of flats which was refused for a number of reasons. A new detached building was proposed which largely replicated the size of the previous coach house and would be used for office purposes.

The Panel were of the opinion that the proportions were wrong on the proposed building. It was also felt that if the proposed building was due to be an office use, it should be a good modern design building for that specific purpose.

Overall the Panel had no objection to the proposed use of the building or the size, but it was felt that the design was a poor copy of a coach house.

B) WALNUT STREET BRIDGE

Listed Building Consent 20060913 Repairs

The Director said that the application was for repairs to the bridge following damage caused by a traffic accident. The work involved the reinstatement of a section of the cast iron parapet.

The Panel noted that it was proposed to use a stronger type of metal to replace the missing section of bridge. The Panel considered the issues relating to using a different type of metal or replacing it with cast iron as it was originally. These were

The Panel recommended that the missing section of the bridge be replaced with cast iron as it had originally, with other means of safeguarding the bridge being utilised for safety purposes. It was however commented that should the alternative metal be used then it should not mean a precedent had been set for the replacement of other sections of the bridge with a similar material.

C) MARKET PLACE
Planning Application 20060790
Food Court

The Director said that the application was for the removal of stalls within the retail market and installation of a new food court.

It was recommended that the design of the canopy would be 'light hearted' in its choice of colours and materials.

The Panel commented that they had no objection to the design of the canopy, but noted that views of the Corn Exchange would be impeded and walkway routes would be lost.

The Panel expressed concern about the encroachment in the Market Place of what appear to be further permanent structures.

Concern was also expressed about the social consequences of the development such as litter and a place for youths to congregate.

D) HUMBERSTONE GATE / CLOCKTOWER
Advertisement Consent 20061192
Signs

The Director said that the application was for new signage for the former Littlewoods building.

The Panel noted the application for signage and expressed concern regarding the proposed internal illumination. It was also noted that the artist's impressions of the signage also showed further proposals for the building not covered by the current application.

The Panel therefore felt that this building was at an important prominent site, which was too important for a piecemeal development. A thorough rethink of

the whole façade should be considered which took the importance of the clock tower into account.

E) CHARLES STREET BAPTIST CHURCH
Advertisement Consent 20060926
Signs

The Director said that the application was for two freestanding sign boards to replace existing ones within the front forecourt.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

F) 51 GALLOWTREE GATE
Advertisement Consent 20060954
New projecting signs

The Director said that the application was for two internally illuminated projecting signs on each street frontage. The applicant was also intending to install an internal internally illuminated sign, which didn't require planning permission but the planning authority could object once it was in place.

The Panel noted that there was a preference for external illumination in sites such as this, but it was agreed that it could look cluttered in this location. It was recommended that the existing sign could be moved to make it an equal distance from the door as the proposed sign.

G) 122-124 GRANBY STREET
Planning Application 20060938
External alterations

The Director said that the application was for external alterations comprising of a new extract flue, new conservatory and bricking up of an existing opening and the formation of a new one. The work is confined to the rear and rear / side elevations but visible from the street scene. The flue was the main issue for the Panel's consideration.

The Panel felt that an internal solution for the positioning of the flue should be sought.

H) 2 ST JAMES TERRACE
Planning Application 20061162
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the house to four self-contained flats. The proposal involved a first floor extension over an existing double garage and other external alterations.

The Panel raised no objection to the change of use. The proposed extension was considered to be a very poor design and looked out of place. It was felt that the gaps in between the houses were a feature of the conservation area

and should be retained. Therefore it was recommended that this part of the application be refused.

I) 209 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20052291
New windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the existing windows with ones made from uPVC. The building dates from the early 1970s.

The Panel noted that uPVC had been accepted in modern buildings elsewhere in conservation areas, but commented that this should not be a precedent. The Panel didn't however wish to see a range of different windows in the building making it look untidy.

J) 62A LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20061203
New rear windows

The Director said that the application was for three telecommunication antennas with associated equipment cabinets.

The Panel felt that the proposed antennae would be visible and would ruin an attractive feature of the building. It was therefore recommended that an alternative, less obtrusive position be sought.

K) 48 FOSSE ROAD CENTRAL
Planning Application 20061054
New rear windows

The Director said that the application was for new uPVC windows to the rear of the property. The windows would be visible from Norfolk Street.

The Panel noted that there were a number of precedents in the street where uPVC had already been used. It was therefore recommended that if uPVC had to be used it should seek to replicate an original sliding sash design.

L) 237 AYLESTONE ROAD
Listed Building Consent 20061013
Extension to rear

The Director said that the application was for an extension to the rear of the building, to allow the resident to create an internal bathroom.

The Panel noted the difficulty with the houses on this part of Aylestone Road, as they were not very deep, therefore it was felt that the extension proposed was a sensitive as could be expected in the circumstances.

A potential difficulty was noted with the ventilation grid on the wall next door that the proposed extension would cover over.

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

M) RAWSON STREET, KENNETH HOLMES
Planning Application 20061059
New Fence

N) 115 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application 20061134
Change of use

O) 278 EAST PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20060931
New fence

P) 27 PARK VALE ROAD
Planning Application 20061053
New windows

25. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.37pm.

