



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 17 JANUARY 2007 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| S. Britton | - | University of Leicester |
| D. Hollingworth | - | Leicester Civic Society |
| K. Chhapi | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects |
| D. Martin | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust |
| P. Draper | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors |
| M.Elliott | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |
| R Roenisch | - | Victorian Society |
| A. McWhirr | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee |
| J. Dean | - | Royal Town Planning Institute |
| P. Swallow | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |
| D. Smith | - | Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors |
| C. Sawday | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |

Officers in Attendance:

- | | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| J. Carstairs | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department |
| Jane Crooks | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department |
| Jeremy Crooks | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department |
| M. Reeves | - | Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity
Department |

* * * * *

63. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from P. Draper, M. Elliot, A. McWhirr and Cllr. O'Brien.

64. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Garrity declared that she was a member of the Development Control Committee and therefore undertook to give no opinions on any of the business on the agenda for the meeting.

K. Chhapi declared that he had a personal interest in the late item, Former Church Rooms, Clarendon Park Road.

65. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 13 December 2006 be confirmed as a correct record.

66. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Former Spread Eagle Pub

Members of the Panel hoped that lessons would be learnt from the loss of this building and that where enforcement notices were given, then they should be pursued, before any other action was taken. Officers explained that it would have been their preference to pursue the enforcement notice, but once the planning approval had been given this was pointless.

A query was raised regarding the façade design of the proposed building and whether changes were included in the planning approval conditions. Officers explained that design changes couldn't be included as a condition of the planning approval.

A Panel member noted that this was a wide issue that was occurring across the country. It was difficult to address at Government level because the responsibilities for planning and conservation matters were split between two departments, Communities and Local Government and Culture, Media and Sport.

Jeremy Crooks

Congratulations were given to Jeremy on his recent appointment to the Building Conservation Officer post.

67. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Service Director, Planning and Policy submitted a report on the decisions made by Leicester City Council on planning applications previously considered by the Panel.

RESOLVED:

that the report be noted.

68. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) QUEEN STREET / ST GEORGE STREET

Pre-application enquiry

Major development

The Director said that a pre-application enquiry was received for a twelve-storey building to provide a ground floor restaurant and visual and audio arts centre with flats above.

The Panel raised no objection to the space being redeveloped. It was felt that the proposed use – rock music venue, might conflict with flats adjacent because of noise. The Panel also thought that there were too many flats proposed and again raised the issue of demand for the ever increasing number of flats being built. They considered the building height to be excessive, the design poor and should convey the mixed use of the building.

The Panel thought that the lower floors could be exploited creatively to reflect the ground floor use – to make a statement. The upper floors were very repetitive especially the window elements. It was suggested that the designers look at the industrial buildings nearby with their fine window proportions & brickwork and use them as a reference for a new design. The overall design needed to harmonize with the existing building adjacent. With regard to materials, Leicester was seen as still mainly red brick and they would prefer to see an indigenous pallet, the use of silver cladding signalled a business park/out of town image.

B) LONDON ROAD, ST JAMES THE GREATER

Pre-application enquiry

External alterations

The Directions said that a pre-application enquiry for alterations to the church to provide a lift and disabled toilets.

The Panel raised no objections.

C) 80 LONDON ROAD

Planning Application 20062125, Listed Building Consent 20062127

Antennae & equipment cabinet

The Director said that the applications were for a 3.5 metre flagpole to incorporate three internal antennae, a pole mounted dish and equipment cabinet to be located on the roof of the early 20th century part of the building to the rear of the Georgian building.

The Panel had no objections to the flagpole but asked if the equipment cabinets could be located in a less prominent place so that they were hidden from view. The application also mentioned a dish and it was not clear from the plans where this would be or what size it was. The Panel indicated that they would be opposed to a large dish mounted on the roof that was visible from the

conservation area.

D) 9 CANK STREET
Planning Application 20062231
New shopfront

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on the change of use of the ground floor of the building to a casino last year and more recently, new signage. This was a retrospective application for a new shopfront including moving the doorway to its original position to retain the symmetry of the entire frontage.

The Panel reiterated their thoughts from the earlier meeting, that the red first floor panels would be better if they were white to match the second floor. They considered that the proposal was acceptable providing the door was repositioned to match the adjoining shop reinstating the symmetry and the large box sign within the recessed doorway removed, together with the removal of the 1st floor signage.

E) 39-41 LOWER HASTINGS STREET
Planning Application 20062170
Rear extension & dormer

The Director said that the application was for a two-storey extension and a new dormer window to the rear of the terraced houses, currently in use as flats.

The Panel conceded that the existing rear elevation to the outrigger was unsightly and therefore an extension with good quality brickwork might improve the building. The Panel commented that they would like to see windows introduced into the extension – blind ones at the very least to give some relief to an otherwise bland wall. It was also noted that there were no details for extractor fans or vents which would be needed for the kitchens which the extension would accommodate. These could be unsightly. It was also recommended that the dormer should be reduced in size and pulled away from the side of the building in order to retain the roof which is visible from the street scene.

F) 49 ST ALBANS ROAD
Planning Application 20062016
Rear extension

The Director said that the application was for the removal of the existing garage and erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the building. The proposal included new gates to the rear boundary wall facing Evington Road.

The Panel were happy with the proposed extension but expressed a preference for traditional timber windows rather than uPVC. The need for double gates was queried if they were not using them for parking. It was suggested that the reinstatement of a brick wall might be preferable to gates. It was noted that the garage might have originally been a trap house. The Panel

also noted the existing poor quality replacement windows and asked if anything could be done to get the applicant to improve them.

G) LONDON ROAD STATION
Listed Building Consent 20062236
Cleaning

The Director noted that an application for repair and cleaning of part of the station including the clock tower had already been carried out under a previous consent. The current application was for the cleaning of the remainder of the interior and the exterior of the porte-cochere.

The Panel raised no objections.

H) 64-66 HUMBERSTONE GATE
Planning Application 20062139
Smoker's terrace

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the rear of the nightclub to provide a smokers terrace.

The Panel raised no objections.

I) 14 – 16 KING STREET
Advertisement Consent 20062122
Signage

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations for the conversion of the upper floors to flats retaining the ground floor as a restaurant. The current application was for new signage for the restaurant.

The Panel raised no objections.

J) 18-20 STONEYGATE AVENUE
Planning Application 20062102
Paving of garden

The Director noted that the Panel recently considered replacement windows to this building in use as flats. The current application was for the paving over of the front garden.

The Panel felt that brick pavers were not an appropriate treatment for a garden in a conservation area. It was recommended that the existing gravel should be retained. The Panel also recommended a small timber fence instead of the planters, which it was argued would obscure the brick pavers should they be approved.

The Chair agreed to take the following items as urgent business.

BRAUNSTONE LODGE, BRAUNSTONE PARK

The Director said that the application was for an extension to the lodge and a 3m fence to go around the whole of the site.

The Panel was happy with the design of the extension. The fence however appeared very solid and looked rather like a prison compound, it was suggested that something more suitable should be explored. It was felt that the views of the building through the fence should be retained.

FORMER CHURCH ROOMS, CLARENDON PARK ROAD

The Director said that application was for matters relating to the materials used in the construction of the external decoration of the frontage of the building.

The Panel raised no objections to the materials used.

REAR OF 34 SPRINGFIELD ROAD

The Director noted that the Panel had previously agreed to the principle of a single dwelling in this location. The Panel previously expressed concerns about the proposed design of the building. A new design had been submitted.

The Panel felt that the design could be more dramatic which could be achieved by bringing forward the first floor gable so that it oversailed more. A chimney would also improve the design.

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

**K) 4 PRINCESS ROAD WEST
Planning Application 20062023
Taxi Office**

**L) 16 SANDOWN ROAD
Planning Application 20061824
Rear Extension**

The following applications were all for replacement of the rear windows with uPVC double glazed units.

**M) 36 LANCASTER ROAD
Planning Application 20062185**

**N) 7 SEYMOUR STREET
Planning Application 20061852**

**O) 17 SEYMOUR STREET
Planning Application 20061851**

P) 9 WOODBINE AVENUE

Planning Application 20061905

69. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

A Panel Member queried whether the note in the Leicester Mercury about a refused application in Granby Street related to the 109-133 Granby Street application which the Panel had previously considered. Officers confirmed this was the case.

Officers reported that following a long period of negotiation a scheme had been agreed with the owners of 78-80 Rutland Street for its residential conversion. It was expected that the work would commence soon.

70. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.40pm.

