



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 14 MARCH 2007 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Henry

Councillor O'Brien

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| S. Bowyer | - | English Heritage |
| 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 |

Officers in Attendance:

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

* * * * *

80. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from C. Sawday.

81. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

K. Chhapi declared an interest in Appendix C, Item G, 3-5 Knighton Park Road.

82. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 14 February 2007 be confirmed as a correct record.

83. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

84. 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.

85. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 213 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD, THE BELGRAVE HOTEL Planning Application 20070390 Change of use, extensions and external alterations

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to eight flats and extensions to the building to provide a further sixteen flats.

The Panel was of the opinion that this large extension was too fussy and it dominated the existing building. Some felt that it would be better to redevelop the whole site from scratch rather than lose the identity of the historic building. The majority of the Panel felt that if the development went ahead, there should be a gap between the existing building and the proposed addition in order to retain the identity of the existing building.

Less immediate concerns were expressed about the lack of modern design in new buildings, which it was felt should be the starting point for such buildings.

B) GLENFIELD RAILWAY TUNNEL Listed Building Consent 20070283 Strengthening works and repairs

The Director said that the application was for structural repairs to the tunnel and air shafts and replacement grilles to the shafts.

The Panel welcomed the fact that the council were prepared to undertake repair work. It was questioned whether this structural repair approach was a sound long term solution and wondered whether something could be done externally to strengthen the tunnel.

It was requested that a site visit take place.

C) CHURCH FARM, HUMBERSTONE
Planning Application 20070208
New college campus

The Director said the application was for a new Gateway College campus comprising of three / four storey buildings, sports pitches, car parking etc.

The Panel agreed that the proposal would not have an adverse affect on the character of the adjacent Old Humberstone Conservation Area. There were reservations regarding the use of bright render colours which it was felt would make the building look dated quite quickly. Coloured materials could also weather and discolour and look tired quite quickly.

D) IMPERIAL AVENUE, FULLHURST COLLEGE
Planning Application 20070228
Extension to school

The Director said that the application was for an extension to the school with car parking and games area as part of the national Building Schools for the Future programme.

The Panel felt that this design would have been much better for the campus at Humberstone with its simple geometrical design. The Panel welcomed the retention of the historic façade but felt that the link between the old and the new was abrupt and should be softened with a transitional element.

E) 55 OXFORD STREET
Planning Application 20070155
New Building

The Director said that the application was for the redevelopment of the site with a four and five storey building providing 23 flats.

The Panel felt that this design was little better than the previous scheme. The design had no life in it and the fact that there was no main entrance to Oxford Street compounded this. It was noted how the two buildings of Local Interest once complimented each other with their differing styles and heights which created drama. It was also noted that the loss of no.55. was lamented.

F) HALL LANE, DISRAELI STREET
Planning Application 20060507
New Building

The Director noted that an application for a new three storey building for 24 flats was considered by the Panel in April last year. This was a revised scheme.

The Panel noted that there was little change in this new design. It was felt that the long roofline was bland and could be made more interesting. Ideally it was thought that it would be better to have houses with chimneys on this site to reflect the character of the adjacent conservation area.

G) 3-5 KNIGHTON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20070137
Change of use and extensions

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to thirteen flats. The proposal involved extensions to the rear.

The Panel did not wish to see the loss of the gate piers or any car parking to the front of the site. The Panel also considered the front dormers to be poor and made the symmetrical frontage unbalanced and this should be addressed as part of the works.

H) 61 GREAT CENTRAL STREET
Planning Application 20070153
Mobile phone equipment

The Director said that the application was for three antennae and associated equipment cabinets.

The Panel was of the opinion that this was a fine building and asked if any other building within the locality could be used instead. If it must be this building then all the aerials and equipment should be located on the rear of the building.

I) 223 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20070187
Detached office building

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on a new building for office accommodation several years ago. This was approved, but the scheme was never carried out. This new application was for a single storey office building within the gardens of the building.

The Panel thought that the building could be more imaginative – something along the lines of Farnsworth House (built in 1951 by Mies Vander Rohe and an icon of 20th century architecture). The Panel further commented that the building should only be allowed on a limited period basis until the previous office building consent was implemented. The retention of the concrete bunker on the site was also supported.

J) 24 STONEYGATE ROAD
Planning Application 20070190 & 20070191
Change of use to four flats

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the basement of the building to two flats. The proposal involved two new doors to the rear and

new windows at basement level. A separate application for the conversion of the first floor to two flats involved no external alterations.

The Panel had no observations regarding the first floor flats but they did not like the proposed porches to the rear or the introduction of the window underneath the side bay window and recommended refusal of the basement conversion.

K) 6-8 SILVER STREET & 5A CANK STREET
Advertisement Consent 20062154
New signage

The Director said that the application was for new signage for the existing amusement arcade.

The Panel did not consider that this either preserved or enhanced the building and recommended refusal. They did suggest as a compromise in that if the large banner sign were removed consent for the new signage could be granted.

L) 1 GALLOWTREE GATE, 1 EASTGATES
Advertisement Consent 20070203
New signs

The Director said that the application was for new signage for Ernest Jones, the jewellers.

The Panel raised no objection to the application.

M) 63 ASHBOURNE STREET
Planning Application 20062187
Replacement window

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of a stained glass window to the side elevation of the house.

The Panel felt that the existing side window was of exceptional quality and should be retained and repaired.

N) 56 DANESHILL ROAD
Planning Application 20070250
Retention of fence

The Director said that the application was for the retention of a boundary fence to the side of the property and a French door that replaced a modern window.

The Panel accepted the French window as a suitable replacement for the modern window. The fence was considered acceptable providing it was turned around so that the polite elevation faced the street scene and it was lowered to be in line with the adjacent wall. Further, it was recommended that the section to the front of the house should be lowered down to 1m in height.

**O) 9 WESTLEIGH ROAD
Planning Application 20070246
Alterations to Doors and Windows**

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the rear of the house and the replacement of a window to the side elevation of the house.

The Panel felt that the drawings provided were not of sufficient quality to make a proper judgement and requested more information. They did consider that the loss of the original door at the rear was unfortunate and as a minimum this should be re- used in the new door opening. The side window should also be of timber and traditionally styled.

**P) 27 PORTLAND ROAD
Planning Application 20070175
Dormer Extension**

The Director said that the application for a dormer extension and new velux window at the rear of the house and new roof lights to the front elevation.

The Panel was happy with the work to the rear of the property but did not wish to see rooflights on the front elevation.

The Chair agreed to take the following as a late item of business.

**BOW BRIDGE, ST. AUGUSTINES ROAD
Listed Building Consent 20070139
Maintenance works and repairs**

The Director said that the application was for repainting, re-pointing, re-surfacing and increasing the kerb height.

The Panel raised no objections.

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

**Q) 3 ALBERT ROAD
Planning Application 20062133
Change of use**

**R) 71 MARKET PLACE
Planning Application 20070199 & Listed Building Consent 20070200
Change of use**

**S) 17 – 19 EAST BOND STREET
Planning Application 20070244
Rear extension**

T) 14-16 KING STREET

**Planning Application 2002123 & Listed Building Consent 20062129
Change of use**

**U) OLD CHURCH STREET
Listed Building Consent 20070341
Alteration to front bay**

**V) BRINSMEAD ROAD, ST MARY'S CHURCH
Planning Application 20070134
Alterations to porch**

**W) 14 VICTORIA PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20070231
Change of use rear extension**

**X) 290 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20062099
Change of use**

**Y) 9 COLLEGE STREET
Planning Application 20062015
Rear dormer**

**Z) 39 SEVERN STREET
Planning Application 20062186
Replacement rear windows**

86. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.00pm.

