



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 20 JUNE 2007 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

D. Hollingworth - Leicester Civic Society
D. Martin - Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
S. Heathcote - Royal Town Planning Institute
R Roenisch - Victorian Society
P. Swallow - Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
K Chhapi - Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects

Officers in Attendance:

J. Carstairs - Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department
J. Crooks - Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department
J. White - Heritage Regeneration Officer, Regeneration and Culture
Department
M. Reeves - Committee Services, Resources Department
P. Mann - Committee Services, Resources Department

* * * * *

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from S Britton, C Sawday, R Lawrence and A. McWhirr,

M. Elliot declined to attend the meeting as he objected to the fact that the Council were not taking the views of the panel seriously.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

D. Smith declared an interest in Reports item A) Spa Building, Queen Street and Aylestone Hall which was contained within the minutes.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 16 May 2007 be confirmed as a correct record.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Membership

The Panel agreed in principle to Joan Garrity becoming a member of the Panel as a person of specialist knowledge due to her previous experience as chair of the Planning and Development Control Committee. The Panel also agreed in principle to accept Mr Lyne from The Leicestershire Industrial Society as a member of the Panel. Officers noted that there was only specific vacancy, which both of these people could fill. The Committee Administrator undertook to raise this matter with the Political Group Whips to see if it would be possible to allow both individuals to join the Panel and report back to the next meeting.

5. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

Members raised no comment on this report.

6. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) SPA BUILDING, QUEEN STREET

**Planning Application 20070933, Conservation Area Consent 20070934
Demolition, redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopments of the site with a four to nine story block of 87 flats with bar, restaurant and shops.

The Panel reiterated their previous views, which were that this is a fine quality building at the vernacular end of the architectural scale and that in this area so full of big buildings, these smaller buildings add drama to the street scene with the dramatic drop in scale and should be preserved. It was recommended that the whole building should be retained. It was further suggested that with all the flats already in the area a more diverse use such as workshops would be welcomed. The Panel urged that the building be properly marketed in order to find a suitable re-use, commenting on the proposed new build, the Panel thought that it did not reflect the character of St Georges Conservation area in design, materials or height.

B) 21 CAREYS CLOSE

**Planning Application 20070954
New development**

The Director said that the application was for a demolition of the existing factory and the redevelopment of the site with a seven-storey building for

student accommodation with ground floor retail units. This was considered by the Panel last September. Following comments by the Panel the application was refused. This is a revised scheme, which lowers the rear by a storey and pulls back the top storey from Peacock Lane.

The Panel were pleased that the building had been reduced in height but were still unhappy with the design. It was thought that the proposed building did not exploit this prominent corner site and the corner treatment in particular was bland. The Panel also thought that the fenestration could be improved by drawing on elements from the adjacent building.

C) 157-159 GRANBY STREET, CALAIS HILL
Planning Application 20071056
Change of use to flats, rear extension and new build adjacent

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the ground floor of the public house to shops and the conversion and extension of the remaining parts to create seven flats. A five-storey block of eight flats was also proposed to the rear, facing onto Calais Hill, which is outside the conservation area boundary.

The Panel were generally happy with this proposal but thought that the rear extension could be improved with larger windows which would improve the look of the building and make it a better place to live in. It was also thought the conversion would be a good time to reinstate a better ground floor shopfront. The Panel also considered that the proposed new build would not impact on the character of the adjacent conservation area.

D) FIVEWAYS HOUSE (FORMER THREADS FACTORY), TUDOR ROAD
Listed Building Consent 20070730
Partial demolition, internal and external alterations

The Director noted that Members made observations on the conversion of this building to flats a few years ago. The Director said that the application was for amendments to that proposal including the demolition and rebuilding of a later addition, alterations to the car parking area and removal of the remainder of the north lights.

The Panel were adamant that the north lights (ribbon of glazing) should be retained. It was a principle characteristic of historic industrial buildings and there are not many surviving examples left. It was also thought that the demolition of the end section of the building created a wonderful opportunity for an imaginative modern building rather than the pastiche rebuild proposed.

E) 114 REGENT ROAD
Pre-application enquiry
Ramp, alterations to porch

The Director said this was a pre-application enquiry for a disabled access ramp to the main entrance. The proposal would involve modifications to the entrance

porch.

The Panel were supportive of the need for disabled persons access and therefore asked Officers to instruct the applicant to submit a formal planning application based on the retention of the porch (in rebuilt form) and the ornamental flooring.

F) 152 UPPER NEW WALK

Pre-application enquiry

Chair lift, disabled toilet

The Director said this was a pre-application enquiry for a chair lift to the rear of the building. The proposal would involve the removal of a rear window to create an access door from the lift. The proposal would also involve the conversion of one of the rear outbuildings into a disabled toilet.

The Panel were supportive of the need for disabled persons access and therefore asked officers to instruct the applicant to submit a formal planning application based on the retention of the side door & steps.

G) 56 LONDON ROAD

Advertisement Consent 20070786

Internally illuminated fascia sign

The Director said the application was for the retention of an internally illuminated fascia sign that wrapped around the front and side elevation of the building.

The Panel raised an objection to this unauthorised advertisement and recommended refusal and enforcement action for its removal. Any signage should be confined within the existing architecture and not obscure architectural details. It should also respect the individual units.

H) 43 SILVER STREET, THE GLOBE PH

Planning Application 20070781

Canopy

The Director said that the application was for a canopy to the elevation on Carts Lane.

The Panel objected to the canopy and its proposed use as a smoker's terrace. A more modest canopy following the profile of the arched opening may be acceptable. The existing sign should be retained.

I) 12-14 HOTEL STREET, MOLLY O'GRADY'S PH

Planning Application 20070848 & Listed Building Consent 20070850

Canopy at front

The Director said that the application was for a canopy to the Market Place elevation.

The Panel objected to the canopy in principle and the use of the street as a smoker's terrace.

J) EXCHANGE BUILDING, RUTLAND STREET

Pre-application enquiry

Canopy/projecting sign

The Director said the application was a pre-application enquiry for a canopy or projecting sign.

The Panel thought there was no scope for a canopy but a tasteful projecting sign might be acceptable.

K) 27 MARKET STREET & 28 POCKLINGTONS WALK

Advertisement Consent 20070864

Signs & canopies

The Director said that this was a retrospective application for new signage to change the name of the pub from the Hogs Head to the Slug and Lettuce. The proposal also involved new canopies.

The Panel raised concerns that once again they were making observations on a retrospective application. However the Panel were happy with the new signage but would prefer the canopies on the Market Street elevation rather than Pocklingtons Walk, which it was thought, had too narrow a pavement to accommodate them.

L) 12-14 EASTGATES FORMER COFFEE HOUSE

Advertisement Consent 20070783

New signs

The Director said the application was for new signage to the front and side elevations.

The Panel thought that too much signage was proposed. It was felt that there was no reason for the non-illuminated fascia sign on the Eastgates elevation and the projecting sign closest to the main entrance on Church Gate should also be omitted. The Eastgates projecting sign should be brought down in line with the other projecting sign on Church Gate and the sign at the entrance should either be removed or set back into the doorway more.

M) 2-4 COLTON STREET

Planning Application 20070948

Banner sign

The Director said the application was for a banner sign to the front elevation of the building.

The Panel pointed out that this was the most sensitive location for a sign next

to the main decorative doorway and close to the adjacent listed building. It was recommended that it should be placed in a less sensitive location and reduced in height to fit within existing architectural details.

N) 21 CENTRAL AVENUE
Planning Application 20070868
Demolition, extension

The Director said the application was for the demolition of the existing garage and erection of a single storey extension to provide a new garage to the side and store to the rear of the dwellinghouse.

The Panel objected to this proposal. The Panel recognised the quality of this side elevation and did not wish to see it destroyed by this extension. There were no objections to an extension at the rear and it was suggested that the existing garage be retained and extended instead.

O) ST JOHNS SCHOOL, EAST AVENUE
Planning Application 20070823
Extension to school

The Director said the application was for an extension to the existing school and resurfacing of part of the grounds.

The Panel raised no objections to this proposal but stated that materials should match the existing ones.

P) 4 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20070859
Change of use to 9 flats and extension

The Director said the application was for the change of use of the care home to nine self-contained flats. The proposal involves a two storey rear extension

The Panel raised no objections to this proposal but stated that careful matching of the materials was required.

Q) BISHOP STREET REFERENCE LIBRARY
Planning Application 20070931 & Listed Building Consent 20070932
Internal alterations, lift shaft

The Director said that the Panel had made observations on a proposed lift shaft and internal alterations last year. This was a revised scheme

The Panel were happy with the principle of the proposal subject to suitable materials being used and possibly widening the shaft.

R) 56 DANESHILL ROAD
Planning Application 20070250
External alterations, fence

The Director said the application was for a revision to the boundary fence in line with the Panel's previous comments and the retention of stucco to the rear outbuilding.

The Panel were happy with the revised fence and other alterations. The rendering of the rear outbuilding was considered acceptable because it was not historic fabric but a later flat roof extension. It was however thought that the white paint was a bit bright and might benefit from a more muted colour. As a general policy the painting of the rear outriggers or other original historic fabric should be avoided.

**T) 83 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20070984
Shopfront**

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront

The Panel considered the existing shopfront to have some character and the proposal would sanitise this by removing the recessed entrances. There were no objections to the renewal of the shopfront but it should reflect the existing character.

The Panel raised no objections to the following, they were therefore not formally considered:

**S) 159 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20070961
Change of use to offices**

**U) 96-98,62-64,27-29 & 49-51 HIGH STREET
Planning Applications 20070922, 0921,0915 & 0916
Freestanding signs in street**

**V) 33 RUTLAND STREET
PLANNING APPLICATION 20070993
Floodlighting to main elevation**

**W) WESTBRIDGE PLACE
Planning Application 20070860
Erection of a cycle shelter**

**X) 35 HIGHFIELD STREET, FLAT A
Planning Application 20070908
Extension**

**Y) 132 WESTCOTES DRIVE
Planning Application 20070945
Demolition of outbuildings & new door to rear**

Z) 172 ST SAVIOURS ROAD
Planning Application 20070813
Replacement windows

AA) 22 WEST AVENUE
Planning Application 20070844
Rear extension

7. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Panel Minutes

Officers noted that they had received a letter from Malcolm Elliott. In the letter he raised a number of comments in particular in relation to the way in which the discussion on the recent Granby Street application was minuted.

Panel members considered a proposal to be sent the minutes of a meeting for comment prior to them being published. Members overall welcomed this idea but felt that it would only really be necessary if the Committee indicated that they wanted to see them for a particular item.

Further discussion was held around the wider issues of CAP's influence and the trigger for committee consideration of an application.

Rowan Roenisch commented that she had written to Councillor Kitterick on this issue of committee decision triggers. Officers noted that currently an application would go to committee if the Panel and Conservation Officers recommended refusal to an application. This however was now being reviewed as it may be seen as giving too much influence for conservation matters. Further consideration was given to ways in which the Panel could push for a Committee decision such as making individual representations, possibly at the guidance of the Chair or filling in an objection pro forma at meetings.

Officers noted that it wouldn't be possible to give an over-riding priority for the Panel's view in planning decisions. There were a number of factors which came into play in decision making. Panel members felt that they were balanced in their deliberations and further expressed disappointment that no Labour Councillors were taking part in the meetings. It was also commented that it may be a better idea for the Panel to become more involved in developing planning policies. In addition it was stated that there were large numbers of people who supported conservation issues and that they should have their views democratically represented as part of the planning application process.

AGREED:

that Panel members would be sent draft copies of the minute where they indicated that there was a specific item that they wished to comment on prior to its publication.

8. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.57pm.

