



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 2007 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Lawrence – Chair

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| S. Britton | - | University of Leicester |
| D. Lyne | - | Leicestershire Industrial History Society |
| D. Martin | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust |
| P. Draper | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors |
| R Roenisch | - | Victorian Society |
| A. McWhirr | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee |
| C. Sawday | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| P. Swallow | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| M. Elliott | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| S. Heathcote | - | Royal Town Planning Institute |
| J. Westmoreland | - | Leicester Civic Society |
| D.Trubshaw | - | Institute of Historic Building Conservation |

Officers in Attendance:

- | | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| Jeremy Crooks | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department |
| J. White | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department |
| Jane Crooks | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture
Department |
| P. Mann | - | Committee Services, Resources Department |

* * * * *

33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Judith Carstairs, Richard Gill and Joan Garrity.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

35. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 24 October 2007 be confirmed as a correct record.

36. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Heritage Regeneration Officer circulated a document, which gave some information of regeneration to an important historic area in the city known as the 'Old Town'. He went on to explain to the Panel that it was important to consider their opinions on the regeneration and that there would be a discussion on the issues at the next meeting of the Panel.

37. 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.

38. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 7 STANLEY ROAD Planning Application 20071741 24 Dwellings

The Director said that the application was for 24 new dwellings with new vehicular access, parking and landscaping. The Panel made observations on the redevelopment of this site on several occasions in recent years.

The Panel thought that the scale of the new development would look very odd in comparison to existing buildings in the road. The Panel commented that the windows looked odd and the large expanse of the roof looked stark and required chimneys or something to give some interest to the roof-scape. There seemed to be a mix of styles with none carried through properly. The Panel stated that they would prefer something modern that also reflected the surrounding characteristics or at least a better thought out pastiche that reflected the qualities of other houses in Stoneygate. Overall they thought that there were too many units and a smaller number of better quality houses would be better for the site and the conservation area. Also they did not approve of the further encroachment towards the listed building.

It was also noted that a fine air raid shelter from 2nd World War survived on site and it would be desirable to have photographic records before they build over it.

The Panel recommended that this be refused in its current form and to seek

amendments.

B) ST GEORGE STREET
Planning Application 20071525
118 Apartments

The Director said that the application was for a revised scheme for a seven-storey building of 118 apartments with basement car parking. The site is currently used as a car park. The Panel made observations on proposals for this site at the pre-application stage last year.

The Panel were on the whole satisfied with this proposal. They questioned the need for single bed flats once again. They stressed the importance of good materials and in particular a good facing brick for the walls.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

C) 461 ST SAVIOURS ROAD, NANSEN ROAD
Planning Application 20071552
Change of use and redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the factory to business uses on the basement, ground and first floors, with flats above. The proposal included a new build to the rear for new business units and twelve three-storey houses.

The Panel were happy in principle with the proposal, which retained the important buildings on the site. It was noted that these buildings were of interest and particularly the 1930s building had an excellent interior particularly the entrance hall and therefore the applicants should be encouraged to keep as much of the original fabric as possible when carrying out the conversions. It was noted that the original Crittall windows in particular helped give the building its special character and should be retained.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

D) WHEAT STREET
Planning Application 20071552
Conversion and external alterations

The Director said the application was for the conversion of the factory to 34 self-contained flats with associated external alterations.

This was not considered, as it had already been determined.

E) 35-43 NEWARKE STREET
Planning Application 20071409

The Director said the application was for change of use from offices to student flats, an extension on the fourth floor and external alterations. It was noted that

two separate consents were granted in 2003 for Nos.35-37 and 39-43 for residential conversion.

The Panel accepted the change of use but they did not wish to see the original Crittall windows replaced within the 1930s building and they did not like the proposed roof extension. They also requested more details of the composition of the proposed curtain walling.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**F) 7TH DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH, LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20071781
Internal Alterations**

The Director said that the application was for internal alterations to the church to create a parent and child room.

The Panel felt that this proposal would damage the internal character of the building. They asked if there was anywhere else within the building where this facility could be placed. They question if enough justification was provided for the work.

The Panel requested that they seek alternative location for the scheme.

**G) 24 DE MONTFORT STREET
Planning Application 20071669
Replacement Windows & New Entrance Canopy**

The Director said that the application was for replacement metal windows and a new entrance canopy. The work involved blocking the existing entrance and removing the old canopy.

The Panel made no adverse observations to this application.

**H) BELGRAVE NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE
Planning Application 20071780
Sign**

The Director said the application was for replacement signage to the front elevation.

The Panel were happy in principle with the replacement signage but would have preferred to see brushed steel. They also raised concern about possible unauthorized signage on the Rothley Street elevation, which they stated they would like to be investigated.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

I) 61 GREAT CENTRAL STREET

Planning Application 20071573
New entrance to car park

The Director said that the application was for external alterations to form a new entrance to the car park.

The Panel thought that inward opening timber doors would be preferable rather than an up and over timber door. It would also be better if it were in the central bay. They thought that folding doors which would probably have been used if there had been an opening originally would be a preferred solution.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments to this application.

J) CLARENCE STREET
Planning Application 20071711
Extension, alterations

The Director said that the application was for extensions and alterations to the former training centre.

The Panel raised no objections but stated that they would like conservation style flush roof lights.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

K) 16 WOODLAND AVENUE
Planning Application 20071718
Side Extension

The Director said that the application was for a two-storey extension to the side of the house, which dates from the 1960s.

The Panel accepted the principle of the side extension but stated that it should be set back at least a bricks width from the front elevation and the roof style should match the main house by removing the hip. They did not like the proposed bay window, which they felt threw the main elevation out of symmetry.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments to this application.

L) 35 WESTLEIGH ROAD
Planning Application 20071649
Perimeter Fencing & Gates

The Director said that the application was for new walls and railings around the front car park.

The Panel accepted the principle of the walls and railings. They stated that the Overall height was acceptable but the prominent corner required a better design with more robust piers and a greater percentage of railing to wall height.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments to this application.

M) 25 ASHLEIGH ROAD
Planning Application 20071850
Two-storey side extension

The Director said that the application was for a two-storey extension to the side of the building.

There was some discussion by the Panel that the proposal might work if it were better designed as it would also mask the unsightly rear. However it was noted that the relationship between the proposal and the extension next door would create a very unsightly composition and overall the Panel felt that even with a modified design the scheme would still be detrimental to the character of the conservation area.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

N) 3 MAIN STREET, HUMBERSTONE
Planning Application 20071629 & Listed Building Consent20071535
Railings

The Director said that the application was for railings to the existing front boundary wall.

The Panel raised no objections to this proposal.

O) 44 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20071754
Extension

The Director said that the application was for a new dormer window to the rear outrigger.

The Panel thought the proposal was acceptable in principle but stated that it should be much reduced and re designed to reflect the proportions and style of the dormer on the main roof.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments to this application.

LATE ITEM
23 PORTLAND ROAD

The Director said that the application was to replicate the doorway and bring it forward.

The Panel noted that these recessed porches with their fine tiling and paneled doors were an important feature within the conservation area and should be retained. They pointed out that the whole reason for the recent Article 4

Direction was to retain such characteristics. They felt that it would also set a precedent making it difficult to refuse others.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

The Panel raised no observations on the following applications, they were therefore not formally considered.

P) 20 TOLLER ROAD

Planning Application 20071782

Single storey extension to rear of ground floor flat

Q) 133 RATCLIFFE ROAD

Planning Application 20071774

Extension

R) 2 NEWTOWN STREET

Planning Application 20071801

Change of Use

S) SPINNEY HILL PARK

Planning Application 20071831

Work to Park

T) 1 MAIN STREET, BRAUNSTONE

Planning Application 20071684

Replacement Window

39. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

The Committee Services Officer stated the next meeting would be in the Oak Room.

40. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:30pm.

