



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2007 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence - Vice Chair

P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
J. Garrity	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
S. Heathcote	-	Royal Town Planning Institute
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
D. Lyne	-	Leicestershire Industrial History Society
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
A. McWhirr	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
R. Roenisch	-	Victorian Society
C. Sawday	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
D. Smith	-	Leicestershire Archaeological & History Society
D. Trubshaw	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation

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

* * * * *

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Simon Britton and Malcolm Elliott.

42. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

43. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

It was noted that Simon Britton's name was included on the attendance list for the last meeting however he was not present.

RESOLVED:

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

44. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Heritage Regeneration Officer asked for feedback from members regarding a document circulated at the last meeting concerning regeneration of an area in the city known as the 'Old Town'.

A member of the Panel raised concern at the area of land near Bosworth House and commented it was an opportunity for a building proposal. The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that the area should be an open space. It was reported that Bosworth House was to be replaced however any future plans after that were unknown. The Heritage Regeneration Officer added that Bosworth House was not on their list of bad buildings.

A member of the Panel stated that it was important to make sure the scale of the development was appropriate. The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that perhaps a design code was needed in the area and that if there were one, it would help when they wanted to make a refusal. There was concern expressed regarding the height of any potential new buildings.

45. 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.

46. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) CHURCH ROAD, BELGRAVE HOUSE AND STABLES

Listed Building Consent 20072022, Planning Application 20072017

Change of use, extension

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the stables to four flats and the change of use of the house currently in office/storage use to office use. The proposal involved internal alterations to the stables and the house and a single storey extension to the rear of the house.

The Panel were happy with the proposed new use, offices were thought to be the least invasive option for the house. The Panel had some reservations

regarding the proposed extension and asked why the staff room could not be accommodated within the existing fabric. There was some concern regarding the symmetry of the coach house and stable block i.e. that the proposed changes to the facades would create an asymmetrical appearance, which would be detrimental to the character of the buildings. There was also a preference for the flats to be separated vertically rather than horizontally.

It was agreed that further information was needed and a site visit would be arranged.

B) ABBEY PARK CAVENDISH HOUSE & SLATER STREET LODGE
Planning Application 20071870
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the buildings to school use.

The Panel were happy with the principle of school use but were wary of recommending approval without seeing any proposals for the new use or at the least a schedule of the likely requirements that school use would entail.

It was agreed that further information was needed on this application.

C) LEICESTER UNIVERSITY, ENGINEERING BUILDING
Listed Building Consent 20071988
Internal alterations

The Director said that the application was for internal alterations to the building.

The Panel concurred that the work was permitted development.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

D) 31 KNIGHTON DRIVE
Planning Application 20071945
Two storey rear extension

The Director said that the application was for a revised scheme for a two storey extension to the rear of the care home. The Panel made observations on proposals to extend this building at least twice in recent years.

The Panel thought the extension was still too large and detrimental to the character of the main building and opposed the loss of garden space

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

E) 52 RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Application 20071640
Conservatory to rear, change of use of basement to flat

The Director said that the application was for use of the basement as a flat involving new stairs and a conservatory to the rear.

The Panel noted the superb quality of this building. They accepted the principle of the basement flat but were opposed to the conservatory at the rear.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

F) 52A RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Application 20071641
Use of coach house as single dwelling

This was currently part of the house relating to the previous proposal (E above). The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the coach house to a single dwelling. The proposal involved extending the front and side and adding a new entrance, additional windows and a conservatory to the rear.

The Panel noted the fine proportions of the coach house and its relationship with the adjacent house. They thought that the proposed alterations damaged the character of the building and also adversely affected its relationship with the main house.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

G) 42 RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Application 20071914
Single and two storey extensions

The Director said that the application was for a single and two storey extension to the side and rear of the property.

The Panel debated this proposal at length. They decided that as the building had no historical or architectural qualities, was well set back from the main street and also within a group of modern houses, that the proposal would not harm the character of the conservation area.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

H) 2 BEACHCROFT ROAD
Planning Application 20071718
Single storey extension

The Director said that the application was for the removal of a modern single storey extension and replacement with a new slightly larger single storey extension on a similar footprint.

The Panel were happy with the reinstatement of the garage doors but stated that they would like the applicant to try to find out exactly what was there originally and match it. They conceded that the proposed extension was a

much better design than the existing but felt that its increased height, which would hide the strong eaves line, would be detrimental to the character of the building and recommended that the extension be reduced in height to retain the eaves line.

The Panel recommended amendments on this application.

I) 168 MERE ROAD
Planning Application 20071807
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of all of the windows and doors with uPVC double glazed units and uPVC doors.

The Panel reiterated their line that uPVC was unacceptable in a historic building and especially when the original windows were intact.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

J) 75 MARKET PLACE
Planning Application 20072054 & Listed Building Consent 20072056
ATM machine & illuminated sign

The Director said that the application was for an ATM machine and illuminated sign within the shopfront.

The Panel noted that although this was not an original shop front it was still very pleasant. They considered that the proposal would not damage any of its fabric and was therefore reversible.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

K) 78-80, LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20071868
New gates

The Director said that the application was for new gates to the car park entrance of the Freemasons Hall on Prebend Street.

The Panel made no adverse observations on this application.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

L) 49 GALLOWTREE GATE
Planning Applications 20072025,2026 & 2027 & Advertisement Consent 20071845
New telephone kiosks with advertisement

M) 2-4 HAYMARKET
Planning Applications 20072028,2029 & 2030 & Advertisement Consent

20071844

New telephone kiosks with advertisement

The Director said that these applications were for replacement telephone kiosks with internally illuminated signs.

The Panel thought that the proposed kiosks and illuminated signs would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area and the clock tower and recommended that the applicant seek alternative locations away from sensitive historic areas.

The Panel recommended amendments on these applications.

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

N) 7 MARKET STREET

Planning Application 20071464

New shopfront

O) 173 NARBOROUGH ROAD

Planning Application 20071795

Replacement windows

P) 6 NEWTOWN STREET

Planning Application 20072061

Replacement windows

47. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

It was agreed that the next meeting be brought forward to Wednesday 12 December 2007.

The Heritage Regeneration Officer circulated two appeal decisions for Towers Hospital and 51 Great Central Street and informed the Panel that the Aylestone Village Character Statement had been prepared.

48. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:35pm.

