



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 19 MARCH 2008 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill – Chair
R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| P. Draper | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors |
| M. Elliott | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| S. Heathcote | - | Royal Town Planning Institute |
| D. Hollingworth | - | Leicester Civic Society |
| D. Martin | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust |
| A. McWhirr | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee |
| P. Swallow | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| D. Trubshaw | - | Institute of Historic Building Conservation |

Officers in Attendance:

- | | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| J. Carstairs | - | Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| D. Chapman | - | Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| J. Crooks | - | Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| T. Ipgrave | - | Planning Management and Delivery Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| P. Mann | - | Committee Services, Resources Department |

* * * * *

74. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Joan Garrity, Rowan Roenisch and David Smith,

75. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

76. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 21 February and on 6 March be confirmed as a correct record.

77. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Head of Planning Policy and Design presented a response from the developers on the Bath Lane, Donisthorpes application to the queries raised by the Panel at the Special meeting on 6 March.

It was reported that the developers would not retain the boiler house and it was explained that the reason for its exclusion was so that the waterside would be more open. The Senior Building Conservation Officer commented that the developers had agreed to retain the historical wall to the riverfront and they had commented that the integrity of the courtyard would be retained. The developers had also agreed that the partitions in the cottages would only be removed if justification was presented. It was stated that there had been no written comments received from English Heritage. The Head of Planning Policy and Design reported that the developers had stated that the Panel had not received all the information to look at accurately in relation to the application. It was stated that there had been no agreement made on whether the application would go to the Planning and Development Control Committee.

78. 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.

79. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 7 STANLEY ROAD, EASTFIELD Planning Application 20080217 Housing development

The Panel made observations on the redevelopment of the site to the rear of Eastfield last October and that application (20071741) was refused. The Director said that the application was for a revised scheme that addressed some of the Panel's comments.

The Panel were critical of the proposal. They commented that the site was full of potential to accommodate a few well designed houses set in open space that would both compliment the adjacent listed building and make the best use of the setting to add quality to the conservation area. They thought that 24 units within the site was far too excessive and that the proposed design of the new build was standardised and did not reflect the high quality of architecture found elsewhere within the area. It was also noted that the previous proposed flat

scheme reflected the footprint of the 1950s rear extension and retained a good proportion of open space, which was more complimentary to the setting of the listed building. The Panel reluctantly had accepted the principle of 24 houses however they stated that they would still like to see a better design with more traditional materials and features.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**B) 136-140 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20071577 & Conservation Area Consent 20071585
Demolition and redevelopment**

The Director said that the applications were for the demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site with a mixed use development comprising of 41 self contained flats and 4 retail units with associated car parking and landscaping.

The Panel stated that it was an important part of the City and expressed their dislike of the proposed development. They stated that it was too high and did not reflect the individual plots that had been present on the site since the area of London Road was developed. The Panel felt that the current buildings cascaded down the hill, which created a desirable townscape to emulate. They thought that the proposed design, which presented a stairwell on the principle elevation, should have offered something better. Some Members of the Panel commented that the rear elevation was more sympathetic than the front. Overall the Panel stated that they would have liked a better design that reflected the scale of the existing buildings and paid some regard to the individual plots. They had no objection to the demolition of the existing buildings.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**C) 20 ELMS ROAD
Planning Application 20080234
Change of use, demolition and extension**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the former student halls of residence to 14 self contained flats. The proposal involved a ground floor side extension, new dormers and the demolition of the detached boiler room and chimney.

The Panel felt that there were too many flats and that they should be reduced by half. They did not like the front extension or the double access for cars. The Panel also felt that the grounds should not become a car park however they had no objection to the demolition of the boiler house. The Panel also thought that the area was not suitable for one bedroom flats.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

D) LAND ADJACENT TO MEADOWS COURT, OLD CHURCH STREET,

AYLESTONE
Planning Application 20080022
New building for eight flats

The Director said that the application was for a new two storey building for eight flats. The Panel made observations on a similar proposal for ten flats in the summer of 2002 that was subsequently withdrawn.

(It was reported that an application for an extension to the adjacent care home was discussed by the Panel at the meeting on 23 January.)

It was noted that this was similar to a scheme approved in 2002. The Panel felt that the proposal was similar in style and scale but did not have the subtle details such as chimneys and decorative string course that the previous scheme had. The Panel felt that as the proposal was a watered down version of the approved scheme they preferred to see the previous scheme built rather than the current proposal. It was noted by the Panel that houses would be more appropriate and desirable than a block of flats.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

E) DILLON WAY
Planning Application 20080290
Nine dwellings

The Director said that the application was to redevelop the disused lock up garage site with nine dwellings.

The Panel stated that they would have liked to see the air shaft made into a focal feature within the new housing layout and also mentioned that it was important to provide access around the whole shaft for future maintenance. The Panel had no objection to it being included into a garden however requested that a formal request for the tunnel to be scheduled be submitted to English Heritage.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

F) 3-5 KNIGHTON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20080244
Conversion to four houses

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the care home to four houses. The proposal also involved a rear extension. It was noted however that the Panel made observations on extensions to the building last year.

The Panel thought that the proposal was a good scheme. They stated that would like to see the newer flat dormer removed and replaced with one to match the traditional dormer already there. They also noted the problem of waste bins with the inner two properties, which had no external access to the rear gardens.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

G) 22 KNIGHTON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20072308
New development

The Director said that the application was for the redevelopment of the site with two new three/four storey blocks to form ten flats and four town houses with associated car parking and landscaping.

Overall the Panel were in favour of the application and thought it had imaginative design and landscaping.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

H) LAND ADJACENT TO 18 PENDENE ROAD
Planning Application 20080233
Detached house

The Director said that the application was for a new detached house on land at the end of Pendene Road.

The Panel had no objections in principle although they agreed that the loss of allotment space was unfortunate. They also commented that they would have preferred a cleaner design without so much clutter such as the roof lights in the front roof slope.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

I) 223 SPENCEFIELD LANE
Planning Application 20080324
Flats

The Director said that the outline application was for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the redevelopment of the site with two new two-storey buildings to create a total of eight flats.

The Panel stated that they would have preferred to see two well designed houses that exploit the corner plot rather than the proposed flat blocks.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

J) FORMER ODEON CINEMA (THE ATHENA), RUTLAND STREET
Listed Building Consent 20072184
Lighting

The Director said that the application was for external lighting.

The Panel had no objections to the application.

K) 5 MARKET STREET
Planning Application 20080145
Condensers & safety rail

The Director said that the application was for two condenser units and a safety rail on the rear elevation of the building facing the service yard, visible from Pocklingtons Walk.

The Panel stated that the condenser units should be concealed from the street scene. They felt that an acceptable way to conceal the units would be to increase the height of the fence.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

L) 29 MARKET STREET
Planning Application 20080124
Sign

The Director said that the application was for a new fascia sign.

The Panel had no objections to the sign that has been installed or the canopy.

M) 332 NARBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application 20080217
Fence

The Director said that application was for a 2.4 metre high security fence around the perimeter of the building.

The Panel queried why there was a need for a fence. They stated that they would support a temporary approval to protect the building from vandalism but not a permanent approval.

The Panel agreed that further information was needed on this application.

N) 115 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application 20080253
Change of use

The Director said that application was for the conversion of the building currently in use as offices to a day nursery involving a two storey side and single storey rear extension. It was reported that this was a revision to a previously approved scheme.

The Panel felt that given the previous approval they were satisfied with the revised pitched roof to the rear but commented that they would prefer to see the fenestration retained at the front.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

Extra Item

**87-91 GRANBY STREET
Planning Application 2008
Retention of uPVC windows**

The Director said that the application was for the retention of uPVC windows.

The Panel supported a refusal and reinstatement of metal windows to match the originals. They raised concern that no action had yet been taken on the unauthorised windows on the Wellington Hotel on Rutland Street and asked for reassurance that something would be done to reinstate the original style timber sashes.

The Panel recommend refusal on this application.

The Panel raised no observations on the following application, it was therefore not formally considered.

**O) 54 KING STREET
Advertisement Consent 20080159
Fascia sign and projecting sign**

80. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:54pm.

