



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 23 APRIL 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 |
| D. Martin | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust |
| C Sawday | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| P. Swallow | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| D. Trubshaw | - | Institute of Historic Building Conservation |
| J. Westmoreland | - | Leicester Civic Society |

Officers in Attendance:

- | | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| J. Carstairs | - | 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 |

* * * * *

81. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from David Smith, Rowan Roenisch, Alan McWhirr, David Lyne and Kanti Chhapi.

82. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

83. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 19 March be confirmed as a correct record.

84. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The Committee Services Officer stated that all declarations from Members needed to be recorded and encouraged all Members of Panel to declare any interests they would have, the previous information that they did not have to be recorded was incorrect.

85. 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.

86. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 11-13 ERSKINE STREET

Planning Application 20080272

Change of use, extension, infill building

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to flats involving a two-storey roof extension.

B) CLYDE STREET

Planning Application 20080226

Change of use, extension, external alterations

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to flats involving a two-storey roof extension. The location was on the adjacent site to the previous application.

The Panel considered both of these applications and then discussed them together. They had no objections to the proposed change of use but were unanimous in their view that the roof extensions would completely destroy the character of the buildings and damage the character of the conservation area. They noted that whilst some buildings had roof extensions approved, these were on flat roofs and for where there had been proposals for extensions on pitched roofs previously, it had been resisted such as St George's Mills on Wimbledon Street)

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

C) 47-51 GALLOWTREE GATE/1-7 MARKET PLACE APPROACH

Planning Application 20080387

Change of use to flats, external alterations

The Director said that the application was for change of use of the upper floors to flats and change of use of the existing ground floor café to a cycle store with

associated external alterations.

The Panel had no objections to the change of use, but stated that they did not wish to see the retail unit on the ground floor lost. They commented that an active street frontage was considered essential in a prime location such as the application site. The Panel also did not like the proposed top hung windows, which they thought, would be detrimental to the character of the building and agreed that casements would be a more appropriate option.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

D) 580-594 GIPSY LANE, THE BEECHES
Planning Application 20080596
New development

The Director said that application was for a new two storey building of ten self contained flats

The Panel noted that historically the site had always been an open space which complemented the adjacent listed buildings and felt that this latest proposal would over develop the site.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

E) 21 CENTRAL AVENUE
Planning Application 20080549
Side & rear extension

The Panel had made observations on a side and rear extension to the property last year and that application had been subsequently refused. The Director said that the application was for a revised scheme that had taken on board the Panels comments.

The Panel generally thought that the new application was a greatly improved scheme. They stated that they would ideally have liked the extension to have been set back behind the side window but accepted that it would have caused design issues elsewhere in the scheme, which would have weakened the main façade of the extension.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

F) 37 EAST AVENUE
Planning Application 20080417
Rear extension & new walls and railings

The Director thought that the application was for extensions to the side and rear with 2m high walls and gates.

The Panel were satisfied with the garage. They commented that they would have liked to see the step down within the outbuilding retained. They were

unhappy with the loss of the current boundary treatment and commented that would have preferred to see it retained if possible. The Panel also felt that any new boundary treatment should not exceed a metre in height.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

G) 6 BEEHCROFT ROAD
Planning Application 20080297
Extension and alterations

The Director said that the application was for extensions and alterations to the detached bungalow.

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

H) 46 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20080386
Rooflight & replacement window

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of a dormer window and a roof light in the front roof slope.

The Panel were satisfied with the replacement window but felt that the roof light should be omitted as it would spoil an otherwise intact roofscape and set a precedent similar applications to be submitted.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

I) 39 NARROW LANE, AYLESTONE
Planning Application 20080493
Front & side extension

The Director said that the application was for a new front porch and extension to the side of the 1930s semi detached house.

The Panel thought that the front porch was too large and along with the pitched roof looked out of character with the main house. They commented that the side extension was thought to be a little heavy, especially the raised parapet and also had reservations about removing the external access to the rear garden. They had no objections to a smaller porch with perhaps a flat roof that followed the line of the adjacent window.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

J) 20 HOME FARM WALK
Listed Building Consent 20080394 & Planning Application 20080371
Roller shutters

The Director said that the application was for roller shutters.

The Panel commented that they liked the existing timber shutters and would like to see these retained. They thought that the difficulties in opening and closing could be addressed by improving the tracking system perhaps by automating the doors.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

K) TRINITY HALL, TRINITY LANE
Planning Application 20080400
External alterations

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

The Panel had no concerns over the proposal but they felt that the brickwork would be difficult to match and therefore recommended infilling the arch with panelling.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

L) 136-138 NEW WALK
Planning Application 20080467
Change of use, external alterations

The Director said the application was for the conversion of the building to flats involving external alterations to the building.

The Panel had no objections to the conversion to flats but they felt there were too many and a smaller number of larger flats would be better. They felt that the rooflights should be omitted from the front elevation, which would spoil an otherwise intact roofscape and set a precedent for other buildings on New Walk to do the same. The Panel also queried the need for the railings to the ground floor bay windows.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

M) 142 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20080283
Reinstatement of shopfront

It was noted that the building was the subject of an ongoing enforcement case after the original 1930's shopfront was replaced without planning permission. The Director said that the application was for the reinstatement of the shopfront in painted timber and stone.

The Panel felt that the poor facsimile proposed was not an acceptable replacement for such a fine historic shopfront.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

N) 60 LONDON ROAD
Advertisement Consent 20080477
New signage

The Director said that the application was for a new externally illuminated sign to replace the existing signage.

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

O) 54 WESTCOTES DRIVE
Planning Application 20080576
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building from storage to one self contained flat. The proposal involved external alterations.

The Panel had no objections to the principle of a conversion but felt that the ground floor main elevation should draw on the proportions of the first floor and the side windows should be retained if possible.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

P) 195 MERE ROAD
Planning Application 20071229
Retention of windows

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

The Panel reiterated their usual feelings in that uPVC was unacceptable as a replacement for timber in historic buildings.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

Q) RUTLAND STREET THE EXCHANGE BUILDING
Listed Building Consent 20072185
Lighting

The Director said that the application was for lighting. It was mentioned that the application was another in the recent series for improved lighting and reduced street clutter around the new theatre that the Panel have discussed over the last few meetings.

The Panel thought that the proposed lights looked very large and would have a detrimental impact on the building. They stated that they would have liked

some assurance on the actual size of the units and if possible would like to see a sample at the next meeting before making a recommendation.

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

R) 232 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20080464
Change of use and external alterations

The Director said that the application was for change of use to flats with extension and external alterations.

The Panel thought that the flat conversion was acceptable but the front dormer to the main house should be removed from the scheme and commented that they would have liked to see a more sensitive conversion of the outbuilding with more traditional windows.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

S) 206 EAST PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20080402
Change of use to flats with extension and external alterations

The Director said that the application was for conversion to six flats with rear extension and external alterations to rear, side and front elevations.

The Panel considered the proposal to be an over development of the site and felt that the two storey extension should be removed from the scheme. They felt that the proportions of the windows within the workshop should be retained. The Panel also commented that the attractive fanlight above the French windows to the rear should also be retained.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

LATE ITEM
TAYLOR ROAD SCHOOL

The Director said that the application was for the removal of the current building and the development of a new school on the same site.

The Panel lamented the loss of this fine landmark building however they reluctantly accepted that the condition of the building was too poor to be repaired. They did not feel that the proposed new school was of sufficient quality to replace the existing building and requested that a better design that looked more like a school with similar landmark qualities be sought.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

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

T) 145 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application 20080428
Change of use

U) FLAT 12 ALBERT COURT, 20 STONEYGATE ROAD
Planning Application 20080513
Alterations to rear of flat

V) 3 STONEYGATE AVENUE
Planning Application 20080452
Rear extension & new walls and railings
W) 66 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20080597
Change of use

X) 7 WELFORD ROAD
Planning Application 20080625
Change of use and external alterations

87. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7pm.

