



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2008 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill – Chair  
R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

Councillor R Blackmore - Leicester City Council  
P. Draper - Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors  
M. Elliott - Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge  
J. Goodall - Victorian Society  
S. Heathcote - Royal Town Planning Institute  
D. Hollingworth - Leicester Civic Society  
M. Jones - Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects  
D. Lyne - Leicestershire Industrial History Society  
D. Martin - Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust  
R. Roenisch - Victorian Society  
C. Sawday - Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge  
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  
Jane Crooks - Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture  
Jeremy Crooks - Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department  
P. Mann - Committee Services, Resources Department

\* \* \* \* \*

**113. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received by David Smith and Richard Gill.

**114. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **115. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Martin Jones commented that he was present at the last meeting however was not listed on the attendance list.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 13 August be confirmed as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

#### **116. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that a review of the local list of buildings was taking place. The first step was to review the criteria that was used to place buildings on the list. The cut off point of the list was the Victorian era. The era started in 1837 however the Panel were informed that there was still not a date known for when Leicestershire had been in the Victorian era.

The factors that were important in considering buildings for the list included the architectural importance of the building and it's economic importance. A Member of the Panel felt that historical importance of a building should be considered as well. The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that there was more criteria that needed to be met for buildings to be on the list. A Member of the Panel commented that the Victorian era contained a mix of styles and it was important all styles involved in the era were considered

The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that they hoped to identify all key local list buildings and encouraged Members of the Panel to write in with their views and ideas regarding the review.

#### **117. 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.

#### **118. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

##### **A) CORAH FACTORY, VAUGHAN WAY Planning Application 20081362 Redevelopment**

The Director said that this was an outline application for the redevelopment of the site for mixed uses including commercial, residential, community and offices with new roads, car parking, public spaces and landscaping.

The Panel noted that the earliest part of the site dated from 1865 and had a very modern design for its time. They conceded that this area has become a very depressing part of the City and in general welcomed the redevelopment. The Panel were concerned that St Margaret's Church would lose its significance because of the height of the new hotel behind it, especially when viewed along Sanvey Gate. They thought there was scope to retain more of the original fabric rather than just the central 1865 building. The Panel commented that they would have liked to have a site visit to make a proper appraisal of the site. It was noted that this was the St Margarets works and the Panel thought both St Margarets and Corah should come into the name of the site, rather than St. Johns.

A site visit was arranged for the Panel to take a closer look at the site.

**B) 109-133 GRANBY STREET**  
**Planning Application 20081428**  
**Variation of condition**

It was noted that consent was granted for demolition and redevelopment of this site last year. The Director said that application was for the removal of condition three of the approved Conservation Area Consent to allow immediate demolition of the existing buildings.

The Panel opposed the immediate demolition of the site, which they thought would set a bad precedent. The removal of the condition was essential to avoid unsightly gap sites in historic areas. The Panel commented that in the present economic climate no one was quite sure what was going to happen, there was a concern that the developers could go bankrupt and the buildings would be needlessly lost. The Panel requested that their objection to the loss of the existing buildings be noted which in their view could easily be incorporated into a redevelopment scheme.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**C) SPENCEFIELD LANE, LEICESTER GRAMMAR SCHOOL**  
**Planning Application 20081275 & Listed Building Consent 20081285**  
**Change of use to apartments and new housing in grounds**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the Old Hall to six residential apartments. It involved internal and external alterations including the removal of the modern extensions and restoration of the external façade. The Panel were informed a planning application had also been submitted for new housing development within the grounds of the listed building.

The Panel were satisfied with the removal of the later additions to the main hall. They commented that the subdivision and internal alterations were thought to be too severe. The Panel were of the view that three very fine flats would be better than six and this would be better for the interior of the building. It was noted that the setting of the Old Hall was important and some of the new houses seemed to be very close to the building. The view of the Panel was

that fewer bigger houses would be better than lots of small ones. They commented that the artist's Douglas Smith's scheme on Landscape Drive would be a good model for the layout. There were also concerns raised that the shared entrance with the school would intensify traffic. The Panel thought that the quality of the indicative elevations shown was poor and did nothing to enhance the listed building.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**D) NEDHAM STREET, CHARNWOOD STREET SCHOOL**  
**Planning Application 20081411 & Listed Building Consent 20081311**  
**Alterations to school**

It was noted that the Panel made observations on a modern extension to the school a few months ago. The Director said that the applications were for a new entrance and internal alterations.

The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that the application would be brought before the Panel in October.

**E) THURMASTON LANE, WILLOW COURT**  
**Listed Building Consent 20081458**  
**Additional windows**

It was noted that the building was formerly the stable block to the Beeches and had been in use as offices for many years. The Director said that the application was for additional windows to provide extra light into the building.

The Panel thought that it would be better to remove a section of the wall and have a glazed feature 'wall' rather than lots of extra windows, which would perhaps be more, damaging to the original functional characteristics of the building.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**F) MAIN STREET HUMBERSTONE, WARREN LODGE**  
**Planning Application 20081436**  
**New boundary wall and railings**

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the unauthorised wall fronting Keyham Lane discussed by the Panel earlier this year, with a dwarf wall and railings.

The Panel thought that this scheme was better than the existing wall but opposed the retention of part of the breeze block & rendered wall. They also stated that the dwarf wall should be brick.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**G) 86-92 REGENT ROAD, ENKALON HOUSE**

**Planning Application 20081231**  
**External cladding**

The Director said that the application was for the external cladding of the building, which dated from the mid 1960s.

The Panel noted that this was a good example of a 1960s office block and cladding and also commented that the application would be detrimental to the building and the conservation area.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**H) 59 HIGHCROSS STREET**  
**Listed Building Consent 20081376**  
**New signage**

It was noted that the Panel made observations on the conversion of this building earlier this year as part of the new Highcross development. The Panel were informed that the conversion and glazed extension were now almost complete. The Director said that the application was for new signage for the restaurant.

The Panel raised no objections to the new signs and menu boards

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**I) 14 JUBILEE ROAD**  
**Planning application 20080995**  
**Change of use and extension**

This application is for the conversion of the building to flats. The proposal involved a two storey roof top extension.

The Panel noted the fine quality of the building, which was thought to be by Harvey and Simpson. The Panel commented that the roof extension was completely out of character with the building and would ruin the fine roofscape. They conceded that a roof extension on the rear flat roof element would be acceptable if well designed.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**J) 23 PORTLAND ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20081116**  
**Roof lights**

The Director said that the application was for two rooflights to the front and a dormer window to the rear elevation.

The Panel accepted the dormer at the rear but recommended that the roof lights at the front should be refused.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**K) 36 AVENUE ROAD, FLAT 1**  
**Planning Application 20081305**  
**Single storey extension**

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

The Panel thought that the form of the extension did not relate to the existing building. They commented that the extension needed to be well designed, picking up on the design elements and scale of the existing building. They also commented that they would have preferred it to be built at the rear rather than at the side.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**L) 14 NORTH AVENUE, THE WHITE HOUSE**  
**Listed Building Consent 20081277**  
**Internal & external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for internal alterations to the building and removal of ramp to the main entrance.

The Panel had no objections to the alterations

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**M) 166 ST SAVIOURS ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20081435**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to flats. The proposal involved external alterations.

The Panel had no objections to the change of use although were against the loss of another single dwelling. They commented if the windows at the front were to be replaced they should be in timber to match the existing ones.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**N) 71 PARK VALE ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20081229**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for a rear dormer and a disabled access ramp to the front of the house.

The Panel noted that the dormer to the rear was more like a 'roof extension'

and it should read as a dormer by decreasing its size. The Panel commented that the ramp at the front was acceptable but they would have liked the hand rail reduced in height if possible to hide it behind the front wall

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

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

**O) 17 RATCLIFFE ROAD  
Planning Application 20081148  
New windows and door**

**P) 70 HIGH STREET  
Planning Application 20081120  
New signs**

**Q) 80 REGENT ROAD, REGENT HOUSE  
Listed Building Consent 20081297  
Internal & external alterations**

**R) 1A BELVIOR STREET  
Listed Building Consent 20081059  
Internal & external alterations**

**S) 12 LOSEBY LANE  
Listed Building Consent 20081385  
Internal & external alterations**

**T) 92 GRANBY STREET  
Planning Application 20081314 & Advertisement Consent 20081315  
Alterations to shopfront and signage**

#### **119. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

The Senior Building Conservation Officer invited the Panel to provide any comments regarding the Evington Footpath Conservation Area Character Statement.

A Member of the Panel commented that the old Greens building on Belgrave Gate was in poor condition and the building should be protected. The Senior Building Conservation Officer commented that the building had been submitted three times for listing and the owner had been offered grant assistance for repairs and had been granted planning permission for conversion of the upper floors.

The Committee Services Officer commented that the date of the next meeting would be confirmed in a letter to Members.

## **120. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 6:39pm.



