



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 21 APRIL 2010 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Lawrence – Chair

Councillors Johnson and Hunt

S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
M. Elliott	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
J. Goodall	-	Victorian Society
M. Goodhart	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
D. Lyne	-	Leicestershire Industrial History Society
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

**Officers in Attendance:**

Jeremy Crooks	-	Planning Policy and Design Group
John Snaith	-	Democratic Support
Jennifer Timothy	-	Planning Policy and Design Group

\* \* \* \* \*

**27. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from David Smith and Richard Gill.

**28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Michael Goodhart stated for the avoidance of doubt with regards to item 33 C): Current Development Proposals, 30 Applegate St Nicholas Centre, that he was involved in proposed Cathedral Square developments.

**29. TRIBUTE TO DR MCWHIRR**

The Chair paid tribute to the wonderful contribution made over the years to the work of the Panel by the recently departed Dr McWhirr. It was stated that Dr McWhirr would be greatly missed by many organisations across the city not

least by the Panel. A minute's silence was observed in his memory.

### **30. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel meeting held on 17 March 2010, be confirmed as a correct record.

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

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

### **32. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL**

The Director, Planning and Economic Development 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.

### **33. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

The Director, Planning and Economic Development submitted a report on planning applications received for consideration by the Panel.

#### **A) ALL SAINTS BREWERY, HIGHCROSS STREET Planning Application 20100391 & Conservation Area Consent 20100392 Alterations to wall & demolition**

The Director said that this application was for the demolition of some of the buildings within the site.

Colour photographs of the site were circulated.

It was noted that the enclosure of the churchyard by a substantial building was part of the character of this area and that its replacement with a 2m high boundary wall would not preserve this feeling of enclosure there a more substantial wall should be retained.

It was also felt that the loss of these buildings would result in the loss of an important part of Leicester's social and economic history. This site indicated how close industry and churches sat together in the fabric of the city.

The Panel recommended refusal of the application at least until the opinion of English Heritage was received.

#### **B) NEWARKE STREET/UPPER BROWN STREET, CROWN BUILDING Planning Application 201000417 Change of use**

The Director said that this application was for the conversion of the building to student accommodation.

The Panel generally supported this application. Some concerns were raised over the introduction of a rooflight on the south elevation and it was suggested that this building could be of potentially listable quality. It was requested that conditions be added that ensured the introduction of any vents, flues or external pipework was sensitively done and good quality windows were used.

The Panel recommended approval of this application, subject to sensitive external plumbing and good quality windows.

**C) 30 APPLGATE, ST NICHOLAS CENTRE**  
**Listed Building Consent 20100329**  
**Internal alterations**

The Director said that this application was for internal alterations creating a larger more usable space.

The Panel had no concerns or comments relating to this application.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

**D) 9 CHURCH GATE, CHURCH GATE TAVERN**  
**Planning Application 20100179**  
**External alterations to ground floor façade**

The Director said this application was for alterations to the ground floor of the building.

It was felt that the proposal spoilt the proportions of this prominent building. The Panel stated that a good restoration to enhance the building should be aimed for rather than extensive alteration. Retaining the proportions of the original windows, avoiding dropped openings and reinstating detail at signage level would achieve this.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

**E) 46 – 48 WEST STREET**  
**Planning Application 20100282**  
**Demolition, rear extension**

The Director said that this application was for the demolition of a modern rear extension and redevelopment with a new three storey building.

The Panel welcomed the demolition of the existing 1970s extension and the proposed new windows. It was commented that the detailing and materials used should be of the highest quality. Uncertainty was expressed at the set

back of the new build that appeared in the plans and clarification was sought about this.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

**F) 17 HORSEFAIR STREET**  
**Advertisement Consent 20100456**  
**New signage**

The Director said this application was for seven internally illuminated window signs and two internally illuminated ATM signs.

The Panel was unclear on what exactly was proposed. Concern was expressed regarding any potential external alterations to the Horsefair Street elevation including the installation of an ATM and signage.

The Panel recommended approval of this application, with the exception of the proposed ATM and signage on the Horsefair Street elevation.

**G) ST. SAVIOURS ROAD, ST. SAVIOURS CHURCH**  
**Planning Application 20100016**  
**Removal of bell**

The Director said that his application was for the removal of one of the bells to be relocated to a nearby church.

The Panel supported the application and was pleased to see that the bell was going to a local church. It was noted that this was the last surviving bell of an original peel.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

**H) 691 AYLESTONE ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20100248**  
**Rear extension**

The Director said that this was for a single and two storey extension.

The Panel felt strongly that this application represented an overdevelopment of the site. It was noted that the relationship between the main dwelling and coach house, and the corresponding street views should be retained. The proposed attached double garage was especially detrimental in removing these views. The Panel also stated that the infill was a major overdevelopment and the excessive bulk of the roofline in the proposal was a particular concern.

The Panel recommended refusal of this application.

**I) 68 DERWENT STREET**  
**Planning Application 20100428**  
**Rear extension**

The Director said that this application was for a two storey extension to the rear.

The Panel was generally supportive of the application and felt the proposal was the least detrimental option available. Comments were made regarding the window proportions in the dormer and it was noted that materials should be high quality and match with the existing building.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

**J) NEW WALK, ADJACENT TO NO. 55**  
**Planning Application 201000244**  
**2.2M High Public Art**

The Director said this proposal was for a new piece of artwork sited on the bridge in the original location of the 'Clicker' sculpture.

The Panel commented that vandalism was a concern given the previous history on the site. They supported the request for a comprehensive scheme for an "art trail" on New Walk rather than the existing piecemeal applications.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

**LATE ITEM - HUMBERSTONE MANOR**

The Director said that this application was for replacement UPVC windows.

The Panel strongly objected to the introduction of UPVC windows in this property. It was felt UPVC windows were wholly unacceptable on such a fine listed building in a conservation area.

The Panel recommended refusal of this application.

**The Panel made no objections to the following applications, they were therefore not formally considered:**

**K) 14 GRANBY STREET**  
**Planning Application 20100331**  
**Change of use of ground floor from retail to hot food takeaway,**  
**ventilation flue at rear**

**L) 29 SAXBY STREET**  
**Planning Application 20100108**  
**Replacement of UPVC windows & doors at rear of house**

**M) 31 SAXBY STREET**  
**Planning Application 20100109**  
**Replacement of UPVC windows & doors at rear of house**

**N) 1 ELM TREE COURT**  
**Planning Application 20100397**  
**Insertion of door to side elevation of house**

**O) 57 – 61 STRETTON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20100165**  
**Replacement UPVC windows and doors to rear of flats**

**P) 18 SILVER STREET**  
**Planning Application 20091733**  
**One internally illuminated fascia sign**

**34. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

The Panel requested an update on the status of the Friars Mill site on Bath Lane, as this had been raised repeatedly over a several months. Frustration was voiced at the lack of progress and information about this site.

Officers stated that there had been problems identifying the owners of the site and a final plea was being drafted that would be sent to them shortly before formal notices were issued. It was explained that formal notices could require the owners to temporarily fix the roof, but for a relatively small extra cost it could be repaired permanently, and this letter was an attempt to convince the owners of the benefits of this. There so far been no indication from the owners of any intention to do anything with the site.

It was noted that the Panel would be informed of any developments as soon as possible.

**35. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 6:25pm.