



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 15 MAY 2013 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Dr. Barton Councillor M Unsworth

Dr J Eaton	-	Ancient Monuments Society
D Trubshaw	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation
J. Clarke	-	The Landscape Institute
H. Eppel	-	Leicester Civic Society
Rev. R. Curtis	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
M. Goodhart	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
M. Johnson	-	Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society
P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
S. Pointer	-	Royal Town Planning Institute
S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
J. Goodall	-	Victorian Society
D. Lyne	-	Leicestershire Industrial History Society
C. Sawday	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
C. Laughton	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
Prof. P. Swallow	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
M. Elliott	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
J. Garrity	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge

Officers in Attendance:

Jeremy Crooks	-	Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
Jenny Timothy	-	Senior Building Conservation Officer
Angie Smith	-	Democratic Services Officer

*** ** ***

62.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from:-

- Councillor Malcolm Unsworth
- Councillor Dr. Barton (who was absent on Council business)
- Joan Garrity – person with appropriate specialist knowledge
- Prof. Peter Swallow – person with appropriate specialist knowledge
- Chris Sawday – person with appropriate specialist knowledge
- Herbert Eppel – Leicester Civic Society (substitute: Susan Eppel)

63. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

64. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting held on 15th May 2013 be approved as a correct record.

65. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

66. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

**A) GIPSY LANE FORMER TOWERS HOSPITAL
Planning Application [20130591](#)**

The application was for the construction of 28 houses to the north of the main listed building on a site that ran along Gypsy Lane. The proposal was within the curtilage of the Towers Hospital a Grade II Listed Building and also affected the Lodge to the Towers (Grade II listed).

The panel accepted the principle of the development, as they acknowledged that the area has been identified for residential development as part of the redevelopment of the Towers Hospital site.

There was however concern over the quality of the development being proposed, as they felt that the development showed little imagination, with a poor standard of housing and basic street layout. The panel suggested that the applicant should consider fewer houses of a better quality design in order to improve the scheme.

There was also concern over the proximity of units 5 & 6 to the grade II listed Lodge.

The panel were happy with the changes to the boundary wall fronting Gypsy Lane.

The Panel OBJECTED to the application.

B) 144 CHARLES STREET, SITE OF FORMER SPREAD EAGLE PH
Planning Application [20130571](#)
New eight storey building for 28 flats and ground floor retail

The application was for the redevelopment of the site formerly occupied by the Spread Eagle PH. The proposal was for an eight storey building for 28 flats with three retail units on the ground floor.

The site was within the St George's Conservation Area.

The panel accepted the principle of the development, but were unhappy with the design of the building.

They felt that whereas the previously approved scheme created a landmark building, this scheme lacked context, and was of a poor and bland design. The poor design resulted in the size of the building being oppressive within the streetscene, to the detriment of the St Georges conservation area.

The panel acknowledged that the proposal already incorporated a number of window openings, but that the ratio between window openings and brickwork was ill-proportioned, making you more aware of the large sections of brickwork.

There was also concern over the design of the ground floor retail areas, as the shopfronts appeared squat, showing no relationship to other ground floor shopfronts along Charles Street.

The Panel OBJECTED to the application.

C) 4-6 ST MARTINS
Listed Building Consent [20130642](#), Planning Application 20130707
Removal of boundary wall

The application was for the removal of the wall running along the boundaries of 4-6 St Martins and the former Alderman Newton's School. The removal of the wall was to allow further archaeological investigation of the site following the discovery of King Richard III remains.

The wall would be recorded and carefully dismantled and the bricks stored in a dry location to allow for future reinstatement depending on findings.

The wall was within the curtilage of 4-6 St Martins a grade II listed building and within the Cathedral/Guildhall Conservation Area.

The panel raised no objections to the removal of the wall. They felt that the removal of the wall was positive, as it would expose better views of the architectural detailing of the former Alderman Newton's School.

The Panel raised NO OBJECTION to the application.

D) 52A RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Application [20130600](#)
Extensions to coach house

The application was for extensions to the coach house of 52a to create a four bedroom house.

The building was within the Stoneygate Conservation Area and covered by an Article 4 Direction.

The panel raised concerns over the coach house losing its identity and its visual association to the main house (52 Ratcliffe Road). Although they accepted the size and scale of the extensions, they felt that the front elevation needed to relate to the main house, without appearing as a pastiche design. They want the building to still appear as a coach house.

The panel wanted a condition added to any future decision, preventing any new boundary treatments or the creation of a new access, as they felt it was important to preserve the joint access.

The Panel recommended that AMENDMENTS BE SOUGHT, and a condition be attached to any future decision, preventing any new boundary treatments or the creation of a new access, to preserve the joint access.

E) 8 STONEYGATE ROAD
Planning Application [20130576](#)
Extension to flats

The application was for a third and fourth storey extension to the existing flat roof part of the building to create an additional flat.

The building was within the Stoneygate Conservation Area.

The panel raised an issue with the principle of a 2-storey extension, as the mid-C20th side extension would become too high, creating an uncomfortable junction with the eave detailing of the principal building. The height of the extension would also become greater than the ridge height of the adjacent property (10 Stoneygate Road), losing the visual gap between the properties.

They also raised concerns over the use of a flat roof and the positioning of the 4th floor window.

The panel felt that any extension must be limited to the eave height of the principal building.

The Panel recommended that AMENDMENTS BE SOUGHT.

F) 144 NEW WALK
Planning Application [20130668](#)
Change of use from office to house

The application was for the conversion of the existing office building to a two bedroom house. The proposal involved external alterations including a glazed parapet to form a roof terrace.

The building was within the New Walk Conservation Area. New Walk was listed Grade II on the national register of Historic Parks and Gardens.

The panel raised no objections to the proposal, as they felt that the re-introduction of residential dwellings to New Walk was favourable.

They felt that the building could accommodate a roof terrace, and that the glass balustrade was acceptable.

The Panel raised NO OBJECTION to the application.

M) 28 LANCASTER ROAD
Planning Application [20130716](#)
Change of use, external alterations

The application was for the change of use of the house to a flat and maisonette. The proposal involved the replacement of an existing ground floor timber bay window with one made of uPVC.

The building was within the New Walk Conservation Area and protected by the Holy Trinity Article 4 Direction.

The panel raised no issues over the change of use, but had strong reservations over the replacement of the existing bay window with a Upvc replacement.

They felt that the existing bay window should be retained, or if beyond repair, a suitable timber replacement must be proposed.

The Panel recommended that AMENDMENTS BE SOUGHT.

The Panel raised no objections / observations over the following applications:

G) 286 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application [20130529](#)
Extension to shop, new shopfront

H) 93 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application [20130383](#)
Change of use from bedsits to seven bedroom HMO

I) 213 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application [20130535](#)
Extension to rear

J) 22 MALVERN ROAD
Planning Application [20130393](#)
External alterations

K) 134 LONDON ROAD
Advertisement Consent [20130691](#)
Internally illuminated sign

L) 5 HORSEFAIR STREET
Advertisement Consent [20130660](#)
Replacement signage

N) PREBEND STREET OUTSIDE OF 72 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application [20130653](#) & [20130603](#)
Broadband equipment cabinets

67. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.15pm.