



Leicester
City Council

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL HELD ON Wednesday, 18 January 2017**

Meeting Started 5:15 pm

Attendees

R. Gill (Chair), R. Lawrence (Vice-Chair), Cllr Unsworth, S. Eppel (LCS), N. Feldmann (LRSA), P. Draper (RICS), P. Ellis (VS), C. Hossack (LIHS), S. Hartshorne (TCS), M. Holland (GG), C. Laughton, C. Sawday

G. Butterworth (LCC), D. Harrison (LCC), N. Handa (LCC)

Presenting Officers

S. Peppin Vaughan (LCC), J. Simmins (LCC)

17. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

M. Richardson (RTPI), L. Blood (IHBC), Rev R Curtis (LDAC), D. Martin (LRGT), D. Lyne (LIHS)

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

N. Feldmann – architect for item B.

19. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Panel agreed the notes.

20. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Report of the Director of Planning, Transportation and Economic Development

**A) FORMER INTERNATIONAL HOTEL, 57 RUTLAND STREET
Planning application [20161507](#)
Demolition and redevelopment**

The panel accepted the general design of the revised scheme, noting that it was an improvement on the original scheme. Following on from the panel's acceptance of the massing at the December 2016 meeting, the panel welcomed the applicant introducing verticality into the elevations and the composition of the 3 elements of the building, all as requested by the panel at

the previous meeting.

It was noted that the brise soliel to the tower are to be decorative, not functional. But that they are acceptable as it provides interest into the tower element of the building. The stepping down elevations along the side roads (Rutland St & Wimbledon St) was also considered acceptable, as the applicant has added variety into the elevations, suitably breaking up the massing.

The panel would like to see the ground floor amenity space at the corner of Humberstone Road & Wimbledon Street have an active frontage, whilst it was considered regrettable that the ground floor frontage to Rutland Street was primarily occupied by the service entrance/s.

Concerns were raised over the lack of detail provided with regard to the proposed palette of materials. Although there were no fundamental objections to the materials proposed, the panel would expect the application to have a greater level of detail. It was advised that officers need to carefully control the standard of materials proposed in order to confirm that the materials are of a high quality, befitting the sensitive location. Drawings confirming the depths of the elevations and how this breaks up the massing should also be provided.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

B) 3¹/₂-5 WELLINGTON STREET Planning Application [20162462](#) Change of use, roof top extension

The proposal was supported by the panel, as the works will have a positive impact upon the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider conservation area.

The existing shopfront is a modern addition of no visual merit, its replacement with a more sympathetic shopfront design was considered a clear enhancement.

There were no concerns over the proposed change of use of the upper floors to residential and the proposed single storey roof extension was supported, as it is of a good design and of a material palette that will complement the existing. Furthermore, it was accepted that the roof extension wouldn't be overly prominent within the streetscene, due to the limited views along this narrow street.

NO OBJECTIONS

C) 8-10 WEST WALK Planning Application [20162277](#) Change of use, demolition, redevelopment

There are no concerns over the principle of demolishing the existing 1960s office block, as it fails to preserve the character and appearance of the area. The conversion of the existing original buildings into student accommodation and a new build in-between was also accepted in principle.

The panel did however have concerns over the size and design of the new build. It was debated as to whether 5-storey was too high, with some members of the panel suggesting that 4-storey would be more appropriate.

Of particular concern was the new stairwell abutting the r/o 8 West Walk. The panel felt that it was overly prominent, due to its height and dark cladding. Concerns were also raised over its relationship with the existing pitched roof of 8 West Walk. It was suggested that these concerns could be mitigated by extending the roof of the recessed top floor across the stairwell and introducing a more lightweight appearance.

With regard to the general design of the new build, the panel felt that the massing needed to be broken up more vertically. It was suggested, it could be split (through details & materials) into 3 bays as per the adjacent terraces to address this. Concerns were also raised over the darkness of the cladding, it was suggested that more red brick is introduced into the elevations to better blend with the character of the conservation area.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

D) CONDUIT STREET, GLEBE STREET

Planning Application [20162443](#)

Seven storey building for 159 student studio flats

The panel accepted the principle of a 7-storey purpose built student accommodation on the existing surface car park, noting that the site was an appropriate location for such type of development and that precedence has been set for the size & scale proposed following approval of a similar sized scheme on the adjacent site.

The design of the development was considered acceptable, noting that it was on par with other recently approved and constructed student accommodation schemes. The panel did however remark that they would like to see greater variation in design to that already built.

It was however recommended that a more active frontage is required to the ground floor, Conduit Street elevation. The service entrances could be relocated to a more unobtrusive location. The massing of the blank South elevation also needs to be broken up and improvements to the landscaping to the front would be welcomed.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

E) 38 FRIAR LANE
Listed Building Consent [20162441](#)
Internal and external alterations

Concerns were raised over the proposed works, as they fail to preserve the significance of the listed building and harm the appearance of the building, having a detrimental impact upon the streetscene and wider conservation area.

It was felt by the panel that internal security grilles were unbecoming the architectural merits of the building and conservation area and would be harmful to its character. They suggested that other options be explored that could provide the necessary security in a way that did not conflict with the character of the façade; in particular timber shutters should be considered as a more historically authentic approach to security. The film on the windows was considered cheap looking and should be omitted.

No concerns over the replacement CCTV camera.

OBJECTIONS

F) 35 MILLSTONE LANE
Planning Application [20170004](#)
Change of use from garage ancillary to offices to retail/café, external alterations

The panel supported the principle of the proposal, noting that the conversion of the garage into a café could have a positive impact upon the appearance of the streetscene and wider conservation area.

Concerns were however raised over the design of the shopfronts, as they appeared dated and pastiche and had no relationship to the existing streetscene. It was suggested that the shopfronts should be of a more contemporary, 21st century design and take some reference from the surrounding conservation area.

The panel didn't support the use of a timber sliding shutter on the side elevation, worrying that it may look unsightly. A larger glazed shopfront, improving natural light into the unit would be preferable.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

Late Item) 15/23 HOTEL STREET & 6 MILLSTONE LANE
Planning Application [20162072](#)
2-storey roof-top extension

The panel were pleased to see that the applicant had listened to previous comments and that the roof-top extension was now only proposed above the existing mid-20th century concrete building, leaving the adjacent Victorian

building's roof as existing.

They did however raise strong concerns over the design of the extension, noting it as clumsy and of a poor design. It was debated as to whether a 2-storey extension would be acceptable, with most of the panel members preferring a single storey addition. The entire panel did however agree that the design needs to be much improved, have a better relationship to the existing building and a much lighter finish.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

The panel had no objections/observations on the following applications:

G) CORNER OF FAIRFIELD STREET AND EGGINTON STREET

Planning Application [20161635](#)

Construction of three storey block of six flats

H) 2 COLTON SQUARE, FORMER CHARLES STREET POLICE STATION

Listed Building Consent [20162314](#)

Internal alterations

I) 22 DEACON STREET

Planning Application [20160270](#)

Two six storey buildings

J) 28 FOSSE ROAD CENTRAL

Planning Application [20162456](#)

Construction of single and three storey extension at rear of flats

K) 42 PINE TREE AVENUE

Planning Application [20162210](#)

New bungalow

L) 9 COUNTING HOUSE ROAD PETROL FILLING STATION

Planning Application [20162279](#)

Single storey extension

M) UNIT SU64 HIGHCROSS, 6 EAST GATES

Planning Application [20162293](#)

New shopfront

O) 21 SANDOWN ROAD
Planning Application [20162326](#)
Rear extension boundary wall

P) 45 PARK VALE ROAD
Planning Application [20162344](#)
Replacement windows

Q) 150 MERE ROAD
Planning Application [20162343](#)
Replacement windows

R) 10-12 MARKET STREET
Advertisement Consent [20162439](#)
New signs

S) LAND AT REAR OF 36 ST JAMES ROAD
Planning Application [20162302](#)
New house

T) 50 HIGHFIELD STREET, HIGHFIELD COURT
Planning Application [20162325](#)
Alterations to rear of flats.

Next Meeting – Wednesday 15th February 2017, G.02 Meeting Room 2, City Hall

Meeting Ended – 18:45