



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor O'Brien

- |                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| S. Britton      | - | University of Leicester                          |
| D. Hollingworth | - | Leicester Civic Society                          |
| K. Chhapi       | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects |
| D. Martin       | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust         |
| M.Elliott       | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge   |
| R Roenisch      | - | Victorian Society                                |
| A. McWhirr      | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee            |
| C. Sawday       | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge   |
| P. Swallow      | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge   |

**Officers in Attendance:**

- |              |   |   |
|--------------|---|---|
| J. Carstairs | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| J. Crooks    | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| M. Reeves    | - | Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity<br>Department |

\* \* \* \* \*

**56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies from S.Bowyer, J. Dean, Cllr. O'Brien and D. Smith.

**57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

D. Martin declared a personal interest in Appendix C, Item A) College Hall, Knighton Road.

Councillor Garrity declared a personal interest in all of the business on the

agenda as she was a member of the Planning and Development Control Committee.

## **58. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 22 November 2006 be confirmed as a correct record.

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

Rowan Roenisch queried when the Panel would receive details of the justification for the demolition of the former Spread Eagle Pub. Officers commented that they didn't have details with them at this meeting, but the general justification was that the steps outlined in PPG15 had been followed. Officers undertook to circulate written details of the justification with the minutes of the meeting.

*The response is detailed below and the Committee report is attached to the minutes.*

*We were satisfied that the information submitted by the applicant that the tests in PPG15 were met:*

- 1. The costs of refurbishing and re using the building, separately or in association with redevelopment of the adjoining site, for a variety of uses, showed that its retention and reuse were not viable.*
- 2. Evidence was submitted of unsuccessful efforts to market the building, for letting and unrestricted freehold.*
- 3. The merits of the proposed replacement building as amended.*

*In terms of the application for planning permission there was the additional benefit of regeneration of the site for uses which complement the office core.*

*A lot more detail is set out in the committee report and the supplementary report.*

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

The Service Director Planning and Policy submitted a report on decisions made by the Planning and Development Control Committee on planning applications previously considered by the Panel.

Members of the Panel welcomed the fact that decisions taken by the Council were in line with views similar to their own.

RESOLVED:

that the report be noted.

## **61. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

### **A) COLLEGE HALL KNIGHTON ROAD**

**Planning Application 20061892, Listed Building Consent 20061904,  
Conservation Area Consent 20061977**

**Change of use, new development and demolition**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the former halls of residence to self contained flats and a nursery plus 14 three storey town houses, new parking and landscaping. The proposals involved extensions to some of the listed blocks and internal and external alterations. The demolition of Latimer House, a large early 20<sup>th</sup> century property was also proposed.

The Panel pointed out the national importance of this complex of buildings by Sir Lesley Martin and Trevor Dannett – perhaps the finest of its kind in the country. It was felt that there was little opportunity for change either to the existing layout or additions to the buildings externally, objecting to the increased height of one block and the new build that would replace the bike sheds which would prevent views into the site. The Panel was opposed to the demolition of Latimer house which it was argued was a well designed early 20<sup>th</sup> century house that dominated views along Carisbrooke Road and played a significant role in the character of the conservation area. Concerns were also raised on the potential increase in motorised vehicle use that the proposal would generate.

It was however conceded that there may be scope for a new element within the car park space.

### **B) CHARLES STREET, FORMER CHARLES STREET POLICE STATION**

**Listed Building Consent 20061966**

**Internal & external alterations**

The Director noted that the redevelopment of the former Police station site was considered by the Panel in 2005. This included the change of use of the grade II listed main building to office use with a ground floor restaurant. This application was for internal and external alterations to facilitate this conversion.

The Panel was happy with the proposed internal alterations.

### **C) 20-26 ELMS ROAD, CLARE HALL**

**Planning Application 20062028, Conservation Area Consent 20062041**

**Sixteen houses**

The Director noted that Clare Hall was a university campus that had recently been vacated. This application was for the demolition of the 1960s buildings and the redevelopment of the site with 16 houses, 13 four bed and 3 three bed.

The Panel thought this proposal was an over development of the site. The design of the new build was considered to be a poor pastiche with particularly over powering roofs. The Panel expressed a preference for a modern design

for the buildings – something that reflected the age in which we live - and a layout that made better use of the site. The loss of the existing 1960s buildings was conceded.

**D) 138 WESTCOTES DRIVE, SYKEFIELD**

**Planning Application 20062017**

**Extension and new build**

The Director noted that two applications for an extension to the house involving the removal of outbuildings and a freestanding new build were approved in 1993/1994. These applications had expired and the applicant was re-submitting an application of the previously approved scheme.

The Panel conceded that as these schemes had been approved some years ago that they could not object in principle to the new build. However there were some reservations regarding the design and it was suggested that some of the top heavy roofs could be lowered and that they should have chimneys and ridge details to match the main house.

**E) 16/26 OXFORD STREET & 28 NEWARKE STREET**

**Planning Application 20061516**

**Demolition and Redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site with a new building ranging from three to six stories to create 51 self contained flats with 40 car parking spaces.

The Panel thought that this was over development of the site. The proposed new build was too high and the Newarke Street elevation seemed not to relate to the rest of the design. Further concerns were expressed regarding access and egress to and from the busy road network. Overall it was thought that the design should be reduced in height and redesigned to accommodate the reduction in height.

**F) UNIVERSITY ROAD, LEICESTER UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING BUILDING**

**Listed Building Consent 20061978**

**New sub station**

The Director said that the application was for a new electricity sub-station. The current electricity sub station was located on the ground floor and dated from the early 1960s and was becoming obsolete and dangerous.

The Panel had no objections to the scheme.

**G) HIGHCROSS STREET, ALL SAINTS' CHURCH**

**Planning Application 20061716**

**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of part of the

church to a stained glass workshop. The application related to the Chancel only and no alterations were proposed to the main building. Externally a new ramped access was proposed.

The Panel had no objections to the scheme.

**H) 4-6 WHARF STREET SOUTH, 1-3 CAMDEN STREET**  
**Planning Application 20061939**  
**Change of use / extension**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the first and second floors of the buildings from a factory to twelve self-contained flats. The proposal involved a two-storey extension and alterations to the ground floor retail shop. This was a revised scheme to 20060860 which was discussed by the Panel in June.

The Panel had no objections to the scheme.

**I) 15 ANDOVER STREET**  
**Planning Application 20061782**  
**Replacement rear windows and door**

The Director said that the application was for a new flat block for eleven self-contained flats. This was a revised proposal to the one previously presented to the Panel.

The Panel commented that as this was designed as a Georgian block, it should be redesigned to better represent that style of architecture with stronger elements eg. a stronger more projecting central bay and proper timber windows with deep moulded profiles.

**J) 123 BELGRAVE GATE**  
**Planning Application 20061993**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the basement and ground floor from offices to bar and the first, second and third floors of the building from offices to four flats. A similar application for the conversion of the upper floors to flats was considered by the Panel in 2005.

The Panel accepted the change of use. It was commented that the existing front windows should remain and all proposed new windows to the rear and side should match the existing. It was also recommended that rooflights to the front roof slope should be removed as the rear dormer should be sufficient. If the roof lights were essential then they should be positioned as in the previous scheme and be flush conservation style.

**K) 296 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20061815**

### **Additional flats, rear extension**

The Director noted that this large early 20<sup>th</sup> century house had previously been converted to flats. The current application was for the conversion of the basement and a single storey extension to the rear to create further flats.

The Panel noted that the building had been badly treated over the years with poor rear extensions and a front dormer that was out of character. It was requested that, ideally, the whole rear should be remodelled in a sympathetic way and the front dormer re-designed with something more appropriate to the style of the building. The Panel was also concerned at the loss of garden and requested that this be reinstated at the front.

### **L) 62A LONDON ROAD Planning Application 20062061 Four telecommunication antennas**

The Director said that the application was for four telecommunications antennas with associated equipment cabinets. This was revised scheme to one seen by the Panel earlier this year.

The Panel said this was no better than the previous submission and therefore should be refused.

### **M) 144 LONDON ROAD Planning Application 20062020 Covered area to rear**

The Director said that the application was for a covered area to the rear of the public house.

The Panel were unclear what exactly was intended as the plans were somewhat lacking in clarity and detail and requested more information to consider at a future meeting.

### **N) 2-6 ST MARTINS WALK Planning Permission 20062021 and Advertisement Consent 20062012 Change of use from shop/café to restaurant/takeaway and new banner signs**

The Director said that the applications were for change of use and the retention of two banner signs.

The Panel had no objections to the scheme.

### **O) 73 MARKET PLACE Advertisement Consent 20061959 New signs**

The Director said that the application was for an internally illuminated fascia

and additional projecting sign.

The Panel raised an objection to the height and size of the projecting sign. Concerns were also expressed about the depth and internal illumination of the fascia sign. The Panel requested that the fascia sign should have letters only illuminated or external illumination and that the projecting sign should be brought down to fascia level and reduced in size.

**P) 46 RATCLIFFE ROAD  
Planning Application 20061953  
Conservatory**

The Director said that the application was for a single storey conservatory to the rear.

The Panel considered the proposed conservatory to be out of character with the age of the building. It should be simplified and not made of uPVC.

**The Chair agreed to consider the following as an item of urgent business:-**

**109 HIGHCROSS STREET  
Grille on shop frontage**

The Director said that the proposal was for a metal grille to be attached to the shop frontage at night to prevent vandalism.

The Panel raised no objection to the grille subject to a full listed building application.

**The Panel raised no objection to the following, therefore it was not formally considered:**

**Q) 18 DE MONTFORT STREET  
Advertisement Consent 20061617  
Replacement rear windows**

**62. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.20pm.

