



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 16 MAY 2007 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair (in the Chair)

- |                 |   |  |
|-----------------|---|--|
| D. Hollingworth | - | Leicester Civic Society                        |
| D. Martin       | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust       |
| P. Draper       | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors         |
| S. Heathcote    | - | Royal Town Planning Institute                  |
| R Roenisch      | - | Victorian Society                              |
| A. McWhirr      | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee          |
| P. Swallow      | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| C. Sawday       | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |

**Officers in Attendance:**

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

**Also in Attendance:**

Councillor Patrick Kitterick – Cabinet Portfolio Holder – Regeneration and Transport

\* \* \* \* \*

**96. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from S. Britton, K. Chhapi, Malcolm Elliot, R. Gill, A. McWhirr, and D. Smith.

**97. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **98. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

It was noted that R. Gill's name was not included in the apologies for absence.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 16 May 2007 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

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

### Glenfield Railway Tunnel

The Chair reported back that those attending the site visit had been assured that the proposals for the maintenance works were appropriate and suitable.

### Labour Group Attendance at CAP meetings

Councillor Patrick Kitterick, Cabinet Portfolio Holder – Regeneration and Transport, attended the meeting and outlined the position of the Labour Group with regard to attendance at CAP meetings. He noted that his group had discussed the matter. As far as Councillors who were members of the Planning and Development Control (PDC) Committee, there were still concerns about the issue of pre-determination, more specifically where a Councillor was seemed to have gained a pre-determined view on an application prior to considering it at a Committee meeting. He also pointed to case law arising from Islington which had shown that attendance at a body such as CAP was felt to have influenced Councillors in their decision making. Therefore his group didn't feel it would be suitable for members of the PDC Committee to attend.

He did however comment that it would be acceptable for members of the Labour Group who weren't members of the PDC Committee to attend, although he wasn't presently aware of any interested persons. He also gave a commitment to providing support from the Committee Services section to the Panel.

He also said that he was happy to attend future meetings of the Panel to discuss any matters of policy which the Panel wanted to consider. Further he felt that there could be standing speaking rights on offer to CAP members at the Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny function. He commented further that the work of the Panel was valued and he was happy to consider further ways in which Panel Members thought that CAP could engage in the policy process.

Panel members made a number of comments.

It was commented that Councillors on the Planning and Development Control Committee must meet with and be contacted by constituents and developers as part of the application process on a regular basis. Cllr. Kitterick stated that members of the Committee would declare the fact that they had been contacted by anyone. He also stated that a Committee member would not meet with a developer independently.

It was felt that people attending the Panel were hearing more detailed information about planning applications; therefore it would actually be useful for decision makers to attend. Cllr. Kitterick in response stated that due to the quasi-judicial nature of planning decisions it would seem unfair to an applicant for them to not have similar access to the decision makers.

Officers noted that the Panel had been in existence for 20 years with Councillors attending and queried why their attendance was an issue now. Cllr. Kitterick noted that standards in Local Government were now more of an issue. The Standards Board requirements now put Councillors in the spotlight over their conduct. He felt that they were perhaps too officious in their application of the rules. He also commented that his group didn't judge other political groups on how they interpreted the rules.

The Officer commented further that she felt that it was a backwards step to not have Councillors attending panel meetings and that judgements shouldn't be made about the work of the Panel. Cllr. Kitterick commented further that this issue could be revisited in the future, but he didn't expect this to happen soon.

Stephen Heathcote commented that he agreed that the spotlight on Councillors had increased. He did however feel that it would be worth considering what other local authorities do in respect of Councillor attendance at Conservation Panels. He undertook to do this.

Cllr. Kitterick reiterated his offer for members of the Panel to speak to him if they had any ideas for how the Panel could provide further input into relevant planning policy.

The Chair thanked Cllr. Kitterick for attending.

### Other Items

It was queried whether there was to be a Heritage Champion at Councillor level. Officers noted that this was unclear at present.

### Membership

The Committee Administrator noted that the former Councillor Garrity had offered her services as a Panel member. The Panel agreed to discuss the matter in more detail at the next meeting.

### 109 – 133 Granby Street

Members of the Panel queried the details of the approval of this application and whether it had been to Committee. Officers noted that as part of the approval PPG15 requirements were considered to have been met, as there was not sufficient original material left in the temperance hotel building. Panel members expressed further concerns about the size of the proposed building.

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

Members raised no comment on this report.

## **101. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

### **A) 40 WHARF STREET SOUTH, TELEPHONE EXCHANGE Planning Application 20070675 Change of use, extension**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to 129 flats. The proposal involved a roof extension and external alterations. The Panel had previously made observations on a similar scheme in 2005.

The Panel thought that this latest application was a considerable improvement on previous schemes. The Panel was pleased that the balconies and chequered slate rendering was being retained and that the roof extension had been set back to retain the dramatic views of the roofscape.

### **B) 138 WESTCOTES DRIVE Planning Application 20062017 & Listed Building Consent 20070798 Three storey extension and new build adjacent**

The Director said that the application was for a three-storey extension to the side elevation of the existing building and a new building adjacent. The building was to remain in use as a care home.

The Panel noted that was a magnificent building. Members were generally happy with the extension to the east of the building although it was felt that more information on the removal of existing fabric was required. The new building to the west was thought to be too close to the main house and the design (especially the exaggerated roof) should be modified so that it matched the style of the eastern proposal. Overall it was felt that there was too much additional building being added to the site, which detracted from the setting of the main listed building.

### **C) 42-48 CHATHAM STREET, 37-47 YORK ROAD Planning Application 20050607 New development**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on the redevelopment of this site in 2005. This application was a revised scheme for a five to seven storey block of 95 self-contained flats, with basement and lower ground floor parking.

The Panel noted that views along these streets were a snap shot of Victorian Leicester and the Building of Local Interest was a particularly fine surviving example of vernacular architecture from the 18<sup>th</sup> or early 19<sup>th</sup> century which would be a great loss if demolished. It was considered that the proposed new build was far too tall and out of scale with the existing street scene and not of

sufficient quality to warrant the loss of the historic building. Further information was requested on how this building compared with the other side of Chatham Street, and it was felt that the height of the former factory opposite should be the maximum allowed on this site.

**D) AYLESTONE HALL**  
**Listed Building Consent 20070576**  
**Secondary glazing**

The Director noted that the hall was converted into two dwellinghouses a few years ago. The high quality of the conversion was awarded a silver Green Apple Civic Pride Award in 2004. This application was aluminium glazing to the existing timber windows.

The Panel raised no objection.

**E) 71 MARKET PLACE**  
**Advertisement Consent 20070465**  
**Internally Illuminated signs**

The Director said that the application was for an internally illuminated fascia sign which would face both Market Place and Victoria Parade, and an internally illuminated projecting sign to the Victoria Parade elevation.

The Panel considered this proposal to be vulgar and would be detrimental to the character of the building and the conservation area. The colours of the fascia signs were considered to be too bright, and internal illumination on a listed building in a conservation area was unacceptable. The projecting sign was far too large and detracted from views along Victoria Parade.

**F) 49 GALLOWTREE GATE**  
**Planning Applications 20070701 & 20070705**  
**New shopfront & signs**

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront and externally illuminated fascia and projecting sign. The work had already been carried out.

The Panel raised no objections to the scheme.

**G) 14 WOODLAND AVENUE**  
**Planning Application 20070596**  
**New house**

The Director said that the application was for a sub-division of the garden of no.14 to provide a plot and to build a detached dwellinghouse.

The Panel lamented the loss of the garden but felt that the space was sufficient to accommodate a new house. The design of the house was considered acceptable but attention to fine natural materials such as natural slate and timber windows was essential. Panel Members thought that if the building was

set back a little more it would create a better view. It was also commented that details of the proposed garage were required.

**H) REAR OF 34 SPRINGFIELD ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20070710**  
**New house**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously considered an application for a dwellinghouse. This was a revised scheme.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposal.

**I) 68 CLARENDON PARK ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20070670**  
**Walls and railings**

The Director said that the application was for walls and railings to the boundary of the house which is on the corner of Portland Road and Clarendon Park Road.

The Panel considered that the proposed wall and railings were too high and should be lowered to no higher than the existing fence. The proportion of wall to railings should be approx 2/5 wall & 3/5 railings with gate piers slightly higher.

**J) 50-52 KNIGHTON DRIVE**  
**Planning Application 20070593**  
**Conversion of coach house**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on this site (a former halls of residence) in 2006. This application was a variation on the approved scheme to convert the coach house into two 3 bedroom town houses as opposed to the previous consent for two apartments.

The Panel raised no objections.

**K) 328 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20070677**  
**Extension, access ramp**

The Director said that the application was for a single storey extension to the front and a new access ramp.

The Panel noted the high quality of this building and thought that the proposed front extension would be detrimental to its character. A more suitable location on the side or rear should be sought.

**L) 177½ LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20070709**  
**Demolition, new offices**

The Director said that the application was for the removal of the existing outbuildings and replacement with new offices and stores.

The Panel noted that the outbuildings had considerable character and would prefer them to be refurbished. It was further commented that if the structure was beyond repair then the new build should reflect the style of the existing and incorporate elements such as the specialist bricks within the arches into the design.

**M) 53A LONDON ROAD  
Planning Application 20070663 & Advertisement Consent 20070664  
ATM machine and illuminated sign**

The Director said that the application was for a new ATM machine and internally illuminated sign within the existing shopfront.

The Panel considered that this proposal did not affect the character of the existing shopfront.

**N) 73 MARKET PLACE  
Advertisement Consent 20070646  
Retention of externally illuminated sign**

The Director said that the application was for the retention of an externally illuminated sign to the front elevation.

The Panel raised no objection to the application.

**The Chair agreed to accept the following item of urgent business.**

**BUTT CLOSE LANE  
Raised terrace area**

The Director said that the application was for a raised smoking area at the rear of The Salmon Pub.

The Panel noted that this proposal would sit very closely to the listed building 3 Darker Street. The principle of a smoking terrace was accepted but it was suggested that it be set back away from the boundary wall.

**The Panel raised no objection to the following, they were therefore not formally considered.**

**O) NARROW LANE, BLACK HORSE PH  
Planning Application 20070722  
Smokers terrace**

**P) 15 GRANBY STREET  
Planning Application 20070373**

**Alterations to shopfront**

**Q) 10 ST MARTINS**  
**Advertisement Consent 20070533**  
**New sign**

**R) 20 NEWTOWN STREET**  
**Planning Application 20070629**  
**Change of use**

**S) 12 NEWTOWN STREET**  
**Listed Building Consent 20070660**  
**New chimney pot and boiler**

**T) 44 PRINCESS ROAD EAST**  
**Planning Application 20070682**  
**Change of use**

**U) 158 UPPER NEW WALK**  
**Planning Application 20070618**  
**Change of use**

**V) 21 QUEEN STREET**  
**Planning Application 20070638**  
**Aerial & satellite**

**W) 23 SANVEY LANE**  
**Planning Permission 20070640**  
**Detached House**

**102. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

Officers noted that the Article 4 Direction came into effect at the end of the week following the meeting.

It was noted that the date of the next meeting would be Wednesday 20 June.

**103. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 6.57pm.



