



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 23 JANUARY 2008 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence -Vice Chair

K. Chhapi	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
J. Eaton	-	Ancients Monuments Society
M. Elliott	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
S. Heathcote	-	Royal Town Planning Institute
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
D. Lyne	-	Leicestershire Industrial History Society
R Roenisch	-	Victorian Society
C. Sawday	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
P. Swallow	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
D. Trubshaw	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation

Officers in Attendance:

J. Carstairs	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
J. Crooks	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
P. Mann	-	Committee Services, Resources Department

* * * * *

56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Simon Britton, Joan Garrity, Deborah Martin and Alan McWhirr.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

58. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 12 December 2007 be confirmed as a correct record.

59. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

A member of the Panel reported on the site visit that some panel members had attended to True Jesus Church, Humberstone Road. He stated that they had met the architect and that they had been informed of the problems and the options available for the building. It was reported that the building had financial constraints, which made it financially impossible to implement changes to the building in the current situation. The Panel agreed that they would consider a complete demolition and rebuild providing the design of the new building satisfactory.

A member of the Panel stated that they were unhappy that the hotel on Welford Road was granted planning application to be built. The Heritage Regeneration Officer stated that the building was not listed and it was not in a conservation area therefore there was no statutory protection for it. They added that they could seek to retain the building however the planners were in their right to look at the new build.

A member of the Panel commented that they were disappointed with the information presented by the planner. The Heritage Regeneration Officer commented that there was the opportunity to make representations but the planners could ignore them. It was also stated that since the new arrangements where every application which was rejected went to the Planning and Development Control Committee, it had simply added to the process, however applications were still be approved by the Committee.

The Heritage Regeneration Officer commented that there may be new planning reforms where they may be public consultations, which could strengthen any appeals against approved applications. It was also stated that there was a group called "Save Britain's Heritage", which had received a lot of reports from other councils as well. The Heritage Regeneration Officer added they had also sent the group a considerable amount of photographs.

60. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Service Director, Planning and Policy 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.

61. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) BATH LANE, ALL SAINTS ROAD, JARVIS STREET, RUDING STREET, BLACKFRIARS STREET

Planning Application 20072162

Redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the redevelopment of the site with a new build, ranging from three to nine storeys, for 352 residential units with ground floor car parking.

The Panel were quite impressed when they saw the application for the first time however they disapproved of the revisions to the design and in particular the loss of any lower level interest on the ground floors especially on Bath Lane. The Panel felt that the proposal should contain shops and cafes and other services for the residents living in the area. The Panel questioned if there was a master plan and if so did the proposal follow its guidelines. There was some debate about how larch boarding would weather and what would it be like in 10 years. The Panel stated that the flat roofs were disappointing and that there was very little greenery offered. The Panel suggested roof gardens be added to provide some greenery.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

B) LAND AT CHATHAM STREET & YORK STREET

Planning Application 20071926

Seven storey building

The Director said that the application was for a seven storey building for 57 new residential units with ground floor parking.

Overall the Panel were reasonably satisfied with the upper levels but commented again that the ground floor car parking presented a bland and unimaginative ground floor street scene. The Panel commented that at the very least that the car park entrance should have some gates with an improved appearance.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments on this application.

C) ABBEY LANE, ABBEY PARK ROAD

Planning Application 20072260

Mixed use development

The Director said that the application was for a mixed-use development for new offices and flats.

Overall the Panel thought that the design was better than the other corner buildings nearby. However they commented that the curvy roof slope feature was rather dated for newly designed buildings. The Panel felt that the bland wall at the ground level should be changed to walls and railings.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments on this application.

D) ALEXANDRA HOUSE, ST GEORGES CHURCH YARD, 27 YEOMAN STREET

Planning Applications 20072266, 20072269, 20072270, Advertisement Consents 20072271 & 20072267, Lighting columns & projected images

The Director said the applications were for lighting columns and equipment to project images onto street surfaces and trees. The Panel made observations on some of the new themed lighting installations around the new theatre at the December 2007 meeting.

The Panel were generally supportive but commented that they thought there were too many images in such a small area. The Panel stated that trees in leaf were pleasant to view anyway and questioned whether the images were needed. They mentioned that there could just be basic lights instead. The Panel's other main concern with the imagery was that if there were going to be 'faith symbols' they felt that there should be some Christian ones and symbols for those who didn't have a faith. It was also noted that Alexandra House was looking rather untidy and the Panel asked if officers could write to the owners of the building and ask them to tidy up the frontage of the building.

The Panel recommended approval on this application however they did have some reservations.

E) LEICESTER UNIVERSITY, ENGINEERING BUILDING

Listed Building Consent 20072280

Pigeon netting & spikes

The Director said that the application was for the permanent renewal of pigeon proofing nets and spikes to the rear first floor balcony that had been granted limited period consent twice previously.

The Panel raised no objections to the permanent retention of Pigeon proofing.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

F) 9 ST MARTINS WALK

Planning Application 20072107

Removal of structural columns & installation of downlighters

The Director said that application was for the removal of six supporting columns from the first floor restaurant that runs between the east and west sides of St Martins Square and the introduction of downlighters.

The Panel raised no objections to the application.

G) 1 SEVERN STREET
Planning Application 20072299
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for new traditionally proportioned brown uPVC windows. It was also reported that enforcement action had recently been taken against the installation of unauthorised uPVC windows at the property.

The Panel stated that they wished to see proper timber single glazed working sashes reinstated.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

H) 22 STRETTON ROAD
Planning Application 20072262
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the original windows with new timber double glazed units.

The Panel stated that they did not think that the original windows could be copied to the same high standard as the originals and recommended repair of the existing windows with secondary double-glazing.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments on this application.

I) LONDON ROAD, OLD HORSE PUBLIC HOUSE
Planning Application 20072273
Side extension

The Director said that the application was for a side extension to the building. The Panel made observations on a side extension to the building last year and this was a revised scheme.

The Panel thought that the extension looked peculiar when viewed from the car park. They felt that it should be reduced in width and height so that it sat better with the existing building. The Panel noted that the scheme was trying to replicate the existing building and they thought that it might have been better to produce a more modern addition.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments on this application.

J) 14 WOODLAND AVENUE
Planning Application 20072367
New house & garage

The Director said that the application was for a new five-bedroom house and

garage within the garden to the side of 14 Woodland Avenue. This was a different scheme to the one discussed by the Panel in 2007 (0596).

The Panel raised no objections to the proposal.

K) 13 TOLLER ROAD
Planning Application 20072332
Two storey extension to side, single storey extension to rear

The Director said that the application was for a two-storey side extension and a single storey extension to the rear. It was reported that the building was currently in use as a care home.

The Panel noted that the delight of this pair of semi detached houses was the symmetry and the planned addition would spoil it. The Panel suggested that the garage be removed to give access and extended to the rear instead.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

L) 16A ELMFIELD AVENUE
Planning Application 20072357
Single Storey Extension to Side

The Director said that the application was for a single storey extension to the side of the property.

The Panel raised no objections to the application.

M) 75 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20072319
Change of use to flats, new coach house

The Panel made observations on the conversion of the house to flats with a new coach house last year. They were satisfied in principle with the proposal but suggested some refinements for the coach house. The Director said that the application was for a revised scheme based on the Panel's suggestions.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposal.

N) 4 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20080019
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the care home to 8 self contained flats. The proposal involved a two-storey rear extension and external alterations.

The Panel had no objections but stated that the new window should be the same depth as the existing one.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments on this application.

**O) MEADOWS COURT, OLD CHURCH STREET, AYLESTONE
Planning Application 20072242
Extensions**

The Director said that the application was for extensions to the care home.

The Panel reluctantly agreed to the extra storey but considered white render would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area. They commented that they would like to see the retention of the existing brickwork and possibly use the cedar cladding for the upper storey.

The Panel recommended to seek amendments on this application.

**P) 20 NEW WALK (OUTSIDE OF)
Planning Application 20080026
Sculpture**

The Panel made observations on the recently sited sculpture by the bridge over Waterloo Way last year. The sculpture was recently vandalised and the Director said that the application was for it's repositioning outside of 20 New Walk.

The Panel thought that placing the sculpture behind railings defeated the object of public art. They felt that the Sculpture should be near the entrance path to enable easy access and viewing of the sculpture.

The Panel had no objections to the application.

**S) 2 SOUTHERNHAY ROAD
Planning Application 20080034
Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of part of the ground floor from residential to a laser and beauty therapy centre.

The Panel were concerned that introducing a business use in a residential area would give rise to other concerns like signage and car parking. They felt that if consent was given it should be done on the understanding that only a small brass type sign would be permitted.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

The Panel raised no observations on the following applications, they were therefore not formally considered.

**Q) 47 NEW WALK
Planning Application 20072151
Internal Alterations**

**R) 11A WELFORD ROAD
Planning Application 20072315
Change of use**

62. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

The Committee Services Officer informed the Panel that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 21 February.

63. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:54pm.

