



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: THURSDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 2008 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill - Chair

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| K. Chhapi | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects |
| M Elliott | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| D. Hollingworth | - | Leicester Civic Society |
| D. Lyne | - | Leicestershire Industrial History Society |
| D. Martin | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust |
| R Roenisch | - | Victorian Society |
| C Sawday | - | Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge |
| D Smith | - | Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society |
| D Trubshaw | - | Institute of Historic Building Conservation |

Officers in Attendance:

- | | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| J. Carstairs | - | Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| Jeremy Crooks | - | Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| Jane Crooks | - | Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department |
| P. Mann | - | Committee Services, Resources Department |

* * * * *

64. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Simon Britton, Steven Heathcote, Richard Lawrence, Alan McWhirr and Peter Swallow.

65. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

66. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

A Member of the Panel mentioned that his declaration of interest had not been

recorded.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 23 January 2008 be confirmed as a correct record with the above amendment.

67. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

68. 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.

69. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) BATH LANE, DONISTHORPES

Listed Building Consent 20080080 Planning Application 20072365 Change of use, new development

The Director said the application was for the conversion of the existing buildings and an additional new build to provide a 110-bedroom hotel, 280 residential apartments, offices and a restaurant. It was reported that consent for the conversion of the listed buildings to flats with extensions for a total of 153 units and the conversion of the pump house to a restaurant was granted in 2005.

The Panel thought that the proposed new build completely overpowered the historic buildings and that the design was outdated. They felt the element next to the cottages was thought to be particularly overpowering. It was agreed that the scale and position of new buildings against the old was awkward and that the proportion looked weak on the tower building. The Panel also felt that the way the courtyard was placed was insensitive, as it would block the views of the riverside.

The Panel stated that they thought that the proposed internal treatment was better for the mill than the conversion into flats but they were opposed to the new doors to the waterside frontage. They stated they did not wish to lose the boiler house, which they considered to be part of the historic character.

The Panel agreed to have a site visit to the area and thought further information and discussion was needed.

B) 59-59½ HIGHCROSS STREET

Listed Building Consent 20080058 Planning Application 20080056

Change of use, extension

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the existing flats/restaurant use to a restaurant/café. The proposal involved both internal and external alterations. A previous application for the conversion was granted in 2004.

The Panel thought this was a good scheme. They stated that they would have preferred to see the whole ground floor rendered and that with the simplicity of the design façade facing Highcross Street it would have been useful to look at the different size of brick, and that they should be laid in a proper bond not just in a plain stretcher. The Panel noted that Richard Murphy, an architect in Scotland used mirrored sections when joining old with new materials and a similar use might be appropriate here.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

C) YMCA, EAST STREET

Listed Building Consent 20080173 Planning Application 20080133 Internal and external alterations

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the ground floor windows and entrance doors on East Street and internal alterations.

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

D) 80 WHARF STREET

Planning Application 20072342 Mixed-use development

The Director said that the application was for a new building with 72 one and two bedroom apartments and four retail units with car parking for 15 cars.

This application was deferred until the next meeting as some of information on the application was incomplete.

E) 9 GOTHAM STREET

Planning Application 20072355 Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the existing windows with double glazed timber sashes to the front and uPVC to the rear.

The Panel had some doubt about replicating the fineness of the glazing bars. They recommend that the existing windows be repaired with secondary glazing. They stated that the applicant would need to show that they could replicate exactly what was there before double glazed units were allowed. The Panel also expressed concern regarding adding uPVC to the rear.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

F) CRAMANT COTTAGES, 54 KING STREET
Planning Application 20080052
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the bar to a day care nursery. It was reported that Cramant Cottages dated from the early 19th century and that after years of slow decay the cottages were converted to a bar in 1994.

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

G) 7 – 11 NEW WALK
Planning Application 20072372 Listed Building Consent 20072384
Change of use

It was reported that the three late Georgian houses were converted to a hostel for the homeless by the City Council at around 1980 and it was stated that the hostel was currently vacant. The Director said that the application was for its conversion back to three houses. The proposal involved some demolition to the rear, three new detached garages and a new vehicular access to the rear alley.

The Panel had no objections and welcomed the change back to individual housing. They commented that the treatment of the front gardens was going to be important and stated their preference for a division to be installed.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

H) 9 UPPER BROWN STREET
Planning Application 20080033
Illuminated signs

The Director said that the application was for an illuminated 'banner sign' and illuminated menu sign.

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

I) 362 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20080082
Single storey extension to rear

The Director said that the application was for an extension to the rear of the nursing home.

The Panel stated that the new extension should be scaled down slightly and the roof pitch altered. They also felt that the window details could be improved. The overall feeling of the Panel was that the proposal could be more dynamic.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

J) 50 RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Application 20072364
Single and two storey extensions

The Director said that the application was for a single storey extension to the front and side and a two storey extension to the rear of the house. It was reported that the house dated back to the early 1960s.

The Panel thought that the whole proposal would be detrimental to the building and the conservation area. They were particularly opposed to the front extension. The Panel stated that they would accept the proposals to the side and rear but would like a more sympathetic design. They thought the walls and railings to the front would also be detrimental to the character of the conservation area.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

K) VICTORIA PARK
Planning Application 20080158
New ball court

The Director said that the application was for a new ball court, which would incorporate part of the existing Tennis Courts.

The Panel noted that the park was very large and the location of the proposed court would be detrimental to both the Grade II listed De Montfort Hall and more importantly the Grade II listed War Memorial. The Panel recommended that the proposal be located in a less sensitive location.

L) TOWER STREET
Planning Application 20080074
Floodlighting

The Director said that the application was for floodlighting to the car park. It was commented that old maps had shown that the site had always been undeveloped. It was mentioned that usage of the site as a car park dated back from 1971.

The Panel thought that the proposal would not enhance the conservation area and that the lighting columns were too high. They commented that they would accept a lower height for the lighting columns such as half of the current proposal.

M) 13 DANESHILL ROAD
Planning Application 20080100
Conversion

The Panel made observations on the conversion of the house to two flats in 2004. The Director said that the application was for the conversion to five flats.

The Panel repeated their objection from a previous application, that the property should remain a family dwelling.

The Panel recommended refusal on the application.

**N) SPARKENHOE STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL
Planning Application 20080079
Extension**

The Director said that the application was for an extension to the modern section of the school

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

**O) 75-79 MARKET PLACE
Advertisement Consent 20080200
Signage**

The Director said that the application was for two halo lit fascia signs and one halo lit projecting sign.

The Panel raised no objections to this application.

**P) 70 CLARENDON PARK ROAD/ 7 PORTLAND ROAD
Planning Permission 20080205
Demolition and extension**

The Director said that the application was for partial demolition and construction of a two-storey side extension.

The Panel had no objections in principle to the application but stated that the new building should not look like a block of flats and should reflect its use as part of the temple.

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

**Q) 330A LONDON ROAD
Conservation Area Consent 20072381**

**R) 27 HORSEFAIR STREET
Planning Application 20072380**

**S) HUMBERSTONE JUNIOR SCHOOL
Planning Application 20080032**

**T) 1 MAIN STREET BRAUNSTONE
Listed Building Consent 20080188 & 20080201**

U) 30 SPRINGFIELD ROAD

Planning Application 20080116

V) 8 CHURCH GATE

Planning Application 20080065

70. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

The Senior Building Conservation Officer stated that they were looking for support to get the building located at 99 – 103 Highcross Street, listed. She added that they were also looking to trace at how the site developed from 1791 to 1800. A member of the Panel reported that from a photo of the site from 1891, it was rumoured that the building had medieval cellars however this was not true. The members were encouraged to write letters of support to get the building listed.

71. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:35pm.

