



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 21 MAY 2008 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

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

**Officers in Attendance:**

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

\* \* \* \* \*

**88. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Peter Draper, Richard Lawrence and David Lyne.

**89. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**90. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 23 April be confirmed as a correct record.

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

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

## **92. 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.

## **93. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

### **A) 100 VAUGHAN WAY Planning Application 20080703 Redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the redevelopment of the site currently occupied by a two storey factory with an eight storey building for 24 flats over ground and first floor offices.

The Panel were in favour of the application as they thought it would bring life to the street. They thought that the facades were well detailed, with deeply recessed balconies, and changes in the size of the windows. The Panel agreed that the composition had interesting variety and that the drawings did not do full justice to the scheme.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

### **B) WELLINGTON HOTEL, GRANBY STREET Planning Application 20080615 Change of use, extension to rear and external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the upper floors to 15 flats. The proposal involved a four storey extension for a lift, stair tower and external alterations.

The Panel felt that the proposal continued the damage to the building and had no merit. They thought that the tower was badly proportioned. The Panel agreed that it should have been possible to produce a tower without it looking so ponderous. They thought that the idea of glimpsing behind a building was magical and a well designed extension should be sought.

The Panel stated that they would like to add a condition that the original windows be put back before permission was granted.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**C) 32A BELVOIR STREET**  
**Planning Application 20071729**  
**Change of use to flats, external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for change of use of the upper floors to 12 flats including alterations to the roof and replacement windows. It was noted that a similar application was discussed by the Panel in 2006(0624), which was withdrawn.

The Panel accepted the change of use but they did not support the mansard roof. They noted that the sections of bare wall which was similar to the one on Albion Street added to the special character of the town but reluctantly agreed that the scheme depended on putting fenestration in there. They stated that the windows should be timber and match the existing one especially on the Belvoir Street elevation.

They noted the advert 'Jobs' on the first floor was unsightly and should be removed. They also queried why the Conservation Area boundary stopped short of this building.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**D) WARREN LODGE, HUMBERSTONE**  
**Planning Application 20080557**  
**Boundary wall**

The Director said that the application was for the retention of a 2metre high boundary wall.

The Panel thought the wall to be amateurish and of poor quality construction and therefore would be unacceptable as a new addition to what the Panel thought was a prominent corner.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**E) SAFFRON HILL CEMETERY, STONESBY AVENUE**  
**Planning Application 20070692 & Listed Building Consent 20070841**  
**Side & rear extension**

It was noted that the chapel had been the target of antisocial behaviour for some years. The toilets in particular had been vandalised on many occasions. In order to curtail these activities the Director said that the City Council had submitted an application for grilles within the arches of the cemetery chapel.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposals.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**F) LONDON ROAD, 7TH DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH**  
**Advertisement Consent 20080645**

### **Three notice boards**

The Director said that application was for three 3metre high notice boards.

The Panel had no objection to the design of the signs but stated that they should be restricted to two, one at each end of the site. The Panel suggested that an option could be to have an angled board on the corner which would then be visible in views down London Road and University Road.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

### **G) 13 CHURCH GATE Advertisement Consent 20080718 Retention of sign**

The Director said that the application was for the retention of an internally illuminated fascia sign.

The Panel noted that the building dated from 1711 and was therefore one of the oldest secular buildings in the city and the upper floors had survived intact. They suggested approval for the sign providing the first floor projecting sign was removed.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

### **H) 6-8 RUTLAND STREET Planning Application 20080756 Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the shop to a hot food takeaway. The proposal included a ventilation flue to the rear.

The Panel queried the design details for the flue. They stated that they did not want it to be any thicker than the one already at the rear and that it should be powder coated to minimise its impact. They also wanted assurance that it would not be visible from Rutland Street.

It was agreed that further information was required on this application.

### **I) 56 GALLOWTREE GATE Planning Application 20080690 Retention of signage**

It was noted that the ground floor of the building, formerly a shop had recently converted to a café. The Director said that application was for the retention of the new signs.

The Panel raised no objections to the signage.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**J) 23 LOSEBY LANE**  
**Planning Application 20080643**  
**Replacement windows and door**

The Director said that the application was for a new door and the replacement of three upper floor windows within the front elevation.

The Panel raised no objections to the works provided that the glazing bars matched the existing profile.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**K) 18 VICTORIA PARK ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20080611**  
**Change of use and external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the house to five self contained flats. The proposal included new roof lights and a dormer to the rear elevation.

The Panel felt that houses in the location should be retained as individual dwellings instead of being converted to flats. The Panel felt that no rooflights should be allowed to the front roofslope as this would set a precedent.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**L) 4-6 UPPER KING STREET**  
**Planning Application 20080635**  
**Rear extensions**

It was noted that the properties were given consent for conversion to flats from offices last year. The Director said that the application was for first and second storey extensions above the rear outbuildings.

The Panel thought that the extensions were acceptable in principle but felt that the flat roof looked awkward and stated that it would be better if there were a pitched roof instead.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**M) 55 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20080660**  
**Internal alterations**

The Director said that application was for the conversion of the first floor flats to offices. The proposal involved the removal of internal walls.

The Panel had no objections to the proposed alterations.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**N) ST JOHN THE BAPTIST SCHOOL, EAST AVENUE**  
**Planning Application 20080684**  
**New boundary fence**

It was noted that the Panel made observations on new boundary treatment along the school's East Avenue boundary in 2006. The Director said that the application was for a new 1.8 metre boundary fence along the Clarendon Park and London Road boundaries and the section to the rear of Dukes Drive flats.

The Panel lamented the loss of the timber open fence but accepted the need for added security in the case of schools. They stated however that as much of the greenery as possible should be retained to keep the character.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**LATE ITEMS**

**132 Westcotes Drive**  
**Planning Application 20080613**  
**New build in grounds of care home**

The Director said that the application was for a new build in the grounds of the care home

The Panel noted that this was similar to the previous scheme but with reduced roof height and 'second' floor. They thought that it was too close to the main house and had too large a footprint. The Panel also thought that the build looked squat and out of scale with the adjacent property. The Panel suggested that the footprint be reduced and possibly the height increased, but with a single storey element nearest the property to echo the scale of the outbuildings on the other side.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

**LEICESTER COLLEGE SITE, NARBOROUGH ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20080713**  
**New access, gates and fence**

The Director said that the application was for the build of a new access that included gates and a fence.

The Panel raised no objections to the scheme.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

**CHARNWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL**  
**Pre-application enquiry**  
**New classroom**

The Director said that the application was for the build of a new classroom.

The Panel were excited by this scheme and invited a full application.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

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

**O) 6 LANCASTER ROAD  
Planning Application 20080603  
Retention of rear extension**

**P) 14 MALVERN ROAD  
Planning Application 20080446  
New front door**

**Q) 10 NELSON STREET  
Planning Application 20080592  
Change of use**

**R) 40 LINCOLN STREET  
Planning Application 20080646  
Rear extension**

**S) 10 CHEAPSIDE  
Listed Building Consent 20080415  
Repairs and decoration**

**T) 6-10 ST ALBANS ROAD  
Planning Application 20080767  
Rear extension**

#### **94. DATES OF MEETINGS 2008/09**

The Committee Services Officer presented dates for meetings of the Panel for the 2008/09 Municipal year.

RESOLVED:

that the dates be noted by the Panel.

#### **95. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

Kanti Chhapi announced that it was to be his last meeting as he would be taking up the position of President of the Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects. He stated that Martin Jones would be his replacement. The Chair thanked him for his efforts and contribution throughout his time sitting on the Panel and wished him all the best for the future.

**96. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 6:44pm.



