



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 18 JUNE 2008 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

M. Elliott	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
M. Jones	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
D. Lyne	-	Leicestershire Industrial History Society
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
A. McWhirr	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
R. Roenisch	-	Victorian Society
D Smith	-	Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society
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

* * * * *

97. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed Martin Jones, Leicester and Rutland Society of Architects as a new Member of the Panel.

98. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Joan Garrity and the Council for the Preservation of Rural England.

99. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

100. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 21 May be confirmed as a correct record.

101. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

102. 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.

103. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

LATE ITEM

COLLEGE HALL, KNIGHTON

Listed Building Consent 20080981, Planning Application 20080980 Change of use, extensions and new development in grounds

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building to flats.

The Panel were pleased that Latimer House was being retained and had no objections to the conversion to flats. They noted that the scale of the buildings with their different heights was very important on the site and the roof extensions would ruin the whole ensemble. They accepted the need for the change of use and the addition of staircases, however commented that additional storeys would destroy the character of the site. The Panel also stated that the doubling in height of block D would be particularly damaging to the buildings character.

The Panel were informed that it was the demands of affordable housing that was creating the need for extra storeys and stated that there were plenty of sites in the City to provide affordable housing and it was a shame they had to put it in this location. The Panel suggested that more development could be added to the car park area perhaps with the loss of one large tree to create the extra affordable houses required.

In terms of the new build, the Panel thought that the proposed town houses were not very well designed and the block to replace the bike shed would obscure views into the site and should be omitted. The Panel stated that the new build next to Latimer house was considered acceptable

Overall the Panel thought that the scheme was detrimental to the character of the buildings, the other listed buildings nearby and the conservation area.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

A) WALNUT STREET BRIDGE
Listed Building Consent 20080789
Repairs to bridge

The Director said that the application was for repairs to the bridge following damage caused by a traffic accident. The work involves the reinstatement of a section of the cast iron parapet. The Panel made observations on the replacement of another section of the parapet in 2006.

The Panel had no objections to the use of spheroidal graphite to repair the bridge as they commented that it was logical to use the best materials available. They asked if measures could be implemented to prevent further accidents.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

B) 53B JARROM STREET, ST ANDREWS CHURCH VICARAGE
Listed Building Consent 20080916, Planning Application 20080902
Change of use, alterations

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the building from educational use back to residential. The proposal involved internal and external alterations.

The Panel opposed the French windows as they thought it would upset the integrity of that side of the building and commented that they would have liked to see the existing window retained. They had no objections to the other work but stated that the steps should be retained underneath the ramp.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments on this application.

C) 119-121 GLENFIELD ROAD
Planning Application 20080742
Change of use, extensions

The Director said that the application was for 58 flats incorporating the historic buildings into the scheme. The Panel made observations on the total redevelopment of this site involving the loss of the historic buildings last year.

The Panel were happy to see the historic houses retained but asked if the dormers to the rear could be improved by copying the existing ones.

D) MAIN STREET BRAUNSTONE
Planning Application 08/0265/1/PXCS (Blaby District reference)
New development

The Director said that the City Council had been consulted on a proposal for a new Tesco store on the car park of the Shakespeare PH. The proposal was just outside the City boundary in the Blaby District however it would affect the setting of the Braunstone Village Conservation Area.

The Panel felt that the proposal would adversely affect the character of the conservation area. They felt that the new build would intrude into what was at present a lovely rural view over fields. The Panel commented that the trees in particular were hugely important to the street scene. The Panel were concerned that there would also be new signage, which would probably run along the edge of the boundary of the conservation area.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

E) REAR OF 25-27 HIGHCROSS STREET
Planning Application 20080774
New flat block

The Director said that the application was for a new four storey building for 17 flats.

The Panel thought the extension would be sympathetic to the fine building and had no objections. They stated that they would like good quality materials.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

F) STONESBY AVENUE
Planning Application 20080826
10 metre high mono pole & equipment cabinet

The Director said that the application was for a 10 metre high mono pole and equipment cabinet. The Panel made observations on a similar scheme on the Southfields Drive side of the library in 2006, which was subsequently refused.

The Panel reiterated their thoughts on the previous application on Southfields Drive that the aerial should be moved away from the listed building. They suggested the centre of the roundabout as an alternative site. They also raised concerns over the damaged windows and asked how long they would remain boarded up.

G) 91 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20080792
Alterations to shop

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the shop front, new double glazed windows and two dormers to the rear.

The Panel noted that these were built by William Rushin in the 1860s. They commented that they would prefer to see the recessed doorway retained keeping the terrazzo step. The Panel stated that replacement timber windows

would be acceptable providing they matched the original window design. They noted that the roof along the terrace was intact and therefore preferred to see the rooflights removed from the front elevation. The Panel also commented that the dormers to the rear were acceptable but they should be better designed.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

H) STONEYGATE ROAD, DE MONTFORT COURT
Planning Application 20080779
Extension to side of flats

The Director said that the application was for a small extension to the existing first floor balcony at the side of the building.

The Panel thought it would be better to retain the French window with a balcony. They stated that if it couldn't be retained and reused, the window design should be improved, taking reference from the main building.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

I) 136 MERE ROAD
Planning Application 20080879
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the existing second floor timber windows with new reinforced timber windows of similar design.

The Panel felt that top hung windows would be detrimental to the character of the building. They stated that they would prefer to see the existing windows retained with security bars behind but if new windows were fitted asked if a better solution than top hung could be sought.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

J) LAND R/O 39 ABINGDON ROAD, 63-65 EVINGTON ROAD
Planning Application 20080584
Gates and railings

The Director said that the application was for 2 metre gates and railings along the Abingdon Road elevation and a two metre high gate between 65 and 67 Evington Road.

The Panel had no objections but stated that good quality railings were required.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

LATE ITEM

KNIGHTON MANOR, 31 KNIGHTON DRIVE
Planning Application 20071945 (amended scheme)

Rear extension

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

It was noted that the proposal had been discussed over several years. The Panel liked the scheme and raised no objections.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

104. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

A Member of the Panel queried what action had been taken regarding the condition of the Eastgates Coffee House at the corner of Churchgate/High Street. The Senior Building Conservation Officer commented that Building Control had served a repairs notice in 2007 and works were carried out, having consulted with Building Control they stated that they were not proposing to serve any further notices at this time but would continue to monitor the building.

In regards to the Green Television House, they had been offered grant assistance but had not taken it up. They were currently allowed to build an extension as they did have permission.

The Senior Building Conservation Officer updated the Panel on the following enforcement successes:

1 Severn Street – The property had now been installed with timber windows but the door still hadn't been changed.

38 Lincoln Street – The property had now been installed with timber windows but the door still hadn't been changed.

46 Lincoln Street – The property had now been installed with timber windows to match the original design but the doors still hadn't been changed.

48 Lincoln Street – The property had now had two curve units installed which matched the building next to the property and there had also been timber windows installed.

16 Lincoln Street - It was also mentioned that the Council were planning to take direct action on this property. This meant that the Council would employ a contractor to replace the windows to match the original design and submit an invoice to the owner for repayment of all costs.

142 London Road – It was looking likely that officers would have to carry out the intended work themselves at this venue with police support if needed and then send the bill to the owners of the property afterwards.

105. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:30pm.

