



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 21 JANUARY 2009 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor M Johnson - Leicester City Council

P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
M. Elliott	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
M. Jones	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
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
Jeremy Crooks	-	Planning Policy and Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
P. Mann	-	Democratic Support, Resources Department

* * * * *

143. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Blackmore, Simon Britton, Joan Garrity, Alan McWhirr and David Lyne.

144. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

145. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 9 December be confirmed as a correct record.

146. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

147. 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.

148. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) HERONGATE ROAD, NEAR TOWERS HOSPITAL Planning Application 20082029 43 Dwellings

The Director said that the application was one of the last sites to be developed with a proposal for 43 dwellings. It was noted that the Panel had made observations on the redevelopment of the Towers Hospital land on several occasions over the last few years.

The Panel raised concern about the trees to the rear of the listed building. They stated that the design quality of the proposed houses was not great but could be improved by adding some chimneys however the Panel emphasised they should be functional ones not just ornamental.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

B) FORMER REGISTRY OFFICE, POCKLINGTONS WALK Listed Building Consent 20082038 Conversion to offices, internal alterations

The Director said that the application was for the proposed conversion to serviced offices involving internal alterations including the removal of stud partitions, subdivision of spaces and upgrading of facilities.

The Panel had no major concerns regarding this proposal. They stated however that any external cleaning should be done sensitively and conditions should be used to protect historic features and fabric.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

C) REGENT ROAD, REGENT COLLEGE Planning Application 20081779

Extension to college

The Director said that the application was for a two storey extension to the main building.

The Panel raised concerns regarding the junction of the new building & the old one. They stated that they would have liked to see a more subservient link but ideally they would have preferred two separate buildings. They commented that if the link was necessary the extension should be pulled away from the main building as far as possible with a low rise and less dominant link. The Panel added that a simple palette of materials should be used such as laminated glass & metal.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

D) 10 CHEAPSIDE Advertisement Consent 20081790 New sign

The director said that the application was for a new fascia sign. The Panel were informed that as yet there had not been a listed building application with details of the internal changes. It was noted that an application for the conversion of the building to a hot food takeaway had recently been approved.

The Panel thought that the proposed sign would be detrimental to the character of the building. They recommended that any signage be confined to the existing small fascia.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

E) NATWEST, 1-3 GRANBY STREET Listed Building Consent 20081947 Internal works

The Director said that the application was for internal works to relocate some of the historic paneling.

The Panel raised no objections to the works.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

F) 20 DE MONTFORT STREET, THE BELMONT HOTEL Advertisement Consent 20081898 Retention of signs

The Director said that the application was for the retention of the replacement signs. The Panel were informed that the existing signs had recently been replaced without consent.

The Panel was not in favour of the sign hanging on the railings and asked

officers to investigate whether a previous sign had been there. The Panel raised no objections about the retention of the other signs.

The Panel stated that further information was required on the application.

G) 55 OXFORD STREET
Planning Application 20081906
New development

The Director said that the application was for a new mixed-use development for 22 flats and 141m² of office space. It was noted that the Panel had discussed this site previously, which had been formerly occupied by a building of Local Interest.

The Panel noted that the windows of the main block were parsimonious and the overall design was weak compared to the Italianate factory adjacent. The Panel stated that such an important site needed a high quality design.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

H) YMCA EAST STREET
Planning Application 20081957
Repairs to shopfronts

It was noted that the Panel saw this briefly as a pre-application enquiry at its December 2008 meeting and was supportive of the proposal for refurbishment of the shopfronts. The Director said that the application was now complete with additional details.

The Panel welcomed the reinstatement of the traditional shopfronts.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

I) UNIVERSITY ROAD, FIELDING JOHNSON BUILDING
Listed Building Consent 20081951
Alterations

The Director said that the application was for internal alterations to remodel the reception area.

The Panel appreciated why the University wanted to make the alterations as the existing lobby felt cramped & uninviting. They had no major concerns but recommended that the impact on the historic walls be checked.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

J) VISTA, MARGARET ROAD
Planning Application 20081758
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for replacement Crittall windows to the rear elevation.

The Panel raised no objections to the works.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

K) 125 HINCKLEY ROAD

Planning Applications 20082015 & 2016 Advertisement Consent 20082017 & 2018

Alterations to shopfront, atm machine and sign

The Director said that the applications were for alterations to the shopfront including a new atm machine, condenser units to the rear and new signage to the building and within the car park.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposals.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

L) 93-97 HIGH STREET

Advertisement Consent 20082058, Planning Application 20082059 & 2060

Alterations to shopfront, atm machine and sign

The Panel were informed that the building was currently a vacant public house. The proposal was to convert it to a retail outlet. The Director said that the applications were for alterations to the shopfront including a new atm machine and one externally illuminated fascia sign and condenser units to the rear.

The Panel noted the fine quality of the existing ground floor. They felt that the proposed changes would destroy the balance and symmetry of the ground floor, particularly the recessed doorway and would neither preserve nor enhance the character of the building or the conservation area. They saw no need to change the front as the building owners did not need to have goods in the shop windows and the internal use could function exactly the same behind the existing frontage.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

M) 19 UNIVERSITY ROAD

Planning Application 20081984

External alterations

It was noted that the building dated back from the mid 1960s and was built by the University. The Director said the application was for external alterations including modifications to existing window openings.

The Panel raised no objections but stated that they would like to see the fire escape kept intact if it was possible.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

N) 17 RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Application 20081848
Extension

It was noted that the building was a modern house built as part of a small residential development dating from the mid 1990s. The Director said that the application was for an extension to the house.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposal.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

O) 5 RATCLIFFE ROAD
Planning Permission 20081999
Single storey extension

The Director said that the application was for a single storey side extension to form a garage.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposal.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

P) 138 WESTCOTES DRIVE
Pre-application enquiry
Extension to nursing home

It was noted that the Panel made observations on an extension to the building last year. The Director said that application was refused and an option had been received for a revised scheme.

The Panel noted the rarity of the lovely house by Ewan Christian as he had spent most of his time designing churches. The Panel thought that the proposed extension was too large, too close to the listed building and the link was also too large. The Panel thought that the applicant seemed to be expecting more than the site could provide without damaging the setting of the listed building.

The Panel stated that any extension needed to be subservient to the main building. They commented that a two-storey extension may be more acceptable with a modern design, to minimise the impact on the listed building.

The Panel commented that if this were an application they would recommend refusal.

LATE ITEM) LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD
Pre App enquiry

It was noted that the Panel had discussed this item at their last meeting. The applicant had submitted a revised design and the comments of the Panel were once again sought.

The Panel noted that this was a slight improvement on the previous scheme but still fell well below the design quality expected for a building in the prominent location. They commented that the current proposal was still too large and exceeded the footprint of the old filling station. The Panel stated that although there has been some attempt to soften the link with the existing building the proposal still did not read as a stand-alone building. They suggested that it would be worth employing a conservation architect that specialised in buildings in conservation areas in order to exploit the full potential of the site.

The Panel commented that if this were an application they would recommend refusal.

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

**Q) 2 STONEYGATE ROAD
Planning Application
Paved walkway**

**R) Bible Hall, Mere Road
Planning Application 20081856
Extension and ramp**

**S) 10 Loseby Lane
Planning Application 20082001
Change of use and alterations**

149. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

The Senior Building Conservation Officer presented a shop front tile from 142 London Road and informed the Panel that it had taken a six-figure sum to reinstate the tiles to how they looked before the owners had changed the shop front.

Martin Jones informed the Panel that he would be leaving the Panel as the representative from the Leicester and Rutland Society of Architects as he would be starting a new job in Somerset. He stated that his replacement would be Michael Goodheart. The Chair thanked Martin for his contribution to the Panel and wished him all the best for the future.

The Democratic Services Officer informed the Panel that the next meeting of the Panel would be taking place on Wednesday 18 February rather than the previously scheduled date of Wednesday 25 February.

150. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:50pm.

