



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2010 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Hunt

S. Britton	- University of Leicester
P. Draper	- Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
M. Elliott	- Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
J. Goodall	- Victorian Society
M. Goodhart	- Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
D. Hollingworth	- Leicester Civic Society
A. McWhirr	- Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
S. Pointer	- Royal Town Planning Institute
C. Sawday	- Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
D. Smith	- Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society

Officers in Attendance:

Jeremy Crooks	- Planning Policy and Design Group
Ann Provan	- Planning Policy and Design Group
Francis Connolly	- Democratic Support
John Snaith	- Democratic Support

* * * * *

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from J. Garrity, P. Swallow, D Lyne, D. Trubshaw and Councillor Johnson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hunt declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest that he was part of the Friends of the Cathedral Society.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel meeting held on 18 November 2009, be confirmed as a correct record.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

5. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Director, Planning and Economic Development 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.

6. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) PEACOCK LANE, CATHEDRAL SQUARE Planning Application 20091719 Remodelling of Leicester Cathedral precinct

The Director introduced Michael Goodhart who presented an application for the remodelling of the Cathedral Square precinct.

The Panel discussed this application at length. Panel members agreed that mistakes were made with the 1980s scheme and that there was scope for improvements. However they felt very strongly that the remaining gravestones should remain on site. The gravestones represented generations of social history; the inscriptions and details on them created unique pieces of artwork. They were opposed to the loss of the boundary walls, railings and mature trees on site, which would sweep away what was at present an attractive and intimate place. They noted that historically this was never intended as a public square and there are more suitable open spaces within the centre that could be remodelled to create an events space, the market place being the best example. They were concerned that the intimate and distinctive walkways of St Martins Walk East and West would be lost in the proposals. Underlying archaeology and burials would also be compromised. Issues were also raised concerning the proposed materials and in particular the pink granite.

The Panel felt that the proposed scheme did not enhance or preserve the area, as it was destroying everything that is aesthetically and intrinsically pleasing. 'How can it possibly preserve or enhance the historic environment when everything of historical importance is being swept away?'

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

B) LILLIE HOUSE LONDON ROAD Planning Application 20091723 Change of use, roof extension

The Director said that the application was for conversion of the upper floors to 44 student flats. The proposal involved a single storey roof extension.

The Panel generally accepted the principle of the rooftop extension although they raised concerns with the heavy oversailing roof of the extension that tended to draw the eye and was particularly detrimental to the setting of the adjacent listed Porte Cochere. They thought that this could be reduced in size or perhaps finished in a colour that would be lost in the skyline. They would also have preferred that it was set back further from the roof edge.

The Panel recommended that amendments be sought.

C) LEICESTER UNIVERSITY FIELDING JOHNSON BUILDING
Listed Building Consent 20091577
Internal alterations

The Director said that this proposal was for alterations to remove some of the internal walls to create a larger more efficient space.

The Panel raised no objections.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

D) 61 GRANBY STREET
Advertisement Consent 20091624

The Director said that this application was for new internally illuminated signage to both the Granby Street and Belvoir Street elevations.

The Panel considered that the proposed internally illuminated signage was completely inappropriate and detrimental to the character of the conservation area and the listed building.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

E) 45/47 HORSEFAIR STREET & 20 HOTEL STREET
Planning Application 20091677 & 20091678
Awnings & air conditioning unit

The Director said that these applications are for five retractable advertisement awnings at first floor level and new air conditioning units to the rear.

The Panel considered that the proposed awnings with signage were detrimental to the character of the conservation area and the building and that the high level awnings could create a precedent in the future. They had no objections to the rear condenser unit.

The Panel recommended refusal for the awnings but approval for the condenser unit.

F) 58 HIGH STREET
Listed Building Consent 20091673
Internal alterations

The Director said that this proposal was for internal alterations for a new internal staircase to provide access to the basement.

The building is Grade II listed and within the High Street Conservation Area.

This proposal is for internal alterations for a new internal staircase to provide access to the basement.

The Panel raised no objections

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

G) 12 NEW WALK
Planning Application 20091606
Roof extension, change of use

The Director said that this application was for the conversion of the upper floors currently in use as offices to a house in multiple occupation (9 bedrooms). The proposal involved raising the existing roof and adding dormers to create a third floor.

The Panel were mixed in their views on this proposal. They thought that the drop in scale was important and this is one of the oldest buildings along New Walk and changing the scale and appearance of the building would be detrimental to the character of the Walk. They conceded that some drop in scale would still be evident with the new scheme and the retention of the existing chimney and pots along with a new natural slate roof was positive, as was the proposed residential use. The additional height would also help to obscure the blank wall of the adjacent 70s building.

The Panel recommended approval of this application, subject to the scheme being carried out to a high specification with good natural materials.

H) 52-54 CHURCH GATE
Planning Application 20091332
External roller shutter

The Director said that this application was for an external roller shutter.

The Panel accepted a roller shutter providing it did not have an external shutter box. They considered that the new shopfront did not preserve or enhance the character of the building and they would not have recommended approval if it had been the subject of a planning application.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

I) NARBOROUGH ROAD/UPPERTON ROAD, LEICESTER COLLEGE
Planning Application 20091362
Temporary building

The Director said that this application was for a temporary building to provide social facilities.

The Panel would accept a short-term temporary building providing if there was sufficient justification for it. They would not like to see the long term siting of a temporary building that has been the case with others in the past.

The Panel would like to see more details on this application.

J) 43 STRETTON ROAD
Planning Application 20091709
Change of use, replacement windows

The Director said that this application was for a temporary building to provide social facilities.

The Panel raised no objections to the change of use but they would object to uPVC windows at the front of the building and suggested something more appropriate in timber to match the adjacent property.

The Panel recommended approval for the change of use but refusal for the uPVC windows at the front.

The Panel made no objections to the following applications, they were therefore not formally considered.

K) 33 SAXBY STREET
Planning Application 20091659
Change of use

L) OLD CHURCH STREET, MEADOW COURT
Planning Application 20091309
Extensions

M) 17 WESTCOTES DRIVE, THE VICARAGE
Planning Application 20091697
Internal alterations

N) LILLIE HOUSE, 50 LONDON ROAD
Advertisement Consent 20091723
Signs

O) ST JAMES ROAD, 11 ST JAMES COURT
Planning Application 20091541

Replacement uPVC windows

**P) 22 MORELAND AVENUE
Planning Application 20091707
Rear extension**

7. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.