



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 19 MAY 2010 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill – Chair
R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

Councillors Johnson and Hunt

S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
M. Draper	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
J. Goodall	-	Victorian Society
M. Goodhart	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
C. Sawday	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
P. Swallow	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge

Officers in Attendance:

Jeremy Crooks	-	Planning Policy and Design Group
John Snaith	-	Democratic Support
Jennifer Timothy	-	Planning Policy and Design Group

* * * * *

36. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Malcolm Elliott, David Lyne, David Smith and David Trubshaw.

37. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Johnson declared for the avoidance of doubt with regards to Current Development Proposals item D: Wellington Street, Holy Cross Priory that he worshipped at Holy Cross Priory and used to be treasurer at the Priory.

38. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel meeting held on 21 April 2010, be confirmed as a correct record.

39. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

40. 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.

The Panel asked if the Humberstone Gate item from the previous meeting had been approved. It was explained that this was a pre-application and had not gone any further to date.

RESOLVED:

that the report be noted.

41. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) WESTERN ROAD, EQUITY SHOES Planning Application 20100377 & 20100402 Redevelopment of site/Change of use

The Director said these applications were for redevelopment of the locally listed factory and surrounding area for student accommodation.

The Panel questioned the demand for further student accommodation and asked if a housing statement has been submitted with the application justifying the change of use.

The Panel was opposed to the demolition of the factory as per application 20100377 given its historic and architectural importance.

In application 20100402 they welcomed the retention of the factory but expressed concerns with regard to the replacement windows and also questioned whether the chimney was to be retained.

The extensions and new build element were felt to be acceptable in principle however the Panel was unhappy with the massing and detailing on both elements, particularly the new build element fronting the Old River Soar. The architectural style was likened to Russian Communist apartment blocks. There were also concerns over the open element at ground floor level in the new building; it was felt that this could result in crime and disorder issues. The views across Bede Park were also a concern, the Panel noted that the new building would be too tall and dominant within these views.

Concerns were also raised over lack of car parking and it was mooted that residents parking scheme could be introduced in that area to prevent traffic congestion.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

B) 77 – 79 MARKET PLACE

**Planning Application 20100393 & Listed Building Consent 20100501
Internal & external works, alterations to shop fronts, ATM to Market Place**

The Director said this was for the refurbishment of the shopfront and a new ATM machine.

The Panel had no objections to the principle of an ATM machine but would like to have seen it within the glazed shopfront rather than through the masonry.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments.

C) 16 HIGHFIELD STREET

**Planning Application 20100358
Shopfront**

The Director said this application was to replace the existing timber shopfront with an aluminium one.

The Panel noted the fine quality of the existing timber shopfront and considered that it should be retained and repaired.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

D) 45 WELLINGTON STREET, HOLY CROSS PRIORY

**Planning Application 20100578
Access ramp to church hall**

The Director said this application was for a new access ramp to the old church hall fronting Wellington Street.

The Panel noted that this was the earliest part of the priory dating back to the early 19th century. They considered the current intervention to be crude and unsightly and that by extending what had already been done would not make it any better visually and it would be highly visible from the street scene. They felt a platform lift would be a much simpler and cleaner solution.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

E) 3 WELLINGTON STREET

**Planning Application 20100649
Change of use**

The Director said this application was for the conversion of the bar and offices

to flats.

The Panel were reasonably happy with this proposal although the concern that the commercial side of the city was being eroded by yet more flats was again raised. They did ask that if documentation showing the original form of the ground floor could be found it would be nice to reinstate its original character.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

F) 11 KING STREET
Planning Application 20100576
Change of use

The Director said this application was for the change of use of the shop to a hot food takeaway with self-contained flat above.

The building was within the New Walk Conservation area.

The Panel raised no objections.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

G) 2 WEST STREET PAGET HOUSE
Listed Building Consent 20100642, Planning Application 20100433
Demolition of wall, new gates and surround.

The Director said that this application was for the removal of a surviving section of boundary wall and formation of new gates for access to the rear car park.

The Panel reiterated previous feelings that this surviving section of wall told a story and did add character to the conservation area. They would like at least some of it to remain and there was some strong feeling that all of it should remain.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

H) 7TH DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH, LONDON ROAD
Listed Building Consent 20100566
COU from three to four flats

The Director said this application was for a new access ramp to the side elevation facing De Montfort Street.

The Panel saw no need for two ramps and suggested the front ramp would work better if replaced with steps.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

I) 16 VICTORIA PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20100584
COU from three to four flats

The Director said this application was for the conversion of the building from three flats to four.

The Panel considered the extra flat to be over development. They did not like the rooflights on the visible elevations and the loss of the front garden to car parking.

The Panel recommended refusal of this application.

J) 48 KNIGHTON DRIVE
Planning Application 20100630
Extension at side & rear of bungalow, roof alterations

The Director said this application was for extensions to the bungalow and alterations to the roof to create an additional floor.

The Panel raised no objections but advised that good matching materials would be required to make the extensions successful.

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

K) 22-32 HUMBERSTONE ROAD
Planning Application 20100648
Change of use to flats alterations to rear and shopfronts

The Director said this application was for conversion of the upper floors to four flats.

The Panel supported the reinstatement of the smaller shop units although they would have preferred to have seen the original form of the shopfronts reintroduced if historic evidence was available. They suggested that the large fascia could be removed to reveal more of the original building. The rear windows were a concern and they suggested reusing blocked openings and creating a better rhythm as the proposal as existing looks a bit messy.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments, but refusing this application in its current form.

L) NEDHAM STREET, CHARNWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL
Planning Application 20100167
Security fence

The Director said this application was for new security fencing.

The Panel made no objections

The Panel recommended approval of this application.

The Panel made no observations on the following applications therefore they were not formally considered:

**M) SOUTHGATES BUS DEPOT
Planning Application 20100607
Change of use to car park**

**N) 5 JUNIOR STREET, FORMER RICHARD ROBERTS FACTORY
Listed Building Consent 20100519
External alterations**

**O) 139 LONDON ROAD, MARQUIS OF WELLINGTON P H
Planning Application 20100654
Smoking shelters to rear**

**P) 2A SOUTHERNHAY ROAD
Planning Application 2010702
Telecommunications cabinet**

**Q) 93 AVENUE ROAD
Planning Application 2010701
Telecommunications cabinet**

42. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

**ADDITIONAL ITEM – 142 LONDON ROAD ENFORCEMENT SUCCESS
Reinstatement of Art Deco tiling**

The Panel were very impressed with the new shopfront at 142 London Road and thanked all involved in the successful enforcement action.

**OLD NATWEST BUILDING, ST MARTINS SQUARE & OLD HSBC
BUILDING, GRANBY STREET**

The Panel commented on the scruffy state of the two ex-bank buildings including tree encroachment and inquired what action could be taken. Officers advised that a letter to the owners could be sent in the first instance to request an external clean-up and 215 notice could be served eventually if the buildings became too unsightly.

43. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6:25pm.