



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 19 JANUARY 2005 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill – Chair

R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor Henry

Councillor O'Brien

- |             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| T. Abbot    | - | Royal Town Planning Institute                      |
| S. Bowyer   | - | English Heritage                                   |
| S. Britton  | - | University of Leicester                            |
| J. Burrows  | - | Leicester Civic Society                            |
| S. Dobby    | - | Institute of Historic Building Conservation        |
| P. Swallow  | - | Person of Specialist Knowledge                     |
| D. Smith    | - | Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society |
| R. Roenisch | - | Victorian Society                                  |

**Officers in Attendance:**

- |              |   |   |
|--------------|---|---|
| D. Trubshaw  | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| J. Carstairs | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| M. Reeves    | - | Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity<br>Department |

\* \* \* \* \*

**63. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies from A. McWhirr and M. Elliott.

**64. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr. Garrity and Cllr. O'Brien declared personal interests as they were members of the Development Control Committee.

**65. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 15 December 2004 be confirmed as a correct record.

**66. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

A Member of the Panel enquired about any further developments with regard to the Court House, New Walk development. The Officer informed the Panel that enforcement action had now been authorised.

**67. DECISIONS MADE BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

The Service Director, Environment submitted a report on decisions made by the Development Control Committee on planning applications previously considered by the Conservation Advisory Panel.

Members of the Panel enquired about the decision regarding the temporary building on Knighton Park as it was felt disappointing that the Council would put what was considered to be a very poor quality building on the park. The Officer commented that it was approved as a temporary structure which it was hoped would be improved on with a future permanent application.

Members of the Panel also enquired about the 124 Charles Street application. The Officer stated that the application was considered acceptable by the Committee because it was set back sufficiently and there had been approvals on either side of the building which would mean it would not be seen. A Member of the Panel commented further that conservation areas should be about character, not just appearance.

RESOLVED:

that the report be received and the decisions taken be noted.

**68. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**A) HIGHCROSS STREET, GREAT CENTRAL STREET, ALL SAINTS OPEN  
Planning Application 20041445  
Redevelopment**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously considered a scheme on this site. The Application was for the demolition of the existing 'Pretty Legs' factory and the redevelopment of the site with a three to eight storey building for offices, food and drink and residential uses. It was noted that the new scheme was reduced by a floor, in response to previous concerns about the size and scale of the building.

The Panel still thought the height and scale were inappropriate for the location and would fail to preserve or enhance the character/appearance of the conservation area. The revised scheme was considered little better than

previous.

**B) ABBEY PARK ROAD  
Planning Application 20042464  
Redevelopment for 731 flats**

The Director noted that the proposal was on the site of the old bus depot. The proposal was for a new development ranging in height between five and twelve storeys creating a total of 731 flats with associated parking, landscaping and open space provision.

The Panel regretted the loss of the existing buildings and considered they required replacement by something of equal quality. The scale, design and materials of the existing buildings were felt to be more in keeping with the character of Leicester than the “metropolitan” style now proposed.

On the Design, the Panel accepted, if the site was to be redeveloped, that there was a case for something dramatic, but the towers were thought to be too high; the linking blocks appeared as an after-thought and would affect the setting of the park and listed buildings opposite. Development at the rear of the site should address the canal frontage and not turn its back.

The overall site density was thought to be too high, with no open space and represented over-development.

The Panel were supportive of the sustainability/energy efficiency approach.

**C) OXFORD STREET, SOUTHGATES, THE NEWARKE  
Planning Application 20042215  
Highway alterations / landscaping scheme**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously make observations on the greening of the Newarke in the winter of 1992. This new proposal was far more ambitious than the previous one involving the removal of a section of road and restoration of the original level of the square in order to reconnect the Magazine with the Newarke.

The restoration of the spatial integrity of The Newark welcomed by the Panel and it was thought it offered the opportunity to re-create the former enclosed space. The quality of road/materials was considered to be important. The mosaic detailing of the subway – esp. the Tycho Brahe pavement – ought to be retained and re-used within the new landscaping scheme.

**D) WIMBLEDON HOUSE, WIMBLEDON STREET  
Listed Building Consent 20041724  
Change of use**

The Director noted that the Panel made observations on the conversion of this building to flats involving a roof top extension at several meetings last year. This application was a revised scheme that substantially reduced the size of

the rooftop extension.

The Panel welcomed the deletion of the roof extension and considered that the roof detail was now much better. The Panel would prefer to see the main entrance retained as the entrance to the building.

#### **E) 4-8 NEW STREET**

##### **Planning Application 20042481 & Listed Building Consent 20042506 Change of use**

The Director said the application was for a first floor extension to the offices, alterations to the roof and internal alterations.

The Panel recommended refusal. It was considered that there was a danger of losing too much original fabric- notably the 18<sup>th</sup> century staircase. It was also suggested that the use of Fire lobbies/compartments could avoid the need for an external fire escape.

#### **F) 9 ST NICHOLAS PLACE**

##### **Planning Application 20042460 & Advertisement Consent 20042558 New signage and antennae**

The Director said the applications were for telecommunications aerials and satellite dishes to the roof and new signage for the recently completed BBC building.

The Panel considered the proposed antennae should have been designed-in from the start. The scheme was considered messy and would detract from the conservation area. A remote location or a mast specifically designed for the building was suggested.

The Panel raised no objection to the proposed signs, but the deletion of the proposed glazed pavement over the Norman cellar was regretted.

#### **G) 27 KNIGHTON ROAD**

##### **Planning Application 20042455 & 20042456 Change of use / extensions**

The Director said that there were two applications, one of which was for the conversion of the house to fifteen self contained flats, it involved a three/ four storey extension to the rear of the house. The other application was for the partial demolition of and a replacement extension to the coach house. The Panel made observations on a similar proposal at the end of 2002.

The Panel were of the opinion that the proposed extensions were over-large, unimaginative and detrimental to the appearance of the building and conservation area. It was also thought that parking in front garden would be detrimental to appearance and may affect trees. Provision for bin storage was also required.

**H) 7 UNIVERSITY ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20042464**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building from offices and residential use to fourteen bedsits. The proposal involved external alterations.

The proposed number of bedsits was considered excessive and would impact on the character of the area. The building had survived intact and a smaller number of quality flats would be better for the building and area.

**I) 5-9 HOTEL STREET**  
**Planning Application 20042392**  
**Floodlights**

The Director said the application was for four floodlights to the façade of the building fronting Hotel Street.

The Panel expressed a preference for more discreet floodlighting of the building as the proposed lights would be prominent.

**J) 23 ST NICHOLAS PLACE**  
**Planning Application 20042357**  
**New shopfront & roller shutter**

The Director said the application was for a new shopfront and roller shutter.

The Panel had no objection to the alterations to the shopfront, but opposed the solid shutter across the entrance, an open grille would be preferred.

**K) 29 OLD CHURCH STREET**  
**Planning Application 20042547**  
**Two-storey rear extension**

The Director said the application was for a two-storey extension to the rear of the house. The proposal involved the demolition of existing outbuildings.

The Panel thought that the extension was probably too large and likely to impact on the adjoining house although this was clearly a Development Control issue. It was commented that attention to detail was needed as the extension was poorly designed.

**L) 2A ASHLEIGH ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20042258**  
**Change of use**

The Director said the application was for the change of use of the rear outbuilding to one dwelling. The proposal included the addition of two dormer windows and external alterations.

The Panel recommended refusal as they were opposed to a separate dwelling as it would be detrimental to the conservation area, it was felt that the coach house should remain ancillary to the main house. It was also felt that the alterations would change the character and simplicity of the building.

**M) 40 CLARENDON PARK ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20042596**  
**Front extension, dormers**

The Director said the application was for a single storey extension to the front of the house, a single dormer to the front and two dormers to the rear elevation.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposed alterations in view of what had happened to adjoining properties, but were opposed to the use of uPVC for the dormer windows.

**N) 94A LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20042553**  
**New signage**

The Director noted that the Panel had made observations on this building several times over the last year. The application was for new signage.

The Panel raised no objections.

**O) 55 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20042403**  
**Change of use**

The Director noted that this was a fine Art-deco building by Bedingfield and Grundy on the corner of London Road and Nelson Street. It was proposed to convert the rear, attached garage to office use. The proposal involved external alterations.

The Panel considered the alteration to be poorly designed and felt that it should better reflect the proportions of the upperfloors.

**The Chair agreed to take the following item of urgent business.**

**14 BOWLING GREEN STREET**  
**Planning application 20042554**  
**New Shopfront**

The Director said that the a new shopfront was proposed that would remove the inset at the front of the shop and include a central doorway.

The Panel were opposed to the loss of the shopfront, which formed a matching pair with No. 12.

**The Panel raised no objection to the following and they were therefore not formally considered.**

**Q) 47 MARKET PLACE  
Planning application 20042575  
Change of use**

**69. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

**70. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 6.59pm.

