



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 27 APRIL 2005 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill – Chair
R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

Councillor O'Brien

S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
J. Burrows	-	Leicester Civic Society
K. Chappi	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
P. Draper	-	Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
M. Elliot	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge
A. McWhirr	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
P. Swallow	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge
R. Roenisch	-	Victorian Society

Officers in Attendance:

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

* * * * *

79. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from T. Abbott, S. Bowyer, S. Dobby and Cllr. Garrity.

80. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

K. Chappi declared in interest as his company was doing work with the agents for some of the applications although he was unaware exactly which.

S. Britton declared an interest in Appendix C, item N, 15 Church Lane, Knighton as his employer owned land opposite the building.

81. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 16 February 2005 be confirmed as a correct record.

82. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

83. 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 approval of the Junior Street, Former Richard Roberts' Factory application which the Panel had recommended for refusal. Officers informed the Panel that the application which was for the roof extension was approved despite the spot listing because the listing came through very late in the day and it was considered that it would have been unreasonable to refuse it.

RESOLVED:

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

84. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) VAUGHAN WAY, BURGESS STREET, CAUSEWAY LANE, EAST BOND STREET

Planning Application 20050628

Redevelopment – extension to Shires

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on an outline application for new development ranging from 2 to 8 storeys in height for retail, residential and leisure use and car parking on the site north of the Shires bounded by Causeway Lane and East Bond Street to the east, Highcross Street / Vaughan Way to the west / north west, and land north of Vaughan Way running along Burgess Street to Long Lane and east of All Saint's Churchyard. This application was for reserved matters.

The Panel commented on each of the buildings as follows:

Highcross Street:

The Panel felt that the corner building would be an interesting contrast with 59 Highcross Street, but had reservations about the possible use of fair-faced concrete for the frame. A different material/finish that would reduce the thickness of the frame was preferred.

The Infill building between 59 Highcross street & Grammar school was

considered to be unacceptable – It was felt to be a poor 1960s retro style that didn't reflect the scale of surrounding buildings or the rhythm of rooflines. The flat roof didn't reflect the rhythm of rooflines and the building appeared truncated; a different treatment of the top storey, it was suggested may help. A reduction of one storey was suggested on the side overlooking the Grammar School square to reduce the impact.

High Street/Shires Lane:

The design of the new build was considered unacceptable – a bland contribution to an interesting streetscape. Its rectangular, rigid format and lack of articulation was out of character and didn't offer variety. The Block would also be too high in relation to adjoining former post office building. It would also be the only flat roof on the High Street. Corner features were noted as being a characteristic feature of Leicester and that this should be reflected here. The Panel thought that the colour of the brickwork on the image was too washed out and that orange/red brick was more in keeping with High Street.

With regard to Shires Lane, there was confusion about whether the street was intended for vehicular access or pedestrianised; the floorscape needed to be different if pedestrians were to be encouraged.

Bond Street/St Peters Lane:

The panel expressed the same opposition to the bland 1960s retro. architecture. The repetitive horizontal bands; scale, proportion and relationship to other buildings did not appear to have been taken into account, particularly the height in this sensitive to historic location where the Great Meeting Chapel was situated.

Shires mall extension:

There were concerns about large expanses of bland flat roofs. The quality of the floorscape and the surface treatments for new "streets" was felt as being important. On Causeway lane – there was a fear that the bus dominance of the High Street was merely being transferred.

**B) 2-4 COLTON STREET
Planning Application 20050477
Change of use and rooftop extension**

The Director said the application was for the conversion of the building currently in use as offices, to a restaurant on the ground floor with eighteen self-contained flats on the upper floors. The proposal involved a rooftop extension and external alterations.

The Panel raised no objection to the proposed uses, but commented that the roof extension did not improve the appearance of the building. The rear glazed stairwell was considered acceptable.

**C) WHARF STREET SOUTH, TELEPHONE EXCHANGE
Planning Application 20050575
Change of use and rooftop extension**

The Director said the application was for the conversion of the building to 131 flats with basement car parking. The proposal included a two storey rooftop extension and external alterations.

The Panel was of the opinion that this was a good quality 1960s building that should be converted as it was. The Panel was strongly opposed to the roof extensions that would destroy the prominence of the towers and the character of the building. The Panel also felt that the proportions of the existing windows and balconies/grilles should be retained.

D) HUMBERSTONE ROAD / WIMBLEDON STREET, ST GEORGE'S MILL
Planning Application 20050621
Change of use

The Director noted that planning permission had previously been granted for the conversion of the building into flats together with retail units at the Humberstone Road – end of the building. Conversion work was already underway. The application was for the change of use of one of the retail units into a bar/restaurant.

The Panel raised no objections.

E) 4 RUTLAND STREET, WELLINGTON HOTEL
Planning Application 20050590
Change of use and extensions

The Director said the application was for the change of use of the upper floors of the former Wellington public house building to a hotel. The proposal also involved a six-storey extension to the rear, a two-storey extension over the coach entrance and external alterations.

The Panel raised no objection to use of the building as a hotel again, but felt that the height, style and poor detail of the proposed extension would be detrimental to the locally listed building, the adjacent Municipal Building and would affect the setting of the listed former coffee house on Granby Street. The Panel recommended that the extension should defer to the scale of surrounding buildings, not dominate. It was also commented that the yard should remain open. The absence of car parking for the use was also queried. The glass box above rear entrance would also detract from the building and the quality of the detailing of the archway.

F) 20 DEACON STREET
Listed Building Consent 20050144
External and internal alterations

The Director said the application was for internal and external alterations to the building including damp proofing and replacement doors.

The Panel raised no objections.

G) 46 MARKET PLACE
Planning Application 20050620 & Listed Building Consent
New Shopfront

The Director said the application was for a new shopfront and minor internal alterations.

The Panel raised no objection to the internal alterations or the sign. The Panel also expressed support for enforcement action against the roller shutter if unauthorised and the canopy on adjoining unit.

H) 23 – 25 MARKET STREET
Planning Application 20050244
Change of use

The Director said the application was to convert the building currently in retail use to retail on the ground floor and four apartments on the first floor. The proposal involved an extension to the rear.

The Panel raised no objections.

I) 25-27 BEDE STREET
Planning Application 20050321
Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the factory to 21 residential units with ground floor parking.

The Panel raised no objections to the conversion of the building but commented that the existing slate roof should be retained. The Panel was also opposed to the Juliet balconies and French windows as inappropriate to the character of the building. It was further recommended that alterations to the exterior should be minimised such as retaining the existing windows and re-using the existing vehicular entrance rather than forming another opening in the building.

J) 32 – 48 CHATHAM STREET / 37 – 41 YORK STREET
Planning Application 20050607
Redevelopment

The Director said that application was for the redevelopment of the site with a new five to seven storey building containing 95 self contained flats and associated parking.

The Panel felt that the scale and quality of the proposed building were not acceptable and would not justify the demolition of a building of local interest. The loss of the traditional grain of the street / area was also regretted.

K) 330A LONDON ROAD

**Planning Application 20050605
Demolition and redevelopment**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on proposals for the demolition of this house and redevelopment of the site last year. The application was subsequently withdrawn. A revised application for the redevelopment of the site with a building for seven self contained flats had been submitted.

The Panel raised no opposition to the demolition of the existing house provided the replacement was of good quality, it was stated that the proposed building was not of adequate quality for Stoneygate conservation area. It was felt that the proposed building was an inappropriate size for the narrow width of the site. The Panel was also opposed to the loss of the front garden to car parking. It was queried whether there was scope to bring the building forward to provide car parking at the rear.

**L) 12-14 ST ALBANS ROAD, VICTORIA PARK HOTEL
Planning Application 20050546
Change of use, rear extension**

The Director said the proposal was to convert the hotel to nine self-contained flats. The proposal involved a three-storey rear extension.

The Panel raised no opposition to the conversion of the building to flats but felt that the rear extension was too big, it would be over development and would have an overbearing impact on Gordon Avenue. The rear yard should provide amenity space for the flats and that there was no scope for an extension. The loss of the rear detail was also considered to be unfortunate.

**M) DISRAELI STREET
Planning Application 20050468
Redevelopment**

The Director said the application was for six new houses and three and four storey flat blocks providing 30 flats.

The Panel considered the design to be inappropriate for the location, too bulky and too urban for a suburban location and would affect the character and appearance of the conservation area. A more traditional, vernacular style would reflect the character of the area and would be more appropriate. It was also recommended that a planning brief was required for all the industrial sites along Disraeli Street that were becoming redundant.

**N) REAR OF 15 CHURCH LANE, KNIGHTON
Planning Application 20050072
Four houses**

The Director said the application was for four houses to the rear of 15 Church Lane.

The Panel felt that the extra houses would increase traffic in the area and would have an impact in the narrow Church Lane. It was also felt that the proposal would not preserve / enhance the conservation area. The proposed alterations to 15 Church Lane, to add an extra floor would be detrimental to visual amenity, it was thought that demolition and a new build would be better.

O) 201 KNIGHTON ROAD, CRADDOCK ARMS PH
Planning Application 20050320
Marquee

The Director said the application was for a marquee to be sited in the car park between the months of March and October.

The Panel raised no objection to the marquee on conservation grounds as it was removable. Its potential impact on residents was noted as a Development Control issue.

P) 325 LONDON ROAD, DELAMERE HOUSE
Planning Application 20050519
Extensions and alterations

The Director said the application was for single and two storey extensions to the side and rear of the care home. The proposal also involved external alterations to the front elevation to restore the original façade.

The Panel raised no real objections, but there was some opposition to the increased size of the building. The Panel also commented that the detailing and choice of materials needed to be good.

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

Q) 180 ST SAVIOURS ROAD
Planning Application 20050421
Replacement Windows

R) 59 KING STREET
Planning Application 20050249
Alterations to windows

85. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

The Panel expressed their regret at the loss of the Frisby Jarvis building on Woodgate.

86. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.10pm.

