



Councillor O'Brien stated that he had received a number of representations about Appendix C, Item C), 215 Evington Lane.

P. Swallow declared a personal interest in Appendix C, item B) The Newarke, Chantry Building.

## **89. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 27 April 2005 be confirmed as a correct record.

## **90. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

## **91. 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 amended plans that allowed the 4-8 New Street application to be approved. Officers stated that substantial amendments were made to the applications which meant a reduction in the loss of original fabric and English Heritage were satisfied with the plans.

Members of the Panel enquired about the refusal of the 17 Newarke Street application. Officers commented that the reasons for refusal were that the proposal created unsuitable living space and involved external alterations, which was not acceptable in a conservation area.

Members of the Panel also enquired about the reasons for the refusal of the Cradock Arms Public house application. Officers commented that the application was refused on the grounds of potential noise and disturbance.

Members of the Panel then considered the more general issue of any protocol of bring back to the Panel any changes that were made to an application before the Development Control Committee considered them. Officers commented that it was difficult to bring matters back to the Panel due to time constraints. Negotiations were always carried out with applicants on the basis of the Panel's comments but if something significant changed then often matters did return to the Panel.

Further to this members of the Panel commented that if they did have any objections, then applications shouldn't be approved under Officers delegated powers. Councillor Garrity said she would raise this matter with the Head of Development Control to ensure that matters, which the Panel did raise objections to, be at the very least considered by the Development Control Committee.

RESOLVED:

- (1) that Councillor Garrity speak with the Head of Development Control to seek to ensure that where the Panel have expressed objections to planning applications, those applications are considered by the Development Control Committee;
- (2) that the report be received and the decisions taken be noted.

## **92. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

### **A) CHURCH ROAD, BELGRAVE HALL STABLES**

**Listed Building Consent 20050806 & Planning Application 20050807  
Change of use, internal and external alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the stable block to form tea rooms, an art studio and toilets. The proposal included a marquee within the stable yard.

The Panel raised no objection to the proposed change of use but were concerned that increased storage to first floor may have an adverse impact on load bearing.

The Panel felt that further information on the proposed kitchen layout / units and the anchoring points for the proposed marquee was required. Concerns were also expressed about the effect of the marquee on the character and setting of the listed buildings.

The Panel expressed further concerns about the potential loss of the cobbled floor in the stable yard as the floor was being relaid.

### **B) THE NEWARKE, CHANTRY BUILDING**

**Listed Building Consent 20050685 & Planning Application 20050687  
Repairs & alterations**

The Director said that the application was for the refurbishment of the building to create a new digital music performance area. The proposal includes a new roof and alterations to the building.

The Panel raised no objection to the proposed change of use.

The Panel queried the installation of sound proofing and the effect this would have on the historic structure of the building. Concerns were expressed over whether the studio would be attached to the walls of the building and whether vibrations would damage the building.

### **C) 215 EVINGTON LANE**

**Planning Application 20050666**

## **Demolition & redevelopment**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the detached house, built c. 1910, and the redevelopment of the site with a new build of twelve flats. The Panel has previously discussed a proposal to build a single new dwelling in the garden, which was granted outline consent.

The panel were opposed to demolition of the existing building, which made a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area and reflected the historic pattern of development in this area.

The Panel were of the opinion that the proposed new build would be too bulky and would constitute over development of the site. It was also thought to be out of scale with neighbouring properties and no details of bin storage were provided.

### **D) 56 STOUGHTON ROAD Planning Application 20050271 Extension**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on proposals for the demolition of this house and the redevelopment of the site last year. A revised application retaining the house and the addition of a two storey extension to the rear, to create four self contained flats has been submitted.

The Panel thought that substantial demolition of the rear and side elevations would be detrimental to the character of the building. The Panel were also opposed in principle to the proposed extension. It was felt that the property should be converted as it was. The Panel queried if the existing garage was to be demolished, whether this would require conservation area consent.

### **E) 41 HALFORD STREET Planning Application 20050783 Change of use, alterations and roof extension**

The Director said the application was for the change of use of the building currently used as a night club to eight self contained flats, with a cafe / bar on the basement and ground floors. The proposal involved a roof top extension and external alterations.

The Panel considered the proposed roof top extension acceptable in principle, as the completion of second floor would finish off the building and enhance the building's contribution to the streetscene. It was recommended that there was a need to apply strict conditions on detailing and materials for extension.

### **F) 12 CHEAPSIDE Listed Building Consent 20050655 New Illuminated signs**

The Director said that the application was for a logo sign to the first floor, a fascia sign and a double sided projecting sign, which were all internally illuminated.

The Panel recommended that internally illuminated signs were not appropriate for use on a listed building. The Panel would prefer to see the restoration of the first floor window opening.

**G) 49 – 51 MARKET PLACE, 45 GALLOWTREE GATE**  
**Listed Building Consent 20050487**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the vacant premises to a restaurant, drinking establishment and hot food takeaway.

The Panel raised no objection to the change of use, but recommended that officers negotiate improvements to the market street elevation as part of the scheme.

**H) 62A LONDON ROAD**  
**Advertisement Consent 20050741**  
**New Signage**

The Director noted that it was intended to clad the uppermost part of the central tower of the building with four internally illuminated neon signs and one projecting banner sign running up through the first and second floor fascia.

The Panel objected in principle to the addition of any signage covering the tower. The proposed banner was considered to be too large and would set an unwelcome precedent for similar signs along London Road.

**I) 118 CHARLES STREET**  
**Planning Application 20050460**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the building currently used as a dance studio and bridge club to four self contained flats. The Panel made observations on a proposal for six flats last year.

The Panel raised no objection to the change of use, although the loss of community facilities was regrettable.

**J) 40 GRANBY STREET / RUTLAND STREET**  
**Planning Application 20050709**  
**New Signs**

The Director said that the application was for three internally illuminated fascia signs, two externally illuminated projecting signs, one internally illuminated menu holder and three awnings.

The Panel thought that the number of signs should be reduced to avoid clutter. The proposed sign over doorway concealing the fanlight should be omitted from the application as this was an important architectural feature of the building.

**K) WESTCOTES DRIVE, WESTCOTES HOUSE**

**Planning Application 20050337**

**Rear extension**

The Director said that the application was for a single storey conservatory to the rear of the building.

The Panel recommended that amendments should be sought to the roof, which should be pitched to match the existing building. It was also felt that the proposed materials should also be improved as uPVC in a conservation area was regrettable and would set a bad example.

**L) 22-24 DEACON STREET**

**Planning Application 20050321**

**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for two four-storey buildings of sixteen flats with car parking. The proposal involved the partial demolition of the locally listed Harrison Hayes building.

The Panel felt that the loss of the existing wall of the Harrison Hayes building was regrettable. It was further felt that the height of new development should be reduced so it did not tower over the adjacent historic building. Ideally the wall should be retained with a better quality new build to the rear.

**M) 19 THE NEWARKE**

**Planning Application 20050674**

**Dormer window**

The Director said that the application was for a dormer window to the rear roof slope. The design would match the dormers on two other properties within the terraced group.

The Panel raised no objection to the erection of the proposed rear dormer, although some panel members felt it should match the dormer to the front of No's 17 and 19, and not match the dormers on the rear of the adjacent houses.

**N) HIGHFIELD STREET/ TICHBOURNE STREET**

**Planning Application 20050069**

**Redevelopment**

The Director noted that the site was on the south-eastern corner of Highfield Street and Tichbourne Street directly opposite the Synagogue. This application is for the demolition of the existing garage and the redevelopment of the site with a four storey building for fifteen flats.

The Panel considered the proposed development to be still too high and thought that the detailing could be improved. It was suggested that the applicant should refer to the recent new development nearby as a template for what would be acceptable in this area.

**O) 54 DANESHILL ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20050674**  
**Rear extension**

The Director said the application was for the demolition of an existing outbuilding and the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. The proposal also involved a replacement window to the main dwelling.

The Panel raised no objection.

**P) 25 HORSEFAIR STREET**  
**Planning Application 20050731**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the proposal was to change the use of the ground floor shop unit to a betting office.

The Panel raised no objection.

**The Chair agreed to take the following items as urgent business:-**

**HIND HOTEL, 47 LONDON ROAD**

The Director said that it was proposed utilise the rear of the pub to create an outside drinking area and secluded drinking coves within the outbuildings.

The Panel raised no objection and welcomed reuse of the outbuildings. The Panel felt that the existing historic signboard should be retained/restored.

**6-10 ST.ALBANS ROAD**

The Director said the application included a single storey extension, a two storey extension and the demolition of the coal shed.

The Panel raised no objection to change of use or extensions. The Panel recommended that existing bricks and windows to rear should be salvaged and reused.

**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**

**93. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

**94. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.02pm.



