



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 31 AUGUST 2005 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill – Chair  
R. Lawrence – Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor O'Brien

S. Bowyer	-	English Heritage
S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
J. Burrows	-	Leicester Civic Society
K. Chappi	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
S. Dobby	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation
M. Elliot	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge
A. McWhirr	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee
P. Swallow	-	Person of Specialist Knowledge
D. Smith	-	Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society
R. Roenisch	-	Victorian Society

**Officers in Attendance:**

J. Crooks	-	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

\* \* \* \* \*

**23. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies from T. Abbott.

**24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

D. Smith declared an interest in item B) 1-5 Market Place & 10 Hotel Street.

Councillor Garrity declared a general interest as Chair of the Development Control Committee. She undertook to express no opinions on any of the

matters being discussed on the agenda.

## **25. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

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

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

There were no matters arising.

## **27. 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.

Mr Burrows enquired about the Bath Lane application which the Panel recommended for refusal which was approved by the Committee. Officers commented that planners were able to reach a compromise with developers with regard to concerns about loss of original fabric.

Mr Burrows made further enquiries regarding the amended plans that were approved on the 27 Knighton Road and Highfield Street applications. Officers commented that planning officers were able to overcome objections and reach a compromise with the applicants.

Mr Bowyer then raised a general point about getting feedback at the Panel on the changes that were made to applications that were approved at the Development Control (DC) Committee. He felt that it was important to ensure that CAP was made aware that its comments were being taken on board. He also felt that it was important that if CAP had recommended refusal then the matter would automatically be considered by the DC Committee. Councillor Garrity felt that it was important that confirmation be provided that officers with delegated powers take account of the views of CAP. Councillor Garrity agreed to seek a meeting between the Chair, Mr. Bowyer and herself with the Head of Development Control to consider this matter.

RESOLVED:

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

## **28. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**A) VAUGHAN WAY, HIGHCROSS STREET, BURGESS STREET & CAUSEWAY; NEW SHIRES WEST DEVELOPMENT  
Planning Application 20050608 & 20051492  
Redevelopment**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed proposals for the

new 'Shires extension' in 2004 and earlier in 2005. The current applications were for changes in the design of the new build on Shires Lane and Highcross Street (20050608) and details of the new five storey building to include cinema, restaurant and cafe, bar, retail, financial and professional services (20051492).

The Panel felt that the design was difficult to fully appreciate from the submitted plans and suggested that a 3D model could be requested from the applicant. This would help Panel members assess the wider impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings and the High Street Conservation Area.

The Panel felt that the ground floor arrangement was not pedestrian friendly and would not entice people to walk alongside it. A ground floor shopping arcade was suggested. They were also unsure what the proposed reflective materials would look like and requested further information on this. Some panel members felt that the design of the building was not adventurous enough and more dramatic angles might make for a more exciting building. The Panel were of the opinion that a strong building was needed on this corner but more thought and articulation was required.

The Panel judged that the proposed amendments to the residential block adjacent to the old Grammar School were an improvement on the approved scheme.

**B) 1-5 MARKET PLACE & 10 HOTEL STREET**  
**Listed Building Consent 20051479, Planning Application 20051478**  
**Internal & external alterations**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously considered an application for the conversion of the ground floor into two separate shop units with flats on the upper floors, involving the reinstatement of the original party wall and removal of internal details from the former wine lodge, was considered last April. The current proposal was for internal and external alterations in connection with the continued use of the building as a public house.

The Panel were fairly happy with the internal changes although there was some concern regarding the loss of the layout which, although not original, did respect the Georgian/Victorian character.

The panel questioned the need to widen the external doors to the Jetty and opposed the rooflights on the front elevation roof slope. It was also recommended that the proposed additional flue should be powder coated. They also raised the issue of providing suitable access to the disabled toilets.

**C) ABBEY PARK ROAD, BOSTON HOUSE**  
**Planning Application 20051300**  
**Change of use, extensions**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on a redevelopment scheme on this site involving a new six to eight storey building for 84 flats, swimming pool and gymnasium in the spring of 2003. This current

application was for the conversion of the building to 44 flats involving extensions to the front, rear and roof. The proposal included basement car parking and landscaping.

The Panel raised no objections to this scheme although it was thought that the rear extension could be more distinctive to contrast more with the original building.

**D) RATCLIFFE ROAD, ASHLANDS RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME**  
**Planning Application 20051431**  
**Extension**

The Director said that the application was for a substantial extension to the main residential care home. The proposal would involve the loss of protected trees. A similar scheme was considered by the Panel in December 2004.

The panel thought that this was an improvement to the previous scheme but still had reservations about potential tree loss.

**E) 2-6 GALLOWTREE GATE**  
**Planning Application 20051385**  
**Change of use**

The Director noted that this building was built for Burtons Tailors who occupied the building until the 1990's. The current application was for the change of use of the building from retail to financial and professional services. The proposal involved a new shopfront, cash machines and banner signs.

The Panel recommended that the original ground floor appearance be reinstated, as the existing and proposed treatment did not reflect the proportions of the upper facades. Also recommended was that all signage should be externally illuminated and should not encroach onto the upper section of exposed stone. It was also felt that banner signs should be refused.

**F) 4 RUTLAND STREET, WELLINGTON HOTEL**  
**Planning Application 20051424**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the upper floors of the former Wellington public house 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. This was a revised scheme to the one the Panel had previously made observations on in April which was subsequently refused.

The Panel conceded that this was an improvement on the previous scheme but felt that the design did not integrate well into the surrounding townscape and looked as if it were not specifically designed for this site. The panel members felt that the curved roofs were too proud and aggressive with too much emphasis placed on this element of the design, and thought the overall design

was too busy and in direct competition to the surrounding historic buildings.

**G) 69 MARKET PLACE**  
**Listed Building Consent, Planning Application 20051313**  
**Shopfront, roller shutter**

The Director said the application was for a new shopfront, roller shutter to the front and condenser unit to the rear of the building.

The Panel were opposed to the solid roller shutter.

**H) 37 GALLOWTREE GATE, MARKET PLACE**  
**Advertisement Consent 20051366**  
**Signs**

The Director said that the application was for new signage to the Market Place elevation.

The panel considered that internally illuminated signs were unacceptable on a listed façade.

**I) ST MARGARETS CHURCH**  
**Planning Application 20051383**  
**Wall and Statue**

The Director said that the proposal was for a new wall on which the church notice board would be mounted and the resiting in the church grounds of the statue of St Margaret by Pamela Beresford, originally on the chamfered corner of the Corah factory on Burleys Way.

The Panel would like an inscription (if one was not already proposed) to say where the statue came from and who the artist was etc. It was also felt that the boundary wall could be slightly higher to give the statue more head room. The floodlighting of the statue would be welcomed.

**J) 76-80 LONDON ROAD**  
**Listed Building Consent 20051382**  
**Fire escape**

The Director said that the application was for a new external fire escape to the rear of the building .

The Panel raised no objections.

**K) 18 SCOTT STREET**  
**Planning Application 20051360**  
**Extension**

The Director noted that Knighton Fields House dated from c.1860 and was the home of John Johnson the boot merchant until his death in 1877. The gate

house of the fronts on to Welford Road. The house now formed part of the school built in the 1930's when most of the outbuildings were lost. The current application was for a single storey extension to the surviving outbuilding.

The Panel questioned the need to site the new building so close to the historic building, especially as there appeared to be ample room elsewhere on the site. If the building had to be sited in this location, the height of the roof should be lowered to be more in keeping with the adjacent outbuilding.

**L) 65-67 PARK VALE ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20051246**  
**Retention of covered area**

The noted that the applicant had built a structure made from wood and corrugated plastic enclosing the whole of the rear garden, without the benefit of planning permission. This application was for the retention of the structure.

The Panel were of the opinion that the infilling of the entire rear yard was unsightly and detracted from the character of the conservation area and would set an unwelcome precedent if approved. The Panel would support enforcement action.

**M) 7 STRETTON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20051399**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for a dormer window to the rear of the property and two rooflights to the front of the building.

The Panel opposed the rooflights to the front elevation.

**N) 51 HIGHCROSS STREET, OLD GRAMMAR SCHOOL**  
**Listed Building Consent 20051481**  
**Windows and louvre**

The Director said that the application was for two new windows and a louvre to the south elevation. The Panel made observations on this proposal at the June meeting.

The Panel raised no objections.

**O) LONDON ROAD, HOLLYBANK COURT**  
**Planning Application 20051491**  
**Three antennae, equipment cabinets**

The Director said that the application was for three antennae to the roof with equipment cabinets at the ground floor of the block of flats.

The Panel accepted that a precedent had already been set with the approval of other aerials on the building, although there was no recollection of these being

considered previously.

**P) 12 ST JOHNS ROAD  
Planning Application 20051145  
Change of use, dormer extensions**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the house to two self contained flats. The proposal involved two dormer extensions.

The Panel felt that the proposed alterations would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the historic building.

**Q) 2 ALEXANDRA ROAD  
Planning Application 20051417  
Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of a domestic garage to a self contained flat.

The Panel felt that the proposed alterations would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and that to create another residential unit would be over development.

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

**R) OXFORD STREET, POLAR BEAR PH  
Listed Building Consent 20051401  
External alterations**

**S) UPPER CHARNWOOD STREET, CHARNWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL  
Planning Application 20051283  
New window**

**T) 32 FREEMENS HOLT  
Planning Application 20050767  
Extension**

**U) 17 STONEYGATE ROAD  
Planning Application 20051333  
Extension**

**V) 16 HIGH STREET, 11 SILVER STREET  
Planning Application 20051350  
Shopfront**

**W) ST PAULS CHURCH, KIRBY ROAD  
Listed Building Consent 20051407  
Repairs**

**X) 76-80 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20051387**  
**Removal of chimney**

**Y) HIGH STREET, UNIT 73 THE SHIRES**  
**Planning Application 200501387**  
**Removal of Chimney**

**Z) 23 LINCOLN STREET**  
**Planning Application 20050931**  
**New windows**

**AA) 13 WEST STREET**  
**Planning Application 20050931**  
**New windows**

**29. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

Officers reported back with regard to the request for Conservation Officers recommendations being included for B list items. It was commented that B list items are minor items of an uncontroversial nature. If applications come in which do have complications, they would be on the A list. It is therefore to be assumed that B list items would be likely to be approved.

Mr Burrows also noted that the civic society were going on a visit to the historic town of Malvern.

**30. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.30pm.



