



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 28 SEPTEMBER 2005 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill – Chair

Councillor Garrity

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| J. Burrows | - | Leicester Civic Society |
| K. Chappi | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects |
| S. Dobby | - | Institute of Historic Building Conservation |
| P. Draper | - | Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors |
| M. Elliot | - | Person of Specialist Knowledge |
| P. Swallow | - | Person of Specialist Knowledge |
| 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 |
| D. Ringwood | - | Development Control, Regeneration and Culture |
| F. Connolly | - | Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity
Department |

* * * * *

31. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from T. Abbott, S. Bowyer, S. Britton, R. Lawrence, Dr A. McWhirr and D. Smith

32. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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.

33. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 31 August 2005 be confirmed as a correct record.

34. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

35. 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 Gill requested that when a contentious decision was made by Development Control, it would be helpful if a short sentence was added in the minutes explaining what action happened following the decision that was made.

Members of the Panel also requested that the title wording on Appendix B be changed to 'Decisions Made By The Development Control Department' as it was recognised that not all applications that appeared on the paper had been considered by the Committee.

36. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) WELFORD ROAD/AYLESTONE ROAD Planning Application 20031653 Spectator stand & Flats

The Director noted that the proposal had previously been advertised as affecting the setting of the New Walk Conservation Area, the Grade II listed Prison and 73 Aylestone Road and Welford Road Cemetery Historic Park. This current proposal is advertised as affecting only the setting of 73 Aylestone Road a Grade II listed building.

The Panel felt that the design was greatly improved from the previous submission and would have no adverse impact on the setting of 73 Aylestone Road, which is Grade II listed.

Further details on the external materials and glazing were requested, in addition to further contextual sketches demonstrating the impact on the wider streetscape.

The Panel also queried whether the development would encroach upon council owned land adjacent.

B) THE NEWARKE/OXFORD STREET
Planning Application 20051507
New Building

The Director said that the proposal affected the setting of the Grade II listed Gateway College, the Castle Gardens Conservation Area and the Magazine Gateway, part of the Leicester Castle Scheduled Monument.

The Panel members judged that the proposed development had a mediocre design which was of insufficient quality, given the historic setting of the site. A more innovative modern design should be encouraged, to contrast with surrounding notable historic buildings.

One Panel member suggested that the building be lowered and undercroft parking introduced to minimise the visual prominence of the car park. The Panel acknowledged that this solution may have archaeological implications.

C) MORLEDGE ST/ BURTON ST/ ANNE ST
Planning Application 20051521
New flat block

The Director said that the application was for a new eight storey residential development

The Panel felt that the proposed development was ugly and unimaginative, and had the appearance of two separate design concepts fused together. They also commented that the proposed building was too high and may create further traffic problems in the area. The Panel had no objection to the demolition of the existing warehouse.

D) ASTILL LODGE ROAD
Planning Application 20051690
Residential Development

The Director said that the application was for five flats and five houses on land to the south east of the listed building.

The Panel had no objection in principle to a residential development on this site, but this should act as a gateway to the listed Beaumont Lodge. The Panel acknowledged that the development could improve the security of the lodge and reduce anti-social behaviour problems. The Panel suggested that two blocks of three storeys might be more appropriate and that the parking layout be rearranged to give the lodge a more spacious setting.

E) BELGRAVE HOTEL, 213 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application 20051600
Extension and Alterations

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of part of the pub and a new single storey extension. The proposal also involves external

alterations.

The Panel had no objections to the application.

F) 2 HOWARD ROAD
Planning Application 20051542
Four houses

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the redevelopment of the site with four new houses.

The Panel considered that this proposal would be an improvement upon the current situation but were concerned that the rear gardens would face onto West Avenue. They recommended that the site layout be amended to better views along West Avenue.

G) 37 ST.NICHOLAS PLACE
Planning Application 20051651
Roller Shutters

The Director said that the application was for six solid roller shutters to the ground floor frontage facing onto St Nicholas Place.

The Panel raised an objection to the proposed roller shutters, which would detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.

H) 17 UPPER KING STREET
Listed Building Consent 20051647 and Planning Application 20051639
New boundary wall, alterations

The Director said that this application was for alterations to the building and a new two metre high rear boundary wall.

The Panel members welcomed the reintroduction of a traditional boundary treatment but felt that the proposed brick boundary wall should be reduced in height and the design amended to include a step down to the gates.

I) 10 BERRIDGE STREET
Advertisement Consent 20051590
New signage

The Director said that the proposal was for three externally illuminated double sided projecting signs and two non-illuminated wall signs.

The Panel considered that the number of proposed signs would clutter the elevation and would look fussy next to the rustication of the main entrance. They recommended that there should be only two projecting signs. The Panel had no objection to the proposed name plates on the door surround.

J) 69 MARKET PLACE

**Listed Building Consent 20051620, Planning Application 20051313 and
Advertisement Consent 20051619
Shopfront, roller shutter**

The Director noted that this application, for a new shopfront and roller shutter to the front and condenser unit to the rear of the building was considered by the panel at the last meeting. Amendments have since been received and also details of the signage.

The Panel had no objection to the design of the shopfront but felt that a richer, darker colour scheme would be more appropriate to the listed building. The revised roller shutter design was deemed acceptable.

**K) 63 MARKET STREET
Advertisement Consent 20051651
Fascia and Projecting Sign**

The Director said that this application was for a new internally illuminated fascia sign and projecting sign.

The Panel opposed the installation of an internally illuminated projecting sign – this should be amended to external trough lighting.

**L) 4 CHEAPSIDE
Planning Application 20051516
New shopfront and roller shutter**

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

The Panel opposed the introduction of solid roller shutters but had no other objections to the proposed replacement shopfront.

**M) 42 FOSSE ROAD CENTRAL
Planning Application 20051399
Change of use, demolition**

The Director said that this application was for change of use of the house to four self contained flats involving the demolition of rear outbuildings.

The Panel had no objections to the application.

**N) 3B DANESHILL ROAD
Planning Application 20051495
Change of use, alterations**

The Director noted that this application was for a change of use of the workshop to a three bedroom self contained flat with office. The proposal also involves alterations to the front boundary wall to create vehicular access. The work is already in progress.

The Panel raised no objection to the change of use but recommended that the original pitched roof to the former workshop be reinstated and continued along the flat roof section of the building. The use of the area in front of the boundary wall as a car parking space was opposed. The Panel also queried whether there was any bin storage provision on the site.

**O) 62 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20051581
Change of use**

The Director said that this application was for the conversion of the first floor of the building to 8 flats. The proposal involves external alterations.

The Panel had no objections to the application.

**P) 121/121A LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20051718 and Advertisement Consent 20051714
New shopfront and signs**

The Director said that this application was for a new shopfront and illuminated signs

The Panel approved of the proposed replacement shopfront and signage but considered that the proposed flue to the rear elevation would be overly prominent and unsightly.

**Q) SAFFRON HILL CEMETERY LODGE, STONESBY AVENUE
Planning Application 20050586
Hard standing, vehicular access**

The Director said that this application was for a hard standing area and vehicular access.

The Panel felt that the proposed hard standing would impair the symmetrical appearance of the cemetery entrance, would adversely affect the setting of the listed Lodge and would not reflect the solemnity of the cemetery. They also commented that railings would be less obtrusive than a more substantial brick wall.

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

**R) 55 KNIGHTON DRIVE
Planning Application 20051615
Single Storey Rear Extension**

**S) ST. ANDREW'S VICARAGE, 53B JARROM STREET,
Planning Application 20051360
Change Of Use**

**T) 29 HORSEFAIR STREET
Planning Application 20051559
Alterations To Shopfronts**

**U) 13-24 ST. JAMES TERRACE
Planning Application 20051503
Replacement windows**

**V) 4-8 HORSEFAIR STREET
Listed Building Consent 2005 1578 Planning Application 20051550
Condenser units**

37. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

S. Dobby asked whether site plans could be re-instated next to each application. Jeremy agreed that this would help with the pre-planning process and offered to attempt to do this for future meetings.

At the request of the members of the Panel, it was agreed that the next meeting would be moved forward to Wednesday 19 October 2005 at 5.15pm.

38. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.50pm.

