



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the

CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL HELD ON Wednesday, 24 August 2016

Meeting Started 5:15 pm

Attendees

R. Gill (Chair), R. Lawrence (Vice-chair), P. Draper (RICS), C. Laughton, M. Johnson (LAHS), P. Ellis (LVS), D. Lyne (LIHS), L. Blood (IHBC), M. Queally (UoL), D. Martin (LRGT), G. Butterworth (LCC),

Presenting Officers

J. Webber (LCC)

S. Peppin Vaughan (LCC)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Rev. R. Curtis (LDAC), S. Eppel (LCS), N. Feldmann (LRSA), C. Sawday.

The chair acknowledged the contributions of Cllr S. Barton, S. Pointer, D. Trubshaw and J. Garrity to the panel, following their departure. He welcomed L. Blood (IHBC).

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Panel agreed the notes.

4. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 57 NEW WALK, CAR PARK ADJACENT

Planning Application [20161047](#)

New student development

The panel had no objection to development taking place on the site of the existing car park but were concerned that the proposed building was not of sufficiently high quality design for the setting. The style was considered to be out of keeping with the character of the New Walk streetscape - appearing too urban. The panel were particularly concerned by the number of proposed materials and suggested a simplified materials palette and design would

improve the appearance. Concerns were expressed about the proportions, with the undulating form somewhat contrived, while the bay widths were considered to be rather small. Some concerns were expressed regarding the building height, with the eaves of the adjacent building proposed as a more relevant aspect than the ridge.

Objections

B) 2 YEOMAN STREET

Planning application [20160062](#)

Change of use, extensions

The principle of change of use of the existing building was supported, but the panel had strong objections to the proposed extensions. Concern was expressed about the crude design and the loss of the existing roof. The cutting off of the top of the rear windows was considered to be particularly disappointing, while the scale of the extensions was deemed excessive. The Panel were concerned the extensions would harm the setting of the two nearby listed buildings and would dilute the quality of the Conservation Area. The detailing of the proposed extensions was criticised, particularly the fenestration pattern on the side elevations and the proposed use of plastic 'timber effect' cladding.

Objections

C) 36 ST JAMES ROAD

Planning Application [20161368](#)

Demolition, new development

The panel accepted the principle of residential development in this location but were disappointed by the revised design. They considered that the design bore little relation to the context and was of a standard design. They argued that the windows were poorly proportioned and the lack of detailing was poor. They encouraged either development of the original house design or revisions to the new design.

Seek amendments

D) LAND AT REAR OF 5-8 GLENWOOD CLOSE

Planning Application [20161384](#)

Demolition, new development

The panel were concerned that there might be wider planning issues relating to the proposal but had no conservation objection to the development. Although there was some support for the development taking place instead on the site of the existing garages, they considered the proposed site to be discrete. Support was provided for the contemporary design.

No Objections

E) 3 CROSS ROAD **Planning Application [20161552](#)** **New development**

The panel considered the proposal to be overdevelopment of the plot and to be out of character with the Conservation Area. They were concerned the new build had an uncomfortable form, appearing squat, and the fenestration was badly proportioned. Some support was stated for an alternative design, on the footprint of the existing garage, with a well-designed freestanding two storey 'coach house' style suggested. Concerns were expressed about the loss of amenity space, but no objection was made to the demolition of the existing garage.

Objections

The panel had no objections/observations on the following applications:

F) 14 CROSS ROAD **Planning Application [20161353](#)** **External alterations**

G) 142 LONDON ROAD **Planning Application [20161379](#)** **Change of use, external alterations**

H) 10-14 NEW STREET **Listed Building Consent [20161382](#)** **Boundary wall alterations**

I) 1A LIDSTER CLOSE **Planning Application [20161487](#)** **Replacement windows**

J) 6 STRETTON ROAD **Planning Application [20161521](#)** **Rear extension**

K) 24 DANESHILL ROAD
Planning Application [20161559](#)
Replacement windows

L) 1 DARKER STREET
Planning Application [20161234](#)
New signs

M) 16 MALVERN ROAD
Planning Application [20161417](#)
New external flue

N) 16-26 OXFORD STREET, 28 NEWARKE STREET, ALLEN HOUSE
Planning Application [20161578](#)
New signs

O) SOUTHGATES, FAT BUDHA
Planning Application [20161494](#)
New sign

Next Meeting – Wednesday 21st September, G.02 Meeting Room 2, City Hall

Meeting Ended – 18:35