

# Minutes of the Meeting of the CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 19 OCTOBER 2005 at 5.15pm

#### **PRESENT:**

#### R. Lawrence – Chair

#### Councillor Garrity

#### Councillor O'Brien

S. BowyerS. BrittonJ. BurrowsEnglish HeritageUniversity of LeicesterLeicester Civic Society

K. Chhapi - Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects

P. Draper - Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

M. Elliot - Person of Specialist KnowledgeP. 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

D. Windwood - Development Control, Regeneration and Culture

Department

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

#### 38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from A. McWhirr and D. Smith.

#### 39. 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.

#### 40. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 28 September 2005 be confirmed as a correct record.

#### 41. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mr Burrows commented that consideration of the recent Welford Road, Tigers application was deferred by the Development Control Committee. He noted that the club had published pictures of their proposal but there were no plans left at the New Walk Centre for local residents to consider. It was therefore intended to undertake full publicity on the proposals and then the matter would be considered by the Committee.

A Panel member noted that concerns had been raised about two towers on the proposed building but the plans of the proposed development didn't appear to show any towers. Cllr. Garrity commented that there were two eight storey towers included in the building and that the latest proposal took up more of the Granby Halls site than previous proposals.

#### 42. DECISIONS MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL

The Service Director, Environment submitted a report on decisions made by the City Council on planning applications previously considered by the Conservation Advisory Panel.

Councillor Garrity noted that the Development Control Committee on the previous night had considered an application on Lincoln Street for a conversion of a house in to flats. This included a bin store in the front garden in a conservation area. She felt that some sort of policy was needed to ensure bins were covered by a storage facility. There could be three specified types to be used in conservation areas. She felt that bins on display in conservation areas made the areas look less attractive. Officers commented that a 'Residential Design Guide' was currently be written. The bin problem could be considered as part of this. Members of the Panel noted that there would still be problems with flush fronted properties leaving bins on the pavements.

#### 43. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

# A) CHARLES STREET, FORMER POLICE STATION Planning Application 20051900 & Listed Building Consent 20051895 Change of use, extensions and redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the former Police station to offices and restaurant, extensions to the rooftop and rear and a new five to seven storey building to the rear for 40 flats and office accommodation.

The Panel accepted the principle of the proposal but made some observations

on the proposed design:

- The new build was too dominant in relation to the listed building and perhaps too much was being crammed into this space.
- The link between the rear extension and the listed building should be more fragmented.
- There might also be a solar gain problem as this elevation faces the sun for much of the day, but Panel members liked the way it acted as a back drop for the listed building.
- The plant room on the rooftop was unsightly and should be less bulky
- Breaks in the frontage of the office block should be introduced to allow views of the church. The fenestration within the main office block needed more imagination.
- Some members did not like the materials and thought brick rather than red render should be used for the residential block.
- The relationship between the office block and the residential element reads as a solid block and should be broken up in some way. One suggestion was a glazed link between the two buildings where the stairs are proposed.
- It was also noted that on a previous scheme the glass stairwell on the St George Street side had a twin, which acted as a gateway into the courtyard and the Panel felt that this should be reintroduced.
- The courtyard was considered to be uninviting.

# B) THE NEWARKE, NEWARKE HOUSES MUSEUM Planning Application 20051754 Proposed disabled persons lift

The Director said that the application was for a lift to provide access to the upper floors. The Panel had considered various locations for this proposal over the last couple of years. This current proposal was to provide disabled access to every room in the museum but it would require a new opening in part of the original 16<sup>th</sup> century rear wall of Skeffington House.

Members of the Panel raised no objections.

# C) 4 QUEEN STREET Planning Application 20051710 Outline consent for new residential development

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of an existing warehouse and the erection of a new residential development of seventeen flats. A previous scheme for 21 flats was refused earlier in the year. The current application was seeking outline consent for siting and access matters only.

The Panel felt that the proposed development was acceptable in principle, subject to the replacement being a well-designed building and a maximum height no greater that the adjacent buildings.

#### D) REAR OF 195 NARBOROUGH ROAD

# Planning Application 20051704 Demolition and redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of garages to the rear of 195 Narborough Road, facing Westleigh Road and the redevelopment of the site with a three storey building for three self contained flats.

The Panel thought that the coach house made an important contribution to the street scene and the conservation area and did not wish to see it demolished.

# E) 8-10 MILLSTONE LANE Planning Application 20051702 Alterations to shopfront

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the shopfront, seeking to create a French style street cafe.

The Panel had some reservations about this proposal. They recommended that the scheme be simplified and asked for a reduction in the number of signs shown. The Panel was also opposed to awnings on the building. They also pointed out the unfinished nature of the ground floor elevations flanking the shopfront and asked that they be 'finished off'. They commented on the white strip beneath the first floor windows and asked that this be returned to brickwork or at the very least the strip should be painted a brick red to match the upper floors.

# F) LONDON ROAD, RAILWAY STATION Listed Building Consent 20051867 Cleaning and repairs

The Director said that the application was for cleaning and repair of the clock tower.

The Panel was concerned that if the building were cleaned it might end up covered with algae like others in the city (the Robert Hall Memorial Chapel was named as an example). They also raised concern over the proposed method of cleaning which might erode the façade unless used by experts.

# G) 56 STOUGHTON ROAD Planning Application 20050721 Change of use

The Director noted that the Panel had previously considered both the demolition of the building and its conversion to flats involving a rear extension at previous meetings. The Panel considered a revised scheme reducing the size of the rear extension.

The Panel reiterated previous comments that the building should be converted as it is with no additional extensions. They did not wish to see any demolition of the existing building and also pointed out the proposed loss of the garret window on the west elevation – which was considered to be an important feature of the building and should be retained

### H) 64-66 HUMBERSTONE GATE Advertisement Consent 20051660 Retention of signage

The Director said the application was for the retention of an internally illuminated wall sign and internally illuminated projecting sign.

The Panel welcomed the reduction in signage but felt that the first floor vertical sign should be externally illuminated.

# I) 19 BOWLING GREEN STREET Planning Application 20051717 Change of use

The Director said the application was for the change of use of first and second floors from public house to two self contained flats. The proposal involved external alterations.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposed alterations but some members raised concerns over policies regarding flat conversions in commercial inner city areas.

## J) 25-27 UPPER KING STREET Listed Building Consent 20051787 & Planning Application 20051764 New boundary wall & gates

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the building and a new two metre high rear boundary wall with access gates to Trinity Lane. The Panel previously made observations on a similar proposal at 17 Upper King Street at the last meeting.

The Panel welcomed the brick wall enclosure, which would reinstate the garden status of the original Georgian terrace but recommended that it be lowered from 1.8 metres down to 1.5 metres. They also recommended that it be built with a traditional English garden wall bond – three courses of stretchers alternating with one course of headers on the face of the wall.

## K) MANSION HOUSE, GLENFIELD HOSPITAL Listed Building Consent 20050709 & Planning Application 20052469 Disabled Access Ramp and associated lighting

The Director said that the application was for the removal of the existing non compliant ramped access to the rear of the building and replace it with a new compliant ramp with stepped access. The work also involved new emergency lighting and electronic door opener.

The Panel raised on objections.

### L) 225 AYLESTONE ROAD Listed Building Consent 20051781 Single Storey rear extension

The Director said that the proposal was to build a single storey extension to the rear of the house. The proposal involved the demolition of an existing outbuilding.

The Panel were happy with the proposal except for the proposed window, which it was felt should be more in keeping with the original small light windows within the terrace.

# M) 127 MERE ROAD Planning Application 20051180 Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the existing sliding sash, stained glass windows for new mock sash double glazed units.

The Panel commented on the high quality of the existing windows and did not wish to lose them unnecessarily.

### N) 134 MERE ROAD Planning Application 20051863 Dormer window

The Director said that the application was for a dormer window to the front roof slope.

The Panel expressed a preference for the window to be on the rear but if it had to go on the front then it should be situated to sit directly over the central bay so that the line of the bay is carried up into the dormer.

### O) 102 WELFORD ROAD

# Planning Application 20051603 & Listed Building Consent 20051674 Repair and replacement windows, secondary glazing

The Director said that the application was for repair and replacement of windows and the introduction of secondary double glazing.

The Panel raised no objection to this proposal.

# P) 24 GOTHAM STREET Planning Application 20051709 Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the rear windows with double glazed uPVC units.

The Panel pointed out that the rear elevation could be seen from Gotham Street and asked that the windows be like for like replacements in timber.

### Q) 17 NEWARKE STREET Planning Application 20051730 Change of use

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the building to 12 flats. The Panel had previously considered a similar proposal for 11 flats earlier in the year.

The Panel raised no objections.

# R) 222 FOSSE ROAD SOUTH Planning Application 20041304 Alterations to porch

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the existing porch.

The Panel raised no objections.

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

# S) 25 HORSEFAIR STREET Planning Application 20041832, Advertisement Consent 20051809 Alterations to shopfront, new signs

T) 9 ST NICHOLAS PLACE
Planning Application 20051662
Security Gates

U) 8-10 HIGHFIELD STREET Planning Application 20051810 Rear fire escape

V) 29 SHAFTESBURY AVENUE Planning Application 20051812 Retention of external alterations

#### 44. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

### Market Proposals

Mr Burrows commented that he hoped that good consultation would take place with market traders and the public with regard to the plan to replace the current market hall. He noted that should such a building be put forward today it would most likely be refused. He noted that traders had concerns about the forthcoming Shires development.

# 45. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.55pm.