



Leicester  
City Council

**CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL**  
**Meeting Room G.03 – City Hall**

**16<sup>th</sup> November 2016**

---

## Meeting Notes

---

### Meeting Started 17:15

#### Attendees

R. Gill (Chair), R. Lawrence (Vice-Chair), M. Richardson (RTPI), L. Blood (IHBC), S. Eppel (LCS), Rev R Curtis (LDAC), D. Martin (LRGT), N. Feldmann (LRSA), M. Johnson (LAHS), P. Draper (RICS), P. Ellis (LVS), D. Lyne (LIHS), S. Hartshorne (TCS), C. Laughton, C. Sawday

#### Presenting Officers

J. Webber (LCC), J. Simmins (LCC), L. Fraser (LCC)

#### Apologies

M. Holland (GG)

R. Gill welcomed the new members of CAP.

#### Declarations of Interest

None

#### Minutes of Previous Meeting

Agreed

S. Eppel enquired as to whether CAP minutes are visible on Council planning application webpages – JW & JS to find out answer for next meeting,

#### Current Development Proposals

#### **Report of the Director of Planning, Transportation and Economic Development**

##### **A) MOLLY O'GRADY'S PH, HOTEL STREET**

**Planning Application 20162024 Listed Building Consent [20162025](#)**

**Internal & external alterations to Listed Building; Change of Use of Public House to mixed use, ground floor restaurant / bar and upper floors hotel**

The panel supported the proposal, noting that the hotel use was a good re-use of the vacant upper floors.

They accepted the proposal to introduce a new door opening into the blank gable end of the building, accessing the proposed terrace and were satisfied with its design. It was suggested that a similar design should be proposed for the new door openings on the Market Place South elevation, creating the new draft lobby.

With regard to the interior works, although the panel appreciated that much of the original historic fabric had already been lost, they were concerned over the visual images provided, and sought a simplified materials palette. It was suggested that the refurbishment should look to reinstate some local distinctiveness. They were however happy to hear that the original parquet flooring is to be retained.

## **NO OBJECTIONS**

---

### **B) HIGHFIELD STREET, SYNAGOGUE**

**Planning Application 20162096, Listed Building Consent [20162097](#)**

**Internal and external alterations to Listed Building; construction of a 2-storey glazed entrance link**

The principle of the proposed works was supported by the panel, as they appreciated the congregation's desire to remain at the synagogue, but with improved facilities. It was also acknowledged that they are working within very limited space, making the proposal a very difficult task.

Although the principle of a 2-storey glazed link between the synagogue and former school room was considered acceptable, concerns were raised over the designs. It was felt that the front building line of the glazed link had an awkward junction with the existing synagogue and it was suggested that the set-back building line may need to be altered in order to create a better relationship between new and old.

Concerns were also raised over the design of the new openings to the former school room and the loss of original windows. The panel recommended that the openings are redesigned, being more sympathetic to the existing and that on the ground floor only a single opening is created, retaining one set of the original windows.

It was agreed that the general design of the glazed link, with strong vertical members breaking up the glazing could work, subject to high quality materials being proposed.

There were no concerns over the reordering of the kitchens, toilets and staircases to the rear of the former school room.

## **SEEK AMENDMENTS**

---

### **C) 364 LONDON ROAD, 12 GLENWOOD CLOSE, LAND ADJACENT**

**Planning Application [20161361](#)**

**New dwelling**

Concerns were raised over the principle of the proposal, as the new dwellinghouse was considered to be overdevelopment of the site. The panel were concerned that

the new build would sit forward of the existing building line and that this would require a number of trees, shrubs and a hedging to be removed, harming the landscape character along the northern side of Stoughton Lane; which is considered to positively contribute to the character and appearance of the Stoneygate Conservation Area.

Notwithstanding the above, the panel did not have objections to the general design of the house or its compatibility with the appearance of the existing buildings.

## **OBJECTIONS**

---

### **D) 8 RATCLIFFE ROAD**

**Planning Application [20161692](#)**

**Extensions, detached self-contained flat**

The panel raised objections to the introduction of the porch, as it was of a poor and incongruous design, out-of-keeping with the original building. Concerns were also raised over the loss of the gap between the original building and the adjacent extension/outbuilding, as it fails to preserve the appearance of the building and results in the unnecessary loss of a chimneystack.

There was a discussion over the acceptability of the detached self-contained flat within the rear garden, but the panel were split over its acceptability, with some raising concerns over the loss of garden space, whilst others felt that the impact upon the conservation area is negligible.

## **OBJECTIONS**

---

### **E) 2 ST JAMES TERRACE**

**Planning Application [20161985](#)**

**Extension to rear**

There were objections raised by the panel over the proposal, as the extension is of an inappropriate size, scale & design, failing to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

It was agreed that the extension was out-of-scale with the original building and of a poor standard of design, unbefitting its location. Concerns were also raised over the screening of the existing external chimneystack on the adjacent building.

## **OBJECTIONS**

---

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

**F) 9 HOLY BONES**

Advertisement Consent [20161531](#)

Flag pole and flag

---

**G) 20 HOTEL STREET**

Planning Application [20161976](#)

External alterations

---

**H) LANCASTER ROAD, UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCIENCES BUILDING**

Planning Application [20161963](#)

Freestanding sculpture

---

**I) 73-75 HIGH STREET**

Advertisement Consent [20161941](#)

Signs

---

**J) 62-68 HIGHCROSS STREET**

Advertisement Consent [20161907](#)

Signs

---

**K) 263 LONDON ROAD**

Planning Application [20161874](#)

Extension to rear

---

**L) 5 TOLLER ROAD**

Planning Application [20161866](#)

Change of use of garage to living space

---

**M) 224 EAST PARK ROAD**

Planning Application [20161764](#)

Extension to rear

---

**N) 260A ASTILL LODGE ROAD; BEAUMONT LODGE NURSERY**

Listed Building Consent [20160218](#)

Internal alterations

---

**O) 7-9 POKLINGTONS WALK**

Planning Application [20162099](#)

Removal of chimney

---

**P) 103-105 PRINCESS ROAD EAST  
Planning Application 20162082  
Canopy at rear of education building**

---

**Q) 81-83 HUMBERSTONE GATE  
Advertisement Consent 20162015  
Externally illuminated hoarding**

---

**R) 8 VICARAGE LANE  
Planning Application 20162028  
Rooflights**

---

**Next Meeting – Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016, G.02 Meeting Room 2, City Hall**

**Meeting Ended – 18:45**