



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 24 MAY 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair (in the Chair)

K. Chhapi	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
J. Dean	Royal Town Planning Institute
D. Hollingworth	Leicester Civic Society
D. Martin	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
R Roenisch	Victorian Society
C. Sawday	Person of Specialist Knowledge

Officers in Attendance:

J. Carstairs	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
J. Crooks	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
D. Windwood	-	Development Control, Regeneration and Culture Department
M. Reeves	-	Committee Services, Resources Department

* * * * *

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from S.Bowyer, S.Britton, S. Dobby, P. Draper, M. Elliot, A. McWhirr, Cllr. O'Brien and D.Smith.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

C. Sawday declared a personal interest in Appendix D, item X, 1 Albion Street.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

J. Dean commented that his declaration regarding 32/34 Elms Road had not been included.

Rowan Roenisch commented that her name had been spelt incorrectly.

RESOLVED:

that subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the Panel held on 26 April 2006 were confirmed as a correct record.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

5. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

Members of the Panel noted that 118 Charles Street had been approved despite the Panel's refusal recommendation. Officers commented that they felt and Development Control were of the opinion that it wouldn't be possible to defend an objection to the roof extension as there were a number in the area already.

6. HIGH STREET CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER STATEMENT

Members of the Panel were asked for their comments on the draft High Street Conservation Area Character Statement.

It was queried whether there was a presumption against tall buildings and units of a certain size in this area in the local plan, particularly in relation to the Cathedral spire. Officers commented that there wasn't currently any such restrictions in the current Local Development Framework, there was however a tall buildings policy currently being written and consulted on.

As a point of interest it was noted that the High Street suffered a decline in its fortunes following the closure of the Great Central Station.

Paragraph 4.61 regarding the car park at St. Nicholas Circle was referred to. It was noted that nothing could really be done with the site due to the archaeology. It was also noted that there were still a number of archaeological remains in the St Martins Area.

It was requested that this be added as an agenda item for the next meeting.

7. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) BATH LANE, MERLIN WORKS Planning Application 20060614 Residential Development

The Director noted that the application was located within the Waterside Regeneration Area and was the second development to come forward in the area. The owners of the site also developed the adjacent Westbridge Wharf development which rises to 10 storeys. A new 11 storey residential

development adjacent to the Donisthorpes site was approved in 2005.

The Panel had previously discussed plans for a residential development on this site in 2002. The current application was for two towers, one 22 storeys and the other 26 in height, providing 354 apartments, restaurants and retail use. The development would be taller than the cathedral spire, which at 220 feet was currently the tallest building in Leicester, although St. Georges Tower near the station was taller in the landscape because of ground level differences.

Members of the Panel raised the following points as part of the discussion:-

- There was little to commend the building, it was too high and didn't release any groundspace for the public realm.
- The building could flood the market for flats and it was queried whether it was the right type of housing that the city was short of.
- There was a concern that the road system and emergency services access would not be sufficient.
- The building did not fit in with its surroundings and it didn't respect the adjacent Donisthorpe's site or fit in with the Leicester character generally.
- The building looked to 'lumpen' from certain angles, although the landmark elements were to be welcomed.
- There was a feeling that the current proposal looked truncated and that it came to an abrupt stop; it could be better to make the building taller to lose some of the bulkiness that was proposed at ground floor level.

Overall members of the Panel felt that they would welcome further information and a presentation on the proposals. The building would need to be of exceptional quality if it was to serve the purpose as acting as a catalyst for regeneration of the area and a landmark building.

**B) SOUTHAMPTON STREET
Conservation Area Consent 20060594
Demolition of existing building**

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing building, which dated from the mid 19th Century. The building was recently turned down for statutory listing but was still judged by English Heritage to be an important building in the Conservation Area. The Panel made observations on the scheme to replace the building at the last meeting.

The Panel was of the opinion that the building made a positive contribution to the conservation area and therefore shouldn't be demolished. They were not satisfied with the applicant's justification that the new building was of sufficient quality to justify demolition.

**C) 2 WYCLIFFE STREET
Listed Building Consent 20052337
Roller Shutter**

The Director noted that the entrance to the rear of 2 Wycliffe Street accessed

the rear yards of 18-28 Friar Lane and 2 Wycliffe Street. The entrance currently had timber doors. The application was for the removal of the existing doors to the entrance and their replacement with a metal roller shutter. This would allow for remote controlled entry to the rear yard as the current entrance remained open in the evenings and was used for antisocial behaviour.

The Panel was opposed to the loss of the timber doors. It was recommended that they be retained either as automated doors or with a fine mesh behind them.

D) 112 REGENT ROAD
Planning Application 20060675
Glazing to front porch

The Director noted that 112 Regent Road was a fine late Victorian House with fine architectural details, including an ornate timber porch. It was proposed to install frameless glazing in the porch with a sliding entrance door. The frame would be attached to the inside of the roof trusses and into the tiled floor, but would not be fixed to the ballustrading or timberwork. No alterations would be made to the porch detailing or the existing doorway.

The Panel queried the rationale behind this screen; it was suspected it was due to anti social behaviour concerns. It was felt that these concerns could be overcome with better lighting.

The Panel overall felt that the glare from the glass screen would have a detrimental affect on the building and were therefore opposed.

It was also suggested that the applicants should reinstate the wall to the yard at the front of the building.

E) 92 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20060683
Change of use, alterations and extensions

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the building. The ground floor was being changed to a restaurant and the upper floors to residential. The proposal involved a two storey and four storey extension to the rear and an extra storey to the main building to provide nine self contained flats for students. A new shopfront and ventilation flue at the rear was also proposed. The Panel had previously made observations on an application to increase the height of the building by two storeys in 2003. This was subsequently withdrawn.

Some members of the Panel were of the opinion that the extension to the main building would be acceptable if it was carried out well using the same brick bonding and the eaves detail was retained. It was also felt that an improved shopfront also needed to be achieved. Other members of the Panel had concerns about the affect of the extension on the street scene and were opposed.

With regard to the rear extension, it was recommended that this be restricted to two storeys. The infill section was considered to be acceptable.

F) 60 LONDON ROAD
Planning Applications 20060646 & 0647
New Shopfront and signs

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront and signage to the right hand building which was a later addition and set back from the road. The shopfront would be fully glazed with an externally illuminated fascia sign. A 4m high free standing sign was also proposed to be located in the front forecourt.

The Panel felt that the signage wasn't very elegant and requested that officers negotiate with the applicant to hopefully achieve an overall improvement to the signage which enhanced the area rather than detracted from it.

G) 18 HUMBERSTONE ROAD
Planning Application 20060412
Roller shutters

The Director said that the application was for a roller shutter to be fitted to the front of the shop, one of a range in the 'Clump' building of 1888.

The Panel noted that the windows at the upper floors of the building didn't have consent and supported enforcement action being taken on these.

The Panel requested that the usual policy be applied to the shutter including justification, colour coded, a view in to the shop, and unobtrusive when not in use.

H) 37 ST NICHOLAS PLACE
Planning Application 20060509
Roller shutters

The Director said that the application was for roller shutters to the entrance doors.

The Panel was opposed to the roller shutters and requested that a solution be sought which did the least amount of damage to the building as possible. The idea of bringing the doors forward to the street was supported.

I) GLENFIELD ROAD, ST PAULS CHURCH
Listed Building Consent 20060669
Removal of Internal Features

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on the removal of internal features last year to be sold to a church in Japan. The current application was for the further removal of internal features including the

safe with decorative door and a wooden screen. The plan was to relocate the items to St Mary De Castro Church for storage.

The Panel commented that nothing further should be removed from the building without a firm proposal for its re-use. They felt that there was no justification for removing items which were part of the reason for the building's listed status.

J) ST GEORGE STREET, MERCURY BUILDING
Planning Application 20060743 & Advertisement Consent 20060607
Lighting and signs

The Director noted that the Leicester Mercury offices were undergoing a facelift. As part of the new look it was proposed to illuminate the building. New signage was also proposed.

The Panel made no adverse comments.

K) BRAUNSTONE PARK, THE LODGE
Planning Application 20060737
Change of use, alterations

The Director said the application was for external alterations and change of use of the Park Keepers Lodge to a community centre for the Braunstone Community Association. The work included new uPVC windows throughout, a new porch with metal faced door and new window and door openings throughout.

The Panel welcomed the re-use of the building. The Panel felt that as the Council was the applicant, a good example should be set by the use of good quality wooden windows.

The Panel did however recognise the need for concerns regarding security to be addressed both in the door and the windows where internal shutters were recommended to be installed.

L) 30 NARROW LANE, AYLESTONE
Planning Application 20060627
Extension

The Director noted that 30 Narrow Lane was an attractive detached house with some nice features such as the decorative bargeboards and the stepped splayed front entrance. It probably dated from the 1930's. The adjacent garage appeared to be contemporary with the house although it had a new door. The application was for the demolition of the existing domestic double pitch roof garage and the construction of a new single storey dwelling. The extension would be constructed in materials to match the existing building.

It was noted that since the agenda had been published, an amendment had been received to the application which reduced the height and width of the

extension. The applicant stated that this meant that concrete roof tiles would need to be used rather than slate.

The Panel commented that the extension should be reduced in width to ensure that slate roof tiles could be used.

M) 18 DE MONTFORT STREET
Advertisement Consent 20060569
Signage

The Director said that the application was for one internally illuminated fascia sign and one non-illuminated free standing sign.

It was noted that the sign on the sidewall of the building was almost entirely obscured by a tree in front of it.

The Panel was opposed to the sign on the sidewall of the building. It was recommended that a smaller un-illuminated sign be placed lower on the building.

The Panel was of the opinion that the sign in the forecourt of the building had a detrimental effect on the street scene. The Panel was also unsure of its purpose.

N) 144 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20060558
Three non-illuminated wall signs, one externally illuminated projecting sign

The Director said that this was a retrospective application for the retention of three non-illuminated wall signs and one externally illuminated projecting sign to the main elevation to London Road. Two were rectangular menu boards beneath the ground floor windows and a tiny circular sign was proposed on the lower section of the main stone entrance surround. The hanging sign was at first floor level to the left of the first floor feature window.

The Panel wasn't impressed by the signage but recognised there was little that could be done about it in view of what was there previously. It was requested that officers investigate the possibility of toning down the colours, particularly of the high level hanging sign.

O) 172 MERE ROAD
Planning Application 20060741
Rear extension

The Director said that the application was for a two storey extension to the rear of the house. The proposal was visible from the street scene.

The Panel expressed a concern about the continuity of the brick plane at the rear of the building, it was felt that a set back section was required or a

drainpipe to hide join.

The Panel expressed a preference for a single storey extension.

P) 170 MERE ROAD
Planning Application 20060662
Replacement rear windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the rear windows with similarly proportioned uPVC ones. One of the windows is partially visible from the street scene.

The Panel objected to the use of uPVC windows where they could be viewed from the street scene.

Q) 103 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20060638
Single storey rear extension

The Director said that the application was for a single storey rear extension that wrapped around the side and rear of the existing rear outrigger. The materials proposed were to match the house.

The Panel raised no adverse objections.

R) 46 SPRINGFIELD ROAD
Planning Application 20060438
Rear extension

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing rear outbuilding and replacement with a larger single storey part flat part roof building. The building had been converted to flats in the past. The materials were proposed to match the existing.

The Panel was opposed to the loss of the existing rear outbuilding but recognised the limits on protection for such buildings. Officers were requested to seek to negotiate a scheme where it was retained if possible. It was also felt that the character of the conservation area would be affected by the continual loss garden space in the Stoneygate area.

S) 8 WESTLEIGH ROAD
Planning Application 20060599
Rear extension

The Director said the application was for a two-storey extension to the rear of the building. The building was in use as flats and had previously been extended with a two-storey flat roof extension.

The Panel expressed regret that the existing extension had been built.

The Panel was opposed to any further extensions as they felt it was overdevelopment of the site.

T) 26 MAIN STREET, EVINGTON
Planning Application 20060592
Roller shutters

The Director said that the application was for roller shutters to the existing shopfront.

The Panel was opposed to the roller shutter as it didn't enhance or improve the area. It was felt that the current chamfered style sign should be retained in common with the majority of the terrace of shops.

The Chair agreed to take the following item as urgent business.

TAYLOR ROAD SCHOOL
Removal of parapet

The Director said that a request had been received to remove part of the parapet on the roof.

The Panel felt that the removal of the parapet would damage the attractiveness of this fine building, a repair should therefore be sought. The Panel also recommended that listed protection should be sought for the building.

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

U) LANCASTER ROAD FIRE STATION
Planning Application 20060515
Signage

V) 23 GILLIVER STREET
Planning Application 20060260
Replacement side windows & door

W) 32 WOODBINE AVENUE
Planning Application 20060621
Replacement rear windows & door

X) 1 ALBION STREET
Planning Application 20060414
Alterations to shopfront

Y) 27 HORSEFAIR STREET
Planning Application 20060414
Alterations to shopfront

Z) 37 UPPER TICHBOURNE STREET

**Planning Application 20060066
Replacement rear windows**

**aa) 3-5 ST MARTINS SQUARE
Planning Application 20060696 & Advertisement Consent 20060695
New shopfront & signs**

**ab) 2-4 HAYMARKET & 3-7 CHURCH GATE
Signs**

8. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Date of next meeting

This would be notified in the week following the meeting.

Design Champions and Heritage Design Champions

It was noted that there was a networking event taking place on 30 May at the Leicester Creative Business Depot.

1 Knighton Park Road

The applicant lost the appeal for this development and was now having to repair a number of the illegal works that took place.

Spreadeagle Pub

It was noted that the applicant had appealed against the enforcement notice served due to the unauthorised changes made to the pub.

