



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 30 AUGUST 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor O'Brien

S. Bowyer	-	English Heritage
S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
K. Chhapi	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
M. Elliott	-	Person having appropriate specialist knowledge
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
R. Rosenisch	-	Victorian Society
C.J.T.Sawday	-	Person of specialist knowledge
P. Swallow	-	Person of specialist knowledge
A. McWhirr	-	Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee

Officers in Attendance:

J. Carstairs	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
S. Peppin- Vaughan	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
H.Kent	-	Committee Services, Resources Department

* * * * *

26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from D. Smith.

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

28. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

J. Sawday requested that his apologies be recorded.

K. Chhapi stated that under Minute 21, "Minutes of Previous Meeting," his comment was made prior to the meeting.

It was pointed out that under Minute 24, "Current Development Proposals," item J) 62A London Road, concerned three telecommunication antennae, rather than new rear windows.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Panel held on 26 July 2006 be confirmed as a correct record subject to the above amendments.

29. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

30. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Panel wished it to be noted that they had extreme concern regarding the approval for the demolition of 142 Charles Street, 2 Church Street (Spread Eagle Public House.) It was observed that approval had been granted despite objections from the Panel, Conservation Officers and English Heritage, and despite previous enforcement action being approved. The Panel stated that they felt there was insufficient justification given for the decision. The Panel was also concerned that the decision may have not satisfied PPG15.

31. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) WELLINGTON HOTEL, RUTLAND STREET Planning Application 20061314 Retention of windows and rooflights

The Director reported that windows were replaced with uPVC contrary to the approved scheme and the application was for the retention of these windows.

The Panel objected to the retention of the uPVC units on the following grounds: outwards method of opening, inappropriate dimensions of glazing bars, the loss of curved glass feature, infill of arches, materials used, increase in reflection and the loss of sashes which added animation to the elevation. Enforcement action was supported.

B) CHARLES STREET POLICE STATION Advertisement Consent 20061269 Three fascia signs

The Director said that the application was for signage to advertise new office space in the development.

The Panel felt that 3 years was too long and that consent should only be given for 2 years. They also queried the method of attaching the signs. They

therefore requested amendment of the application.

C) TOWN HALL, TOWN HALL SQUARE
Listed Building Consent 20061325
Internal alterations and new substation

The Director stated that the internal alterations were required to make use of the second floor and allow for easier disabled access.

The Panel requested a site visit to assess the works properly.

D) ENGINEERING BUILDING, LEICESTER UNIVERSITY
Listed Building Consent 20061189
Internal Alterations

The Director reported that alterations were requested for the 3rd, 4th and 6th floors of the building. The alterations would increase energy efficiency and allow for more flexible use of space.

The Panel thought that the creation of a false ceiling to the 6th floor was acceptable but queried the need to remove all the benches and suggested that some could be retained, reused or worked around. They opposed the loss of the wall to the 4th floor but were supportive of the changes to the louvres provided that the detailing was good. They also queried whether the boxing in of the pipework was necessary for health and safety reasons. They therefore requested amendment of the application.

E) 7TH DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH, LONDON ROAD
Listed Building Consent 20060754
Retention of internal alterations

The Director reported that unauthorised work had been carried out to the basement of the building, but it was difficult to ascertain what alterations had been done as there was no record of the interior of the basement prior to this.

The Panel gave reluctant approval of the works due to the lack of evidence of what was removed, but asked that a warning be issued to the applicant to prevent any further unauthorised works in the future.

F) 2 SAXBY STREET
Planning Permission 20061033
Demolition and redevelopment

The Director reported that the proposal was for demolition of the garage and redevelopment with four storey block of flats. This was a revised scheme, following a previous refusal.

The Panel felt that the current scheme was an improvement on the previous submission, but asked that special attention be given to the selection of materials and detailing.

G) LEESON BUILDING, CANNING PLACE

Planning Application 20061229

Change of use with extension and internal alterations and new build to rear

The Director reported that the application was for the conversion to residential and office use, with the retention of the front elevation and new build to the rear.

The Panel supported the retention and conversion of the building but thought that the design of the penthouse extension was not in keeping with the character of the building. They had no objection to the new office buildings to the rear. They therefore suggested the application should be amended.

H) 8 WESTLEIGH ROAD

PLANNING APPLICATION 20061242

Rear extension

The Director reported that the revised application was for a single storey extension with pitched roof and few windows. The Panel's opinion was requested on whether the revised application would have a negative impact on the conservation area.

The Panel commented that the revised scheme still represented over development of the site which has already been extended unsympathetically and therefore objected to the application.

I) 32A BELVOIR STREET

PLANNING APPLICATION 20060624

Change of use and roof extension

The Director reported that the application was for a change to 12 flats incorporating a mansard roof to the rear. The front would be unaffected.

The Panel had no objection to the change of use or the extension but the new dormer windows should not be PVC units.

J) 18-20 STONEYGATE AVENUE

PLANNING APPLICATION 20061234

Retention of replacement windows and doors

The Director reported that the application was for retrospective permission following unauthorised uPVC window replacement within a conservation area.

The Panel opposed the retention of the uPVC units and supported enforcement action to have them removed and replaced in timber.

K) 50-52 KNIGHTON DRIVE/ 7 ELMS ROAD

PLANNING APPLICATION 20060079

External alterations

The Director reported that the application proposed one extra flat in addition to the flats already proposed in a previous application which was refused. The amended application also contained additional rooflights.

The Panel repeated their previous concerns about the number of rooflights and the number of flats being created and requested that amendments to the proposal be sought.

**L) 8C ELMS ROAD
PLANNING APPLICATION 20061227
Side extension**

The Director reported that the proposal would consist of 2 storeys with the new gable being slightly smaller than the existing ones and the extension would bring the property close to the boundary with the adjacent house.

The Panel commented that the side extension would result in the loss of the space between this property and its neighbour. The spaces between buildings were important to the historic streetscene and contributed to the character of Stoneygate. They therefore objected to the application.

**M) 121-123 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20061158
Change of use and roof extension**

The Director stated that the rooftop extension would be a mansard roof.

The Panel had no objection to the change of use but felt that the proposed extension with the mansard roof was poorly designed and did not fit well with the existing building. They therefore objected to the application.

**N) 44 FOSSE ROAD CENTRAL
Planning Application 20061287
Rear dormer**

The Director reported that, although similar dormer roofs were in place nearby, these had been there for a long time and therefore their removal could not be enforced.

The Panel objected to the proposed dormer, which was too large and poorly designed.

**O) 16-18 CHURCHGATE
Planning Application 20061133
Roller shutter**

The Director reported that the application had been revised and the design of the proposed roller shutters was to be perforated with clear plastic backing to allow visibility into the premises.

The Panel thought that the proposed roller shutter style was an improvement on previous submissions but queried whether the shutter box could be internal

**P) IRWIN COLLEGE, 163 LONDON ROAD
Advertisement Consent 20061224
Banner sign**

The Director reported that the proposed location of the banner was because there was insufficient space for a ground floor sign due to the location of the shop below the college.

The Panel felt that the proposed sign was too large and should be cloth not aluminium.

**Q) THE VARSITY PH, FRIAR LANE
Advertisement Consent 20061165
New signage**

The Director reported that the signs would be illuminated and replace the existing cloth signs. One illuminated sign would be placed across the front of the main door.

The Panel objected to the signs above the doors and the internal illumination of the banner signs as detrimental to the appearance of the building and the conservation area.

**R) 1 SEVERN STREET
Planning Permission 20061286
Retention of PVC windows and door**

The Director reported that the existing windows which matched other adjacent properties had been replaced with uPVC and had resulted in damage to a lintel.

The Panel opposed the retention of the PVC units and supported enforcement action to have them removed and replaced in timber.

The panel raised no objection to the following, therefore they were not formally considered:

**S) 36 MIDDLETON STREET
Planning Application 20061142
Canopy and carport**

**T) 20 SOUTHERNHAY ROAD
Planning Application 20061170
Rear extension**

**U) 1-3 MARKET STREET
Planning Application 20061254 and Advertisement Consent 20061255
New shopfront and signage**

**V) 51 GALLOWTREE GATE
Planning Application 20061069
Condenser Units**

32. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.25pm.

