



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

Councillor O'Brien

S. Britton	-	University of Leicester
D. Hollingworth	-	Leicester Civic Society
K. Chhapi	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
J. Dean	-	Royal Town Planning Institute
P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
M.Elliott	-	Person having appropriate specialist knowledge
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
R Roenisch	-	Victorian Society
C. Sawday	-	Person having appropriate specialist knowledge
D. Smith	-	Leicestershire Archeological & Historical Society

Officers in Attendance:

J. Carstairs	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
S. Peppin - Vaughan	-	Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture Department
M. Reeves	-	Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity Department

* * * * *

33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from S. Bowyer.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Garrity declared a personal interest in Appendix C, Current Development Proposals as a member of the Planning and Development Control Committee. She undertook to listen to the views of the Committee and not make any judgements on any of the applications.

J. Dean declared an interest in Appendix C, Item M – Leicester University, The Attenborough Tower.

35. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

D. Martin commented that she was present at the meeting but not on the attendance list.

K. Chhapi pointed out that the wrong organisation was included next to his name.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 30 August 2006 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the above amendments.

36. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Town Hall Visit

Members of the Panel attended a site visit at the Town Hall to consider plans to the second floor of the building. Key issues considered at the visit related tiles in the toilets, disabled access matters around the Leader's Office and the demolition of the rear of a safe.

The Panel were largely supportive of the proposed works to make the building more accessible and enable the upper floors to be brought back into use, but opposed the works to the second floor safe. They also asked that a condition be added to the permission to secure the retention of the historic bathroom tiles.

37. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

55 Oxford Street

Officers noted that despite the refusal decision with regard to the above building, it was noted that the owner of the site had given notice to Building Control of their intention to demolish the building. It was noted that there was nothing to stop them from doing this.

38. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 21 CAREYS CLOSE, FORMER A E HOLT FACTORY Planning Application 20061206 Demolition and Redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the existing factory and the redevelopment of the site with a seven storey building for student accommodation with ground floor retail units.

The Panel reluctantly accepted the loss of the existing building as it is currently out with a conservation area but opposed the replacement building as completely inappropriate to this sensitive site. It was thought the proposed development was out of scale with its surroundings and would be detrimental to the setting of Wygston's House.

B) 45 GALLOWTREE GATE, 49-51 MARKET PLACE
Advertisement Consent 20061276, Planning Permission 20061253 &
Listed Building Consent 20061312
New Projecting signs

The Director said that the application was for internal alterations, a new aluminium shopfront, halo lit aluminium signage and a change to the windows on Gallowtree Gate.

The Panel had no objections to the proposed works but felt that the applicant could have been more adventurous with the Gallowtree Gate frontage. The Panel also supported the retention of the existing windows on the Gallowtree Gate elevation as per the amended plans.

C) 8 – 18 ST PETERS ROAD
Planning Application 20061368
Demolition and Redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the petrol filling station and the redevelopment of the site with a four storey building for flats.

The Panel judged that the new building was too high, of poor quality and would be overdevelopment of the site. They recommended that an alternative scheme should follow the historic building line and be of a modern style, not a pastiche.

D) GIPSY LANE, TOWERS HOSPITAL
Listed Building Consent 20061546
Self contained flat

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the old watch tower to create one self contained flat. The flat would be within the tower and spread over five levels.

The Panel raised no objection in principle to the proposal but opposed the new balcony. It was suggested that the roof could be lowered to allow the existing parapet to be used as a protective barrier.

E) 19 STONEYGATE ROAD
Planning Application 20061419
Extension to rear

The Director said that the application was for a two storey extension to the rear of the building which extended the roofline of the building lower and dormers to the front and rear of the building.

The Panel opposed all the proposed alterations as detrimental to the appearance of this notable building.

F) 31 KNIGHTON DRIVE
Planning Application 20061490
Extension to rear

The Director said that the application was for a two storey extension to the rear of the building. The Panel had previously made observations on two similar schemes in recent years.

The Panel reiterated their previous observations that any extension to this building must be subservient and in keeping with the character of the building. The current proposal was felt to be no better than the previous submissions and would still constitute overdevelopment of the site because of its size.

G) ST JAMES TERRACE
Planning Application 20061162
Change of use

The Director said that the application for the conversion of the house to four self-contained flats involving a first floor extension over an existing double garage and other external alterations was considered by the Panel in July 2006. A revised scheme for three flats omitting the extension had now been received for three flats omitting the extension. The only external alterations proposed were for the demolition of the garage and new roof lights.

The Panel had no objection to the loss of existing garage but felt that the proposed gates should be set back from the elevation slightly and asked for details of the gates design to be agreed by officers. The Panel also asked officers to encourage the owner to reinstate the original chimneys.

H) 158 LONDON ROAD
Planning Application 20061526
Antennas & equipment cabinets

The Director noted that applications for antennas and equipment cabinets had been considered for this building in the past. The current application was for two pole-mounted antennas and one face mounted antenna with associated equipment cabinets.

The Panel felt that the proposed antennae had a very crude, utilitarian design that was unfortunate but raised no formal objection to the proposals.

I) LONDON ROAD, HOLLYBANK COURT
Planning Application 20061526
Replacement antennas & equipment cabinet

The Director noted that applications for antennas and equipment cabinets had

also been considered for this building in the past. The current application was for the replacement of some of the existing antennas with new ones and additional equipment cabinets.

The Panel raised no objections to the proposal, as this building was less sensitive than the previous case.

J) 224 EAST PARK ROAD
Planning Application 20061174
Vehicular access new fencing

The Director said that an application for the use of the front garden as a car standing area and the erection of a 2 metre high fence to the side boundary at the front of the house was considered by the Panel in November 2005 and was subsequently refused. The current application was a revised scheme.

The Panel raised an objection to the retention of the panel fencing between the properties as detrimental to the appearance of the terrace. They also felt that the existing picket fence complemented the buildings and its removal would set an unwelcome precedent for other property owners to do the same. It was suggested that a policy should be made for boundary treatments in areas like this, where front gardens were being lost to parking.

K) HUMBERSTONE GATE / CLOCKTOWER
Advertisement Consent 20061192
Signs

The Director said that the application was for new signage at the former Littlewood's building. This was a revised scheme to that discussed at the Panel's July meeting.

The Panel opposed the additional sign to the top of the Belgrave Gate elevation as it would distort the vertical rhythm of the building. They also stated that the minor amendments to the other signs were insufficient to overcome their previous objections. The Panel still requested a comprehensive scheme for the building.

L) 35 STRETTON ROAD
Planning Application 20060744
Replacement windows

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the front windows and doors with 'like for like' double glazed working timber sashes.

The Panel raised no objection to the replacement windows.

M) LEICESTER UNIVERSITY, THE ATTENBOROUGH TOWER
Pre Application enquiry
Replacement of windows

The Director said that the university were seeking to replace the windows on the Attenborough Tower and sought the comments of the Panel on what might be appropriate.

The Panel thought that the profile of the windows was important to the form of the building and that any new windows should respect this. The applicant should explore various options including secondary glazing.

**N) 2 – 4 COLTON STREET
Planning Application 20061383
Replacement of windows**

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of existing timber framed windows with uPVC framed units.

The Panel oppose the use of PVC windows in conservation areas and felt that in this case the timber windows are important to the character of the building and should be retained.

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**

39. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Jack Simmons

A member of the Panel recommended that Jack Simmons, a pioneer in building conservation should be recognised under the blue plaque scheme. Members of the Panel agreed that he made a very valuable contribution in this area on a national level. It was recommended that the house in which he lived in Stoneygate would be the most appropriate location.

(Further to the meeting the criteria for blue plaques was investigated and it was found that the person has to be dead for 20 years before they can be

considered for a plaque or it has to be 100 years since their birth. It was thought that neither of these applied to Jack Simmons. Therefore he doesn't as yet meet the criteria.)

Listed Buildings

Officers reported that Belgrave Neighbourhood Centre and the Robert Hall Memorial Church had gained listed status.

It was however noted that other applications had been unsuccessful for buildings such as Kings Lock Cottage and the Aylestone Pack Horse Bridge.

40. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.05pm.

