



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2006 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T :

R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Garrity

- |                 |   |                                                |
|-----------------|---|------------------------------------------------|
| D. Hollingworth | - | Leicester Civic Society                        |
| P. Draper       | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors         |
| M.Elliott       | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |
| D. Martin       | - | Leicestershire Diocesan Advisory Committee     |
| R Roenisch      | - | Victorian Society                              |
| P. Swallow      | - | Person of Specialist Knowledge                 |

**Officers in Attendance:**

- |                       |   |                                                                   |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| J. Crooks             | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| S. Peppin-<br>Vaughan | - | Urban Design Group, Regeneration and Culture<br>Department        |
| M. Reeves             | - | Committee Services, Resources, Access and Diversity<br>Department |

\* \* \* \* \*

**41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were apologies from S. Britton, J. Dean, Cllr. Hunt and C. Sawday.

**42. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

D. Hollingworth declared an interest in Appendix C, Item C, The Newarke, Trinity House.

Councillor Garrity declared a personal interest in all the business on the agenda as she was Chair of the Planning and Development Control Committee. She undertook to give no opinions on any of the business on the agenda.

#### **43. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 27 September 2006 be confirmed as a correct record.

#### **44. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Jack Simmons

At the previous meeting it was queried whether a blue plaque could be installed to commemorate Jack Simmons contribution to building conservation. It was noted that that currently he would not meet the criteria which was 20 years after the persons death or 100 years after the persons birth.

#### **45. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL**

8c Elms Road

Members of the Panel queried this application where the Panel objected and it was approved. Officers commented that as it was a modern infill development, there would be few grounds on which it could've been objected to and it would have lost at appeal.

#### **46. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

##### **A) EASTFIELD, 7 STANLEY ROAD Planning Application 20061565 Redevelopment**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made a number of observations on this site. This was a new proposal for the redevelopment of the land to the rear with a three-storey block for seven flats and seventeen 3 storey 4 bed houses.

The Panel felt that the houses would be better as a terrace and an overall more adventurous design would be preferable. It was suggested that the houses could be set back / brought forward to create interest. It was also suggested that better detailing could be included on the gables.

The Panel also felt that the design of the flat block was 'lazy'.

##### **B) ABBEY PARK ROAD, FORMER BUS DEPOT Planning Application 20061658 Redevelopment**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously made observations on proposals for this site over the last couple of years. This proposal is an addition to the approved scheme to include a further 28 flats and two roof mounted

turbines.

The Panel accepted the principle of the turbines even though those planned would have little purpose. Something more sculptural would have been preferred.

The Panel felt that the extra storeys would be detrimental to the overall design of the scheme, and were unhappy with the change of form.

**C) THE NEWARKE, TRINITY HOUSE**  
**Listed Building Consent 20061631**  
**Internal alterations**

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed internal alterations to this building on several occasions. This application was for alterations to the existing first floor office to create a new entrance with half glazed timber door.

The Panel raised no objections.

**D) 60 HIGHCROSS STREET**  
**Planning Application 20061575**  
**Change of use, rear extension**

The Director said that the application was for the change of use of the building from a public house to a beauty salon. The proposal included a three storey extension to the rear.

The Panel raised an objection to the loss of the existing shopfront, which they considered to be of high quality. Objections were also raised to covering the yard and the principle and design of the three-storey extension.

It was felt that the application was overdevelopment and would lead to a loss of integrity and character of the original building, which was one of the oldest remaining buildings in the area and was formerly one of the oldest pubs in the City.

The panel felt that extra care should be taken with properties along this section of Highcross Street as it was one of the most historic streets within the City. Particular care should also be taken due to the nearby redevelopment of the Shires, which was likely to increase development pressure in this area.

Questions were also raised on potential disabled access to the upper floors, and as to whether the use would stay as a beauty salon, or whether this was a way of securing planning permission, only for the use to change shortly afterwards.

**E) 55 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20061394 and Listed Building Consent 20061669**  
**New Shopfront**

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront and internal

alterations.

The Panel accepted the application in principle, but noted that it was important to ensure that the 1930's detailing was respected and that the shutter doors remained operational.

**F) 24 MARKET STREET**  
**Planning Application 20061474 & Advertisement Consent 20061473**  
**New shopfront & signs**

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront and internally illuminated fascia and projecting sign.

The Panel raised no objection to this proposal, however they were unhappy that the scheme had been implemented prior to planning permission being approved.

**G) 161 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20061394 and Listed Building Consent 20061669**  
**New Shopfront**

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront and internal alterations.

The Panel felt that the balcony detailing on the upper floors of the front of the building should be retained. It was also requested that it was ensured that there were to be no changes to the existing original windows.

The Panel recommended that the new shopfront take its style from the upper floors of the building. They commented that the proposed new frontage was a slight improvement on the existing.

The Panel accepted the new flue, noting that there were a number of similar on adjacent properties. The tidying up of the rear was also welcomed.

**H) 166-168 LONDON ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20061613**  
**Rear extension**

The Director said that the application was for a single storey rear extension which covered part of the rear yards of two adjacent terraced properties which were used as one office.

The Panel raised no concerns with this proposal.

**I) 32 ELMS ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20061285**  
**Change of use**

The Director said that the application was for the conversion of the building last

as student accommodation to a single dwellinghouse. The proposal involved a side garage extension and a conservatory to the front elevation.

The Panel recommended that the conservatory should be attached to the side of the house and made out of timber, not uPVC.

The Panel was opposed to the infill extension at the rear of the property as it was considered out of keeping and detrimental to the property.

The Panel accepted that the rear outbuildings could be demolished without consent, therefore recommended that the new garage pick up the detailing and materials of the main house including a Swithland slate roof and tiled creasings on the eaves.

**J) 31 HORSEFAIR STREET**  
**Advertisement Consent 20061497**  
**Banner signs**

The Director said that the application was for two banner signs to the first floor elevation.

The Director said that the application was for the replacement of the existing signage to the Market Place and Horsefair Street elevations. The plans were an amendment to the original scheme and omitted two banner signs to the first floor elevation shown on the original submission.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

**K) 30-32 GRANBY STREET**  
**Planning Application 20061657**  
**Retractable canopies**

The application is for two retractable canopies to the front elevation of the building.

The Panel made no adverse observations.

**L) 9 TOWER STREET**  
**Planning Application 20061593**  
**Roof lights**

The Director said that the application was for two rooflights to the front roof slope facing Tower Street.

The Panel was opposed to rooflights on the front elevation as it would be detrimental to the streetscene. Rooflights on the rear elevation would be acceptable as long as they were the conservation type.

**M) 19 STONEYGATE ROAD**  
**Planning Application 20061419**

## **Rear extension and external alterations**

The Director noted that the Panel discussed this application at the previous meeting regarding the roof extension and external alterations. Amended plans had now been received for the extension.

The Panel was pleased to see the front elevation was left unaltered.

The Panel felt that this scheme was a significant improvement on the previous one, and that the two-storey rear extension was of acceptable standard as it respects the original character of the building.

Providing a high quality of material is used, an extension of this style in this location may be acceptable, however the panel would like to reserve full comment until a point when a formal application is received.

The Panel raised an objection to the rear dormer window due to its large size and overbearing presence on the rear roof slope.

The Panel also wished to see the retention of the original rear door.

## **N) 7 HIGH STREET Planning Application 20061676 Replacement signage**

The Director said that the application was for a new fascia sign and a projecting sign. They were also asked to consider proposals to illuminate the façade.

The Panel felt that the sign would project too far if it was placed on the edge of the strip at the end of the building. It was suggested that a sign be placed on the inside of the strip at each end.

The Panel accepted the proposed lighting to the frontage but requested that it be unobtrusive and not in green.

## **O) SITE ADJACENT TO 55 NEW WALK Planning Application 20062696 Proposed 2.13m High Structure**

The Director said that the application was for a bronze sculpture to commemorate the boot and shoe industry.

The Panel welcomed the sculpture but recommended that issues regarding maintenance be considered and a plaque explaining the sculpture was required.

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

## **P) AYLESTONE HALL**

**Planning Application 20061504  
Replacement garden shed**

**Q) 154 UPPER NEW WALK  
Planning Application 20061453  
Internal alterations**

**R) 170 UPPER NEW WALK  
Planning Application 20061678  
Internal alterations**

**S) 2 BISHOP STREET  
Planning Application 20061542  
Change of use**

**T) 24 CAREYS CLOSE  
Planning Application 20061732  
Access ladder / equipment cabinet**

**U) 44 FOSSE ROAD CENTRAL  
Planning Application 20061740  
Rear dormer and replacement windows**

**V) 35 SEVERN STREET  
Planning Application 20061506  
Replacement windows**

**47. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

Spread Eagle PH

The Panel requested details of the justification for the recent demolition of the Spread Eagle Public House on Charles Street, particularly as there was unresolved enforcement action being considered on the property.

Officers commented that they would seek to obtain this from the Head of Development Control.

**48. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.06pm.

