



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 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 |
| D. Martin | - | Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust |
| P. Draper | - | Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors |
| M.Elliott | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |
| R Roenisch | - | Victorian Society |
| A. McWhirr | - | Leicester Diocesan Advisory Committee |
| C. Sawday | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |
| D. Smith | - | Leicestershire Archaeological & Historical Society |
| P. Swallow | - | Person having appropriate specialist knowledge |

Officers in Attendance:

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

* * * * *

49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies from S. Bowyer.

50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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.

51. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

D. Martin pointed out that the wrong organisation had been put next to her name on the attendance list.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Panel held on 25 October 2006 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

52. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

John Dean pointed out with regard to Jack Simmons, that the 100-year anniversary of his birth would arrive before that 20 year anniversary of his death, at which point consideration could be given to the provision of a blue plaque commemorating his work. He noted that Simon Britton would have the exact dates.

53. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Panel welcomed the fact that the Council's decisions largely mirrored their own views.

54. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) BATH LANE, MERLIN WORKS Planning Application 20061999 Residential, hotel Development

The Director noted that the Panel had previously discussed plans for a residential development for this site in 2002. In May of this year the application for two towers one of 22 storeys and the other 26 in height, providing 354 apartments, restaurant & retail use was also discussed by the Panel. This new application was for a third tower on this site 39 storeys high to provide a bed hotel, 176 self-contained apartments, basement car parking and retail and leisure uses.

The Panel debated this matter in detail. The proposal was met with mixed opinions. Some Panel Members thought this was, architecturally, the best designed of the three blocks. However there was also a general view that this type of development was not appropriate for Leicester. Some were unhappy with the piecemeal approach to the redevelopment of the waterside area and they felt that this proposal, including the two approved towers should have been discussed as a whole.

In summary the Panel:

1. did not recommend this proposal.
2. requested a dialogue with planners as a matter of urgency to discuss the impact on the surrounding area and the historic environment and how the infrastructure requirements for this number of residential units- for example the increased traffic that will be generated- would be addressed. The proposed bridge was also raised as an issue. The view was that the redevelopment of this whole area was being done in a piecemeal way and there were grave concerns about this.

B) 109-133 GRANBY STREET

Conservation Area Consent 20061838 Planning Application 20061793 Demolition and Redevelopment

The Director said that the application was for the demolition of the row of buildings 109-133 Granby Street (inclusive) and the redevelopment of the site with a 7 storey building for retail and restaurant use on the ground floor and offices on the upper floors.

The Panel was opposed to the demolition of the historic buildings and in particular the Temperance Hotel - one of very few buildings that link the city to Thomas Cook. It was felt that these character buildings made a contrast to office quarter. The Panel accepted the loss of the 1960s building that was built on the old Temperance Hall site. It was suggested that the façade of the old Hotel could be retained and restored with new development to the rear.

The Panel commented that the new build was not a bad building in terms of design but not appropriate for this location and it did nothing for the character of the Conservation Area. They thought the proposal to be too long, too tall. Any new build should pick up the pattern of development already in the area and it needed to replicate the existing variations in size and scale, such as the buildings opposite which were small scale.

C) 14-16 KING STREET

Pre Application Enquiry Change of use

The Director noted that the building had been in use as a restaurant for many years. Most of the internal character had been lost over the building's history. Consent was granted earlier this year for the conversion of the upper floors to 9 bed sits retaining the ground floor restaurant. After starting work on the conversion the building was resold and the new owners wished to convert the upper floors to three flats including the rebuilding of a rear flat roof extension and removal of a principle wall that formed the two ground floor rooms of number 16.

The Panel was not happy with the obscure glass proposed in the windows on the first floor where the toilets are proposed. It was suggested that the windows be left as they are and an obscure screen be put on the inside. There were no objections to the removal of the ground floor chimney breast or wall provided

that cornice detail and the top section of wall remained. There were also no objections to the exposed beams on the upper floor. It was recommended that there was a need for an elegant ramped access, as this is the gateway to New Walk.

D) REAR OF 12 HIGHFIELD STREET
Pre Application Enquiry
New Dwelling House

The Director said that the enquiry was for a new dwelling house on land to the rear of 12 Highfield Street. The house would be visible from Victoria Avenue.

The Panel queried whether there was a need to do something on Highfield Street to gain access to the site. Further to this it was queried whether the applicant would go back and negotiate access on Victoria Avenue once approval had been given. It was recommended that there was a need to pull the house back so that it continued the terrace, nearer to Highfield Street. It was suggested that the materials should be red brick & slate. If it was moved back so that it continued the existing terrace, the Panel accepted the principle of a dwelling in this location.

E) 20 FREESCHOOL LANE
Planning Application 20061866
Alterations to façade

The Director said that the application was for alterations to the façade of the building, including new, better-proportioned windows.

The Panel raised no objections subject to suitable materials being used which meant no uPVC.

F) 26A MARKET STREET
Advertisement Consent 20061455
New fascia sign

The Director said that the application was for the retention of an internally illuminated fascia sign.

The Panel raised no objections.

G) 11 CANK STREET
Advertisement Consent 20061607
New signage

The Director noted that the Panel made observations on this change of use of the ground floor of this building to a casino last year. The current application was for new signage.

The Panel objected to the appearance of the building and the signage, therefore recommended refusal.

**H) 28 TOWER STREET
Planning Application 20061800
Replacement rear windows**

The Director said that the application uPVC replacement windows to the rear of the building. Some of the windows were visible from the public domain.

The Panel objected to uPVC at the rear and in particular the top dormer window, which they felt in its current state, made a positive contribution to the conservation area.

The Chair agreed to accept the following matters as items of urgent business.

**92-94 CHARLES STREET
Amendment to roof extension**

The Panel noted that following the planning inspectors refusal of an appeal for retention of the roof extension, the applicant had submitted an amendment for consideration. The proposal was to extend the roof canopy to improve the appearance of the extension.

The Panel reiterated their previous comments that the roof extension damaged the character of the building of local interest. Therefore refusal was recommended.

**76 CLARENDON PARK ROAD
Change of use to retail and residential**

The Panel requested a discussion on this application.

The Panel raised objections to the external alterations of this prominent building that lied just outside of the Stoneygate Conservation Area. In particular, the changes to the fenestration.

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

**I) 9-11 CHEAPSIDE & 5 CANK STREET
Planning Application 20061798
Change of use**

**J) 13 UPPER KING STREET
Planning Application 20061775
New boundary wall**

**K) 1 ST ALBANS ROAD
Planning Application 20061872
New signs**

**L) 12 OXFORD AVENUE
Planning Application 20061925
New windows**

55. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.00pm.

