



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 23 JUNE 2010 at 5.15pm

P R E S E N T:

R. Gill - Chair
R. Lawrence –Vice Chair

Councillor Hunt

P. Draper	-	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
J. Goodall	-	Victorian Society
D. Lyne	-	Leicestershire Industrial Historic Society
D. Martin	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
M. Elliott	-	Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge
M. Goodhart	-	Leicestershire and Rutland Society of Architects
D. Trubshaw	-	Institute of Historic Building Conservation
J. Eaton	-	Ancient Monuments Society

Officers in Attendance:

Jeremy Crooks	-	Planning Policy and Design Group
Ann Provan	-	Planning Policy and Design Group
Palbinder Mann	-	Democratic Support
Angie Smith	-	Democratic Support

* * * * *

44. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Johnson, Chris Sawday, Peter Swallow, Simon Britton, David Smith, Jennifer Timothy.

45. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

46. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel meeting held on 19 May 2010, be confirmed as a correct record.

47. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

48. DECISIONS MADE BY LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL

The Director, Planning and Economic Development submitted a report on the decisions made by Leicester City Council on planning applications previously considered by the Panel.

RESOLVED:

that the report be noted.

49. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) NEWARKE STREET, OXFORD STREET Planning Application 20100567 Change of use, demolition and redevelopment

The Director said the application was for change of use from education to residential to provide 220 bedrooms of student accommodation in 77 units. The proposal involved a new seven storey link between the Crown and Elfed Thomas buildings and five storey building fronting Oxford Street.

The Panel welcomed the retention of the buildings of Local interest. They felt that demolishing the building to the rear of the Newarke Street building was wasteful. They were not in favour of the new buildings. They thought the wedge shaped building was peculiar and took no reference to the adjacent historic building and that the new build within the site was heavy and overpowered the historic buildings. They agreed the principle of the new buildings but stated that they would like a more appropriate design.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

B) SANDIACRE STREET, GRAVEL STREET, MANSFIELD STREET Planning Application 20100093 Redevelopment

The Director said the outline application was for the redevelopment of the area bounded by the above roads for a mixed use development comprising shops, hotel, flats with basement car parking. The proposal would involve the removal of buildings on the site and new buildings ranging up to 11 storeys in height.

The Panel rejected this proposal. They expressed the view that this was a major application in a conservation area and they could not comment on an outline application with so little detail. In principle they stated that they would like the better buildings on the site to be retained and thought the height was excessive.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

C) TUDOR ROAD FIVEWAYS HOUSE
Listed Building Consent 20100786
Internal alterations

It was noted that the Panel had made observations on the conversion of the building to flats as far back as 2002. It was also noted that there had been a fire in the building last year which had caused water damage to the timber flooring and the building owners had wished to replace it.

The Panel were sceptical of the need to replace the flooring although some members thought that sodden boards would lead to further problems later on such as dry rot. They recommended caution and to make sure proper moisture tests were done. They stated that they would like the timber kept if possible but did not place a high value on the flooring as making a positive contribution to the character of the building.

The Panel recommended that more information should be obtained, but recommended refusing this application in its current form.

D) 7 HIGH STREET
Planning Application, Listed Building Consent 20100719
Access ramp

The Director said the application was for a new access ramp and steps to the main High Street entrance.

It was noted that a similar scheme had been approved several years ago. The Panel thought that the ramp was one of the best they had made comments on and were supportive of the scheme. They were however not in favour of the motif within the rails and thought that something that made reference to the detailing on the building would be more appropriate.

The Panel recommended approval on this application.

E) ST BARNABAS ROAD
Planning Application 20100849
Extension to school and vicarage

The Director said the application was for an extension to link the school with the Vicarage.

The Panel thought the plans were unclear and that the design of the new building was poor. They agreed the principle of the building but stated that they required a much better design and clearer drawings.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

F) 2 UPPER KING STREET, HOLY TRINITY CHURCH
Advertisement Consent 20100874

New signage

The Director said the application was for two new internally illuminated signs.

The Panel thought that signage of this nature and particularly illuminated signage was completely inappropriate for a building of this stature and importance. They stated that the applicant should seek to modify the existing free standing sign.

The Panel recommended refusal on this application.

G) 53-55 MARKET PLACE

Planning Application 20100892, Advertisement Consent 20100896

New shopfronts and signage

The Director said that the application was for a new shopfront and non illuminated signage.

The Panel were not in favour of the large boards within the window but otherwise thought that the scheme was acceptable.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

H) 31 HORSEFAIR STREET

Advertisement Consent 20100822

New signage

The Director said the application was for new internally illuminated signage. The proposal would affect both Horsefair Street and Market Place elevations.

The Panel did not think the new signage on the Horsefair street elevation preserved the existing character and preferred the individual lettering of the current signage. They appreciated that the proposed lettering was white and might not stand out on the pale façade but thought that at the very least the red fascia panel should be reduced in width.

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

I) 2 HAYMARKET

Advertisement Consent 20100825

New signage

The Director said the application was for nine new internally illuminated signs and two externally illuminated projecting signs to the bank. The proposal would replace the existing signage.

The Panel thought that the new signage was overpowering particularly because the 'brackets' and square signs were all the same colour and the existing signage had a contrasting colour which visually separated the brackets from the signage and stated that this distinction should be reflected in the new

signage

The Panel recommended seeking amendments to this application.

**O) 109-133 GRANBY STREET
Planning Application 20100725
Extension of time for implementation of approval 20070430**

The following application was asked to be discussed. The Director said that the application was for an extension of time to implement the consent for the demolition of 109-133 Granby Street and the redevelopment of the site with a new seven storey building for retail offices and restaurant. It was noted that the Panel had made observations on the original scheme in 2007.

The Panel reiterated previous concerns that a building of world wide importance would be lost and stated that they would like it noted that they were still very strongly opposed to the loss of the Thomas Cook building.

The Panel raised the argument that if the proposal was allowed a further extension of time it may result in future deterioration of the buildings and preclude any option for a future scheme retaining the existing buildings. They also stated that the loss of the buildings would detrimentally affect the character of the conservation area.

The Panel made no observations on the following applications therefore they were not formally considered:

**J) 1 SEVERN STREET
Planning Application 20100765
Single storey extension to rear**

**K) 7 HIGH STREET
Planning Application, Listed Building Consent 20100719
Access ramp**

**L) 26 HORSEFAIR STREET
Planning Application 20080882
New signage**

**M) 193 NARBOROUGH ROAD
Planning Application 20100845
Change of use**

**N) UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER
Planning Application 20080830
Cycle storage building**

**P) QUEEN STREET, SPA BUILDINGS
Planning Application 20100834, 20100804
Extension of time for implementation of approval 20071296 & 20070933**

50. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

51. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 6.51pm.