

Notes of the Meeting of the CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

Held: WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH 2011 at 5.15pm

PRESENT:

R. Gill - Chair R. Lawrence -Vice Chair

J. Goodall - Victorian Society

P. Draper - Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
 D. Martin - Leicestershire and Rutland Gardens Trust
 M. Goodhart - Leicester and Rutland Society of Architects

M. Elliott - Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge

S. Barton - Leicester Civic Society

C. Laughton - Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge

D. Trubshaw - Institute of Historic Building Conservation

P. Swallow - Person Having Appropriate Specialist Knowledge

J. Clarke - The Landscape Institute

D. Lyne - Leicestershire Industrial Society

S. Jesson - Architect M. Al-Sallowy - Architect

Officers in Attendance:

Jeremy Crooks - Planning Policy and Design Group Jenny Timothy - Planning Policy and Design Group

Angie Smith - Democratic Support

*** ** ***

97. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Simon Britton.

98. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

99. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel meeting held on 16 February 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

David Lyne asked for it to be recorded that he had attended the meeting on the 16th February 2011, but his attendance had not been included.

100. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

101. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

A) 82-86 RUTLAND STREET Pre application presentation

The item was also presented by the architect of the proposal.

The building was Grade II listed and within the St Georges Conservation Area.

The proposal was pre application by the City Council to repair and renovate the buildings, add a glazed atrium and introduce creative work spaces for let.

The scheme was fully supported by the Panel.

B) BATH LANE, BLACK FRIARS Planning Application 20110288 Mixed use development

The item was a previous pre-application brought to the Forum on 15 December 2010. The proposal affected the Listed Buildings within the former Donisthorpes site

The Director said the application was for mixed use development for student and residential accommodation, commercial and ancillary uses.

The Panel reiterated the position that it had taken following the presentation by the Architect to the Panel in December 2010. Whilst the presentation was well received and appreciated, the concerns expressed about the scheme had not changed. The Panel still did not like the scale of the development, the design or the materials proposed. The Panel expressed the view that it would be oppressive and dominate important views across the site. From the opposite

side of the river, it would dominate views of the historic environment including the views over Donisthorpe, the nearby Jewry Wall and St Nicholas Church and obscure views of the Cathedral and St Mary de Castro's spire.

The Panel OBJECTED to this application.

C) MANCHESTER PUBLIC HOUSE, KNIGHTON FIELDS ROAD EAST Planning Application 20110125 Conversion of pub to residential.

The building was on the Local List.

The Director said the application was for a new three and four storey building and alterations and conversion of the public house to create 59 units for student accommodation.

The Panel welcomed the retention of the pub. They would like to see the roofline of the new build element stepped to echo existing properties. The panel had some reservations concerning the dormers which they felt might not work as shown on the drawing. They raised concerns over additional car parking in this already congested area.

The Panel recommended SEEKING AMENDMENTS to this application.

D) MEDWAY STREET SCHOOL Planning Application 20110222 Perimeter fencing

The building was within the South Highfields Conservation Area.

The Director said the application was for security fencing around the school. The fencing is deemed necessary following a long series of break-ins and vandalism.

Whilst not desirable the Panel accepted the need for additional security.

The Panel had NO OBJECTION to this application.

E) 3 ELM TREE GARDENS Planning Application 20110043 Timber decking

The building was within the Stoneygate Conservation area and covered by an Article 4(2) Direction.

The Director said the application was for timber decking to the rear of the recently built property which was visible from Elms Road. This was an

opportunity to discuss the general principle of additions and extensions to the Elm Road frontage.

The Panel accepted that the timber decking would be acceptable because it would be screened by the new yew hedge proposed.

They also discussed potential extensions within the gardens and thought any boundary treatments to improve privacy should be achieved using hedges rather than close boarded fencing. Any development that might be allowed on these elevations should only be allowed if carried out to a very high standard.

The Panel had NO OBJECTION to this application.

F) CEDARS COURT FLAT 11 Planning Application 20101491 Roof light & rear dormer

The building was within the Stoneygate Conservation area.

The Director said the application was for a roof light to the front elevation and dormer to the rear.

The Panel noted that there was currently an uninterrupted plain roofscape fronting the highway. They raised concerns that the introduction of a rooflight would therefore be detrimental to the character of the group. Accordingly they recommended that it be removed from the proposal. They did not object to the rear dormer.

The Panel recommended SEEKING AMENDMENTS to this application.

LATE ITEM: COLLEGE HALL SITE, KNIGHTON ROAD Pre application presentation

A presentation was given on proposals for the former halls of residence. The Panel were supportive of the scheme which had been developed with the assistance of one of the original architects, Trevor Dannett. They raised concerns about potential traffic issues possible, car parking, loss of trees and the size of plant on the roofs. They noted some structural problems and queried how these would be addressed and wanted an assurance that the treatment of Latimer House would be done sensitively. Overall though they were impressed with the presentation and offered a word of congratulations to the architects and the University.

The Panel made no observations on the following applications

G) 30 CHURCH GATE Planning Application 20110207 Change of use to flats

H) 14 ST JAMES ROAD
Planning Application 20110088
Replacement rear windows

I) 9A ST JAMES ROAD Planning Application 20110134 Replacement rear windows

J) 6 LANCASTER ROAD
Planning Application 20110158
Replacement rear windows

K) 44 OXFORD STREET Listed Building Consent 20110270, Advertisement Consent 20110264 Replacement signage

L) 125 HINCKLEY ROAD Planning Application 20110161 External door

M) SPARKENHOE STREET SCHOOL Planning Application 20110094 Timber shelter

102. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.00pm.