

Minutes of the Meeting of the CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL HELD ON Wednesday, 22 March 2017

Meeting Started 5:15 pm

Attendees

R. Gill (Chair), S. Eppel (LCS), P. Draper (RICS), P. Ellis (VS), C. Hossack (LIHS), S. Hartshorne (TCS), R. Woolford (LRSA), C. Laughton

Presenting Officers

J. Webber (LCC), J. Simmins (LCC)

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

R. Lawrence (Vice-Chair), M. Richardson (RTPI), L. Blood (IHBC), Rev R. Curtis (LDAC), D. Martin (LRGT), N. Feldmann (LRSA)

Rev R Curtis will be leaving the panel, as he is moving to Salisbury.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

23. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Panel agreed the notes.

24. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Report of the Director of Planning, Transportation and Economic Development

A) 13 GLEBE STREET
Planning application 20162410
Change of use, extension, demolition

The panel accepted the principle of the proposal, as the new development is of an appropriate height for the location. Although it was noted that the proposed building is higher than that of the adjacent former schoolrooms, it creates a stepping-up effect within the streetscene, matching the height of the 1960s block adjacent.

Concerns where however raised over the design of the proposed building, as the front elevation lacked sufficient architectural detailing, resulting in a rather plain elevation that fails to complement the ornate detailing of the adjacent former schoolrooms. The twinned windows, similar to the schoolrooms was however noted and considered appropriate. The panel suggested that the windows need greater detail and a deep reveal, breaking up the massing of the elevation.

Concerns were also raised over the use of a buff brick and the lack of a stronger ground floor; the recessed bin store and vehicular access give the visual impression that the building above is floating. One suggestion was that this could be addressed by a more visible pedestrian entrance to the development, or stronger framing to the bottom of the first floor element.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

B) 22-28 PRINCESS ROAD WEST Planning Applications 20170136 & 20170185 Extension to roof and rear

The proposal to construct a single storey roof extension across the front elevation of the building was considered wholly inappropriate by the panel, as it would reduce the visual merits of the building, harming the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The panel noted that the building is a prominent corner building within the streetscene and that the current roofscape with a slate pitched roof and red brick chimneys adds to the architectural merits of the building. An extension as proposed would reduce the visual appearance of the building, losing the chimneys and the existing eave detailing. The extension would also unbalance the arrangement of windows, which reduces in size each floor.

It was noted that a historic roof extension already exists at the centre of the building; however, this was considered to disrupt the rhythm of the roofscape and demonstrates the failings of such an extension. It gave a precedence to refuse the current application.

The panel raised no objections to the single storey roof extension to the rear, as it would have negligible impact upon the overall appearance of the building.

OBJECTIONS to 20170136.

C) 227 – 231 BELGRAVE GATE
Planning Application 20170175
Change of use; demolition, construction of 6-storey block

The panel raised strong objections to the proposal, as the loss of the existing Art Deco building was regrettable and the proposed 6-storey building would

harm the setting of St Mark's Church (grade II* listed) and 7 Woodboy Street (locally listed).

There was strong concern over the loss of the existing building, as it is a well-designed Art Deco influenced building, built in the 1930s following the widening of Belgrave Gate. The building reflects the character and appearance of the streetscene, which is of a similar construction date and a consistent 3 / 4 storey in height.

The proposed development would fail to match this important characteristic, as it is of an excessive height and a poor design, with a monolithic front elevation. There is no relief to the elevations.

The panel where concerned that due to the excessive height and poor design, the proposed building would appear out of context with its surroundings, harming the setting of St Mark's Church, whilst the proposed height would obstruct views of the prominent chimneystack to the locally listed building, harming its significance.

The panel also wished for it to be noted that they felt that the application lacked suitable information for it to be properly considered. There are no comparable heights to adjacent buildings and a lack of detail regarding the elevations.

OBJECTIONS

D) 104 REGENT ROAD Planning Application 20170271 Extension to side

The existing 1980s extension was considered by the panel to be a modern, unobtrusive extension, allowing for the original building to remain as the prominent structure within the streetscene.

There was concern that increasing the height of the 1980s extension as proposed would harm this important relationship between the two buildings, removing the clear subservient appearance of the extension. It was also felt that the increase in height would reduce the visual appearance of the extension, which is currently well-balanced.

The panel did however feel that there is some scope to increase the height of the extension, perhaps by $\frac{1}{2}$ a storey, allowing for additional units. The applicant would however need to carefully consider how this could be achieved, improving the design and appearance of the extension; maintaining its subservient and ancillary appearance.

SEEK AMENDMENTS

The panel had no objections/observations on the following applications:

E) 358 ST SAVIOURS ROAD Planning Application 20170061

Extension to rear

F) 14-18 FRIAR LANE

Planning Application <u>20170190</u>, Listed Building Consent 20170220 External alterations

G) 10 FRIAR LANE

Planning Application 20170466

Flue to rear

H) 20-20A MILLSTONE LANE

Planning Application 20170235

New wall

I) 75 CHURCH GATE

Planning Application 20170100

Change of use

J) 61 SOUTHGATES

Advertisement Consent 20170198

Two non-illuminated signs

K) 2 ST MARTINS

Planning Application <u>20170154</u>, Advertisement Consent <u>20170158</u> Change of use, internally illuminated sign

L) 14 HOTEL STREET, MOLLY OGRADYS

Listed Building Consent <u>20170394</u>, Advertisement Consent 20170343 New signs

M) 1 ST NICHOLAS PLACE

Planning Application <u>20170350</u>, Advertisement Consent <u>20170351</u> Atm machine and sign

N) 1-13 GRANBY STREET

Planning Application <u>20170401</u>, Listed Building Consent <u>20170402</u> Atm machines

O) THE GATEWAY, HAWTHORN BUILDING

Advertisement Consent 20170214

Two non-lluminated signs

P) LONDON ROAD, OUTSIDE OF LEICESTER RAILWAY STATION

Listed Building Consent 20170058

Internal alterations

Q) 165-169 HINCKLEY ROAD

Planning Application 20162494

Rear extension

R) 297 LONDON ROAD

Planning Application 20170210

Extension, alterations

S) 2 KNIGHTON PARK ROAD

Planning Application 20170145

Two storey extension

T) 218 ST SAVIOURS ROAD

Planning Application 20170234

Rear extension

U) 19A CENTRAL AVENUE

Planning Application 20170251

Rear extension, alterations, car standing

V) 56 REGENT ROAD

Planning Application 20170055

Internal alterations

W) 40 NEWTOWN STREET

Planning Application 20170032

Rear extension

X) 42 NEWTOWN STREET

Planning Application 20170033

Rear extension

Y) 274-276 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD

Planning Application <u>20170228</u> Change of use, extension to rear

Z) 262 LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD

Planning Application 20170153

Extension to rear, new roof, alterations

AA) 4 MAIN STREET, BRAUNSTONE

Planning Application 20170177, Listed Building Consent <u>20170178</u> New fence

Next Meeting – Wednesday 19th April 2017, G.02 Meeting Room 2, City Hall

Meeting Ended - 18:10