



Leicester
City Council

Wards: see individual reports

Planning & Development Control Committee

Date : 10th
September 2025

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON APPLICATIONS AND CONTRAVENTIONS:

INDEX

APPLICATION ORDER

Page Main	Page Supp	Application Number	Address	Ward
31		20241345	101-107 Ratcliffe Road, former Mary Gee Houses Halls of Residence	KN
93		20250839	61 London Road	CA

Recommendation: RECO subject to s106 Agreement	
20241345	101-107 Ratcliffe Road, former Mary Gee Houses Halls of Residence
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings; construction of four x three storey buildings to provide retirement apartments with care (Class C2); communal facilities; associated landscaping, access roads, car parking and services. (Amended plans)(s106 agreement)
Applicant:	Gladman Retirement Living Ltd
App type:	Operational development - full application
Status:	
Expiry Date:	29 August 2025
AP	WARD: Knighton

Page Number on Main Agenda: 31

Amended Description: No

Amended Recommendation: No

Representations

Three further representations have been received.

The first resident states that he heard a comment on Radio 4 that disused student halls of residence could be used to home asylum seekers when the proposed use of hotels has ceased.

The second resident raises concerns in relation to the parking provision and considers it to be too low for the number of apartments and staff.

The third resident states that she supports the development and posted a summary of points on the Knighton Drive Whatsapp group. 15 households on Knighton Drive responded supporting the development. The residents are concerned about crime and dereliction of the site and recognise the need for good accommodation for older people as many people are aging and would welcome a local provision to downsize.

Further Considerations

Student accommodation is Sui Generis (not within a specified use class) in the Use Classes Order therefore any use other than student accommodation would require planning permission.

As stated in the report the LHA have assessed the proposal including consideration of the applicants submitted Transport Statement, which includes a study of four other sites owned and managed by the applicants looking at parking occupancy rates, and consider the amount of parking proposed to be acceptable.

I have not been provided with the details of the 15 households on Knighton Drive.

The comments above are noted. The recommendation remains as per the officer report to approve permission on the basis of the proposed conditions and a s106 agreement.

Recommendation: Refusal	
20250839	61 London Road
Proposal:	Construction of new shopfront to front and side; installation of first floor doors, balustrade and screens to create first floor roof terrace; cladding to front and side; installation of ventilation system including units to rooftop; & alterations to restaurant (Class E)
Applicant:	Mr Riyaz
App type:	Operational development - full application
Status:	
Expiry Date:	30 July 2025
SS1	WARD: Castle

Page Number on Main Agenda:

Page 93

Representations

Councillor Kitterick made one further representation noting the following points -

The intention in calling this to committee was to determine the suitability of the first-floor roof terrace restaurant area and whether it is appropriate for this location.

It has now become apparent that there are further issues about the space standards for the residential accommodation on the second floor. It does appear that there is the ability to re-configure this space to comply with space standards either by reducing the number of bedrooms or borrowing some space from the rest of the second floor, or a combination of both. There was no prior notice to make the necessary amendments.

Therefore suggests that this application is withdrawn from the agenda to give the applicant time to re-submit the plans for the second floor which are in line with minimum space standards so that the application can return with a clear focus on the issues surrounding the open seating area on the first floor. The applicant is happy with this as a way forward.

Further Considerations

The comments above are noted however as amendments would not resolve all of the issues with the proposal the recommendation remains as per the officer report to refuse permission on the basis of the plans and documents received at the time of writing the report.