

Minutes of the Meeting of the CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL HELD ON 9TH DECEMBER 2015

Meeting Started 17:15

Attendees

R. Lawrence (Vice-chair), N. Feldmann (LRSA), P. Ellis (LVS), S. Eppel (LCS), P. Draper (RICS), M. Johnson (LAHS), D. Lyne (LIHS), C. Laughton, Rev. R Curtis

Presenting Officers

J. Webber (LCC) J. Crooks (LCC)

Apologies

R. Gill (Chair), Cllr S. Barton, D. Martin (LRGT), M. Queally (UoL), Chris Sawday

Declarations of Interest

N. Feldmann (LRSA) – Agenda item C (Land adjacent to 79 Knighton Drive). Neighbour.

Minutes of Previous Meeting

The panel agreed the minutes.

S. Eppel asked for an update on putting the agenda/minutes on the website - Officers informed the panel that this was being addressed.

S. Eppel asked for an update on the possibility of receiving monthly summaries of decisions – Officers will arrange for this to happen.

Current Development Proposals

A) CHARTER STREET Planning Application <u>20152098</u> New foot/cycle bridge

The panel supported the principle of the wider regeneration of the local area and the improved access the bridge will bring. They did raise concerns about the design of the bridge and thought the high side would make it claustrophobic for users. They conceded that the additional arch was needed because of the increased span but would have liked a better design.

The panel also raised concern over the loss of the established tree belt on the edge of the park and requested that additional tree planting alongside the new park boundary fence be considered to reinstate some form of unbroken tree belt. It was suggested that increased visibility could be achieved by crown lifting existing trees.

Seek Amendments

B) 21 MORLEDGE STREET Planning Application 20150866 Demolition and redevelopment

The panel had no objection to the demolition of the existing buildings and the principle of redevelopment. There were some differing opinions on building height, but they did not fundamentally object to the proposal. However, they were concerned that the design was 'hectic' and that the site did not warrant an over complicated design, which would harm the streetscene.

They concluded that the design should be simplified to two primary facing materials and that the white cladding panels should be replaced with either brickwork or grey cladding panels.

Seek Amendments

C) LAND ADJACENT TO 79 KNIGHTON DRIVE Planning Application <u>20151770</u> Detached house

The panel maintained their previous objection to the principle of building on the garden space, which they consider to be an integral part of the character of the conservation area. Concern was expressed about the impact of a new access on the root zone of the street trees and the potential loss of boundary planting.

While acknowledging that the design of the proposed building had changed and the footprint was smaller, they considered the design to be derivative and not one that would enhance the conservation area.

Objections

D) LAND ADJACENT TO 8 PENDENE ROAD Planning Application <u>20151881</u> Detached house

The panel were more concerned with the design of the proposed new build, rather than the principle of development on the land noting that the street numbering infers a house was planned. They were unconvinced by the range of materials which do not complement one another and they did not like the ground floor which looks awkward with rendered front elevation and brick to the sides. They considered the design to be clumsy and without local precedent.

Seek Amendments

E) LAND REAR 6 SPRINGFIELD ROAD Planning Application 20151846 Demolition, new detached house

Although the panel had no objection to the principle of developing a house in this location, they were not convinced that the design was appropriate to the street, although the height was not a concern. The existing properties here were calm and subservient, they argued, and the design failed to pick up the rhythm of the street.

The panel were not convinced by the inauthentic pastiche design and thought the roof form was notably clumsy. They considered that it would not enhance the wider conservation area.

They did mention a house that read more like a coach house may be more appropriate.

Seek Amendments

F) LAND ADJACENT TO 31 SANVEY LANE Planning Application <u>20152100</u> Detached house

While the panel did not consider that the proposed development would harm the amenity of the conservation area, they had concerns with various elements of the design. They thought the non-functional chimney should be removed and that the brickwork should not be painted.

They questioned the set-back and argued that the house would work better if it sat adjacent to number 31, with the loss of less garden space.

Seek Amendments

G) 16 VICTORIA PARK ROAD Planning Application 20152035 Detached building to rear.

Accepting the principle of some form of development in this location, the panel concluded that it would be better if the design went for a 'coach house' aesthetic, to better integrate with the streetscene.

Seek Amendments

H) 9 WESTHILL ROAD Planning Application 20152081 Extension to house

The panel were positive about the replacement chimney and had no concerns with the design of the house/garage extension. However, they were concerned with the height of the boundary wall/gates, which they considered to be contextually inappropriate and harmful to the setting of the heritage asset. **Seek Amendments**

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

I) CHURCH ROAD, THURCASTON ROAD, LOUGHBOROUGH ROAD Advertisement Consent <u>20152090</u> Free standing interpretation boards

This application is for three free standing historical interpretation boards telling the storey of Belgrave's key buildings.

The proposal is within the Belgrave Hall Conservation area.

J) OLD CHURCH STREET, RIVERSIDE DRIVE Advertisement Consent 20152158 Free standing interpretation boards

This application is for two free standing interpretation boards telling the storey of Aylestone's key buildings.

The proposal is within the Aylestone Village Conservation area.

K) 4 WEST WALK Planning Application <u>20152103</u> Change of use from offices to five flats

This application is for change of use from offices (class b1) to five flats (2x1 bed) (3x2 bed) (class c3); demolition of single storey front and rear extensions and erection of single storey front extension and, a two storey extension and dormer extension at the rear of the building.

The building is within the New Walk Conservation area

L) TUDOR ROAD, FIVEWAYS HOUSE Listed Building Consent <u>20152029</u> Internal and external alterations to building This application is for minor changes to the approved scheme.

The building is Grade II listed.

M) 33-35 SPRINGFIELD ROAD Planning Application <u>20151985</u> Replacement rear windows

This application is for replacement of the rear windows of the building in use as flats with uPVC double glazing.

The building is within the Stoneygate Conservation Area.

N) 24 WEST AVENUE Planning Application <u>20152069</u> Replacement second floor window

This application is for replacement of the front second floor window. This is a retrospective application for a new timber double glazed window.

The building is within the Stoneygate Conservation Area.

O) 26-28 GRANBY STREET Planning Application <u>20151987</u> & <u>20152032</u> Alterations to shopfront

These applications are for alterations to the shop front including new entrance to provide first floor access and installation of ventilation flue.

The building is within the Granby Street Conservation Area.

P) CHARLES STREET, HALFORD HOUSE Planning application <u>20152125</u> Replacement windows

This application is for new double glazed windows.

The building is on the Local List.

Q) 159 MERE ROAD Planning Application <u>20152060</u> Side extension

This application is for a single storey extension to the rear of the house. The proposal is visible from the street scene.

The building is within the Spinney Hill Park Conservation area.

Meeting Ended – 19:00