

# **WARWICK DISTRICT TOWNS CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**

## **MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs C Sawdon  
Councillor G Webber  
Mr P Edwards  
Mrs R Bennion  
Mr M Baxter  
Dr C Hodgetts  
Mr M Sullivan

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor N Pittarello  
Mrs J Illingworth  
Mr J Mackay  
Mr A Pitts

### **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a correct record.

### **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillor Webber declared an interest in 18 Augusta Place as he knows residents living in Portland Street.
- Dr C Hodgetts declared an interest in 49 West Street, Warwick, as the applicant is a member of the Warwick Society with Dr Hodgetts and left the room for this item.

### **PRESENTATION BY MR GARY STEPHENS**

Mr Stephens outlined the new proposals for CAAF.

- Focus on pre-application to be a more informal session at the start of the meeting. Members would receive the weekly list by email.
- The case officers and Conservation Officer will decide the agenda.
- Agendas will be circulated on the Friday before the meeting by email.
- Members will then choose any additional items from the subsequent weekly lists and let the Conservation Officer know in time for them to be added to the final agenda.
- The CAAF meeting presentation will be by PowerPoint including the plans with applications available for scrutinising actual plans if needed.
- A DC officer would attend the meetings.
- A DC officer most likely would prepare the minutes which would be circulated in the normal way.

The following discussion took place:

- It was clarified that only one case officer would attend the meeting at a time.
- Concern about case officers recording the comments; would prefer Conservation Officer to do this.
- The form of presentation has been discussed in the past and members prefer paper copies. It will not be time efficient to scrutinise notes on one plan between the whole group.
- Concern expressed that would not be able to do job properly as cannot scrutinise drawings properly in the way proposed.
- Try this method for next meeting and see how it goes.

#### **ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION IN NEW MILVERTON**

The Conservation Officer circulated an information sheet regarding the Article 4 Direction made for New Milverton. It was suggested that comments be brought back to the next meeting.

#### **LEAFLET ON RENEWABLE ENERGY**

This had been circulated. Members generally were in support of this. It was suggested that, in listed buildings, it should be stressed that only very discrete locations are acceptable (in the light of the comments on 49 West Street). Also suggested that more emphasis should be put on the use of photovoltaic slates where these could be accommodated on the rear slopes of historic buildings rather than panels at all. It was also stressed that applicants should keep abreast of new developments to ensure that they use the most discrete form of solar energy, in particular the possibility of maintaining good links with Woollsey in Leamington. Otherwise the leaflet was welcomed.

#### **REFERRALS FROM PLANNING COMMITTEE**

- W11/0967 – 9-11 St Marks Road, Leamington Spa. Change of use from Nursery to residential dwelling and erection of two outbuildings in the rear garden. No one wished to speak on this.
- W11/1339 – 20-24 High Street and 2-8 Swan Street, Warwick. Change of use of first and second floors to 9 flats. Dr Hodgetts confirmed that Mr James Mackay had indicated he would wish to speak on this item.

#### **LINEN STREET CAR PARK**

The Conservation Officer presented some photographs of the Linen Street Car Park where it is proposed to put some new signage. Members generally felt the signage would be misleading in terms of where the entrance to the car park was. It was suggested that signage needed to be more strategic throughout the town to guide people to the car park, rather than additional signage. No comments were made about the actual signage itself.

## **FORMER MENCAP HOME, WHARF STREET, WARWICK**

Dr Hodgetts gave a short presentation on this property which is to become vacant and is now under threat. It was designed as part of the workhouse movement and is considered a significant building. Dr Hodgetts suggested it was put in to the Conservation Area or considered for listing. It was suggested that possible listing should be pursued, also inclusion in the Conservation Area.

## **LEAMINGTON SPA ITEMS**

### **1. W11/1646 – 16 Park Street, Leamington Spa Change of use from retail use (Class A1) to a tea room (Class A3)**

As there is only one other A3 outlet in Park Street, this was felt to be acceptable. It was suggested that the extent of the A3 permission be conditioned to ensure that it cannot become a wine bar or any form of takeaway.

### **2. W11/1650 – 91 Northumberland Road, Leamington Spa Demolition of one extension, alterations and loft conversion, ground floor rear extensions**

This was felt to be acceptable at the front if appropriate material was used for the windows (timber). Some concern was expressed at the gables to the rear, in particular the gable on the single storey wing which appeared to be out of character.

### **3. W11/1662/W12/0013/CA – Garages, 18 Hill Street, Leamington Spa Demolition of garages and erection of 2 no. 1 bedrooms. New driveway and access**

Consideration was given to the contribution that the garage block makes to the Conservation Area at the present time, and this was felt to be significant enough for it to be retained and converted into some use. It was pointed out that the two storey buildings adjacent had been converted to an acceptable use and this was a building of some significance which should be retained. It was felt that whilst the replacement building provided some accommodation, including on site car parking, it was very small and it did not warrant the demolition of the existing building.

### **4. W11/1627 – 18 Augusta Place, Leamington Spa Demolition of existing building to rear of Augusta Place. Construction of 2/3 storey office building.**

It was felt that the proposed building was too tall and bore no relation architecturally to the main building. It was felt that, by possibly raising the roof of the existing warehouse building, nominally, two floors of office accommodation could be accommodated within that building in a very discrete way, by the use of roof lights, possibly a lightwell. The existing

building, it was felt, did not contribute to the conservation area and in fact would be detrimental to the houses viewing it from Portland Street.

**5. W11/1328/LB/W12/0018 – 65 Willes Road, Leamington Spa  
Erection of a single storey rear extension and decking; erection of fence on front side of boundary; erection of fence to form refuse area to northern boundary; reinstatement of dwarf wall and gate to side boundary; installation of timber gates in rear garden wall; removal of canopy from front elevation (retrospective application)**

Conservation Officer explained the various parts of this application:

- The veranda: it was felt that this could not be granted for removal and this should be restored. If the property is sold, it was felt that either an enforcement notice should be placed upon it to ensure the new owners reinstated it, or the present owner should put back the veranda.
- The low wall around the side, although considered acceptable, was felt not to be wide enough to take the coping construction shown. The gate in the low wall was felt to be inappropriate.
- The bin area: it was considered this would be better with a brick wall and gate, rather than the piece of fence which was out of character and would eventually blow over.
- Double gates: some concern was expressed at the flow of traffic that might come in and out of the double gates as in Innage Close is quite well trafficked already.
- The kitchen extension: whilst it was accepted that an extension in this location, as a single storey building with a hipped roof was appropriate, concerns were expressed at the whole building being rendered, although it was accepted this may hide inappropriate brickwork. The main concern was the use of the decking and the veranda which alienated the structure from the main building and gave it the appearance of a mobile building. It was felt that although access is needed from doors into the garden, this could be provided in the form of a simple platform with steps down, thus by removing the veranda, the base of the building would be properly exposed. It was suggested that the cream painted render could be either changed to terracotta or a natural stone colour to reduce the impact of this rendered building to the rear of the building.

## **LEAMINGTON SPA - PART II ITEMS**

- 1. W11/1531/1532/LB – 22 Grove Street, Leamington Spa  
Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and rear garage/roof terrace; erection of single and two storey rear extension incorporating a conservatory to the side basement garage; re rendering of front elevation.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 2. W11/1622 – 32 Rushmore Street, Leamington Spa  
Conversion of existing garage to form additional bedroom and erection of two storey rear extension.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 3. W11/1651 – Flat 1, 40 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa  
Replace first floor windows.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 4. W11/1361 – The Coach House, 26 Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa  
Removal of existing kitchen door and installation of a set of bi-folding style doors.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 5. W12/0002 – 1a Leicester Street, Leamington Spa  
Formation of one lightwell to front elevation to facilitate existing basement flat.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 6. W12/0003 – 5a Camberwell Terrace, Leamington Spa  
Erection of a first floor extension to existing workshop.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 7. W11/1663 – 1 Fairlawn Close, Leamington Spa  
Conversion of vacant basement into two HIMO bedrooms and insertion of two lightwells.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 8. W11/1639/CA – 9 Cross Road, Leamington Spa  
Removal of chimney and formation of balcony extension in area of roof removed to existing bed 3.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 9. W12/0024 – 17 Wathen Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Replacement of existing drainage pipe at front of building with soil pipe.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 10. W12/0026/CA – 94 Northumberland Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of single and two storey rear extension; removal of front dormer window and erection of roof extension; erection of replacement front porch and front canopy incorporating single storey side extension (retrospective application – amendment to planning permission no. W10/0543**

Part II item – no comment.

- 11. W11/1671/1672/LB – 6 Lansdowne Circus, Leamington Spa**  
**Alterations to the outbuilding to raise the ground floor 150mm above ground level; insert French doors and window with a canopy over the window frame on west and south elevations; replacement of internal ladder with a staircase**

Part II item – no comment.

- 12. W12/0010 – 6 Brownlow Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Single storey rear extension and rear dormer.**

Part II item – no comment.

- 13. W12/0036 – 19 Regent Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Change of use of ground floor from a shop (use class A1) to a tattoo studio (Sui Generis).**

Part II item – no comment.

## **WARWICK ITEMS**

- 1. W11/1465/1466/LB – Lazy Cow Hotel, 10 Theatre Street, Warwick**  
**Display of advertisements consisting of two sets of individual lettering (retrospective) to be illuminated by stainless steel downlighters; one projecting hanging sign to be illuminated by trough light (retrospective); one inset fascia sign (retrospective); one fascia sign illuminated by stainless steel downlight.**

It was felt that the current signage with the grass effect on was inappropriate on a listed building, and the circular signs were too large and inappropriately lit with the down lighters fixed on the building. Concerns were expressed that the roundle sign facing the Holloway, of which only half could be seen from the other side. Generally it was felt the signage was not effective as one could not read it at a distance,

particularly the roundle signs. It was felt this needed to be rethought and traditional signage used on this building.

**2. W11/1469/LB – Betfred, 9 Market Place, Warwick**  
**Change colour of the existing doors and window frames/cils on the Betfred and residential unit.**

It was felt to be acceptable to distinguish between the shop door and the residential door for the shop door to be blue and the residential door to be black. However, the blue of the Betfred signage was felt to be too bright and a darker blue was suggested for the door and the edging of the window frame.

**3. W11/1623/LB – 3 Church Street, Warwick**  
**Installation of front light well window with steel grid above; removal of internal glazed entrance lobby; removal of part of the rear extension and installation of roof lantern and internal alterations.**

Generally works to the front elevation at cellarage level was felt to be acceptable. The use of new windows to the rear was to be welcomed, however concerns were expressed that the large inappropriate boxed dormer at the rear had no proposals for improvement. It was strongly felt that the architect should encourage the owner to at least try and replace windows in the boxed dormer, if not try and remove the boxed dormer and have appropriate dormers to the rear of this important building. In terms of the internal alterations, it was noted that several walls are to be removed and it was felt the Conservation Officer needed to inspect carefully the interior of this building to consider whether this would be appropriate. The lantern light at the rear was felt to be acceptable and the French doors. It was suggested that grant aid should be offered for the improvement to the rear boxed dormer.

**4. W11/1329 – Warwick Racecourse, Hampton Street, Warwick**  
**Proposed temporary entrance fencing and alterations to turnstiles, removal of trees and new tarmac hardstanding to replace existing.**

This was felt to be a rather cheap and poor upgrading of this entrance to the Racecourse. The use of UPVC on the buildings and the use of standard white railing was considered to be unacceptable. It was felt the railing proposed would not be timber but some form of composite material. Generally, it was pointed out white railings are used on the course and not the entrance to a racecourse and therefore having high white railings around this enclosure was not appropriate. Whilst it was appreciated the entrance needed to be made more appropriate and more attractive, it was felt this was not the right approach and that possibly some better quality railings painted green with more appropriate distinguished gates would be a better entrance to the race course.

**5. W11/1455/LB – 49 West Street, Warwick  
Retention of 10 solar panels on the rear slope on main house.**

It was suggested that, if solar installations are to be used on listed buildings, then this should be in the form of appropriate slate or tile to match the existing roof covering or in very discrete locations. It was felt that this installation was a good example of how, if permitted, the degradation of the rear of listed buildings which are clearly visible from other properties and locations would follow. It was therefore felt that these panels are not appropriate on this particular listed building in this location and did not enhance the conservation area in any way.

**6. W12/0030/LB – Pageant House, Jury Street, Warwick  
Painting of existing rear elevations.**

It was pointed out that this was built as unpainted render and not intended to be painted. It was scored to look like ashlar stonework and should remain as such in this location. It was pointed out that there are operatives who could inspect the render and offer advice on how to improve the colour of the patched areas. Rory Young was suggested as a national lime expert who may be called in for this issue, but it was clearly felt that painting was not appropriate.

**WARWICK PART II ITEMS**

**1. W11/1623/LB – 3 Church Street, Warwick  
Installation of front light well window with steel grid above;  
removal of internal glazed entrance lobby; removal of part of rear  
extension and installation of roof lantern and internal alterations.**

Part II item – no comment.

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** 16 February 2012