

WARWICK DISTRICT TOWNS CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM

MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS HELD ON 11 MAY 2010**

PRESENT: Councillor Mrs A Mellor
Councillor Mrs J Falp
Councillor A Wilkinson
Mrs J Illingworth
Mrs R Benyon
Mr P Edwards
Mr J Turner
Mr R Haydn
Mr L Cave
Mr M Baxter
Dr C Hodgetts
Mr A Pitts

APOLOGIES: Councillor W Gifford
Mr J Mackay
Mr O Brock

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS Mr A Pitts acted as a substitute for Mr J Mackay representing the 20th Century Society. Mr R Haydn was welcomed as representing the Leamington Spa Chamber of Trade.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

REFERRAL ITEMS

W10/0102 – Blackfriars House, 6 West Street, Warwick.
W10/0232 – Hut for Birds of Prey, Warwick Castle.
W10/0231 – Trebuchet, Warwick Castle, Warwick.

After discussion it was decided that Dr C Hodgetts would speak on behalf of the CAAF in respect of the Trebuchet only.

LEAMINGTON SPA ITEMS

CHANDOS STREET PROJECT

Further discussion took place on the Chandos Street project. Attached to these minutes is a separate item to be discussed at the next meeting with a view to formalising a minute on these applications representing the views of the CAAF.

1. **W10/0443/CA – 16b Milverton Terrace, Leamington Spa**
Alterations to rear of property, new terrace over to lounge and first floor apartment.

It was pointed out this did not require planning approval.

2. **W10/0469/0470/CA – Stoneleigh Arms, 31 Clemens Street, Leamington Spa**
Partial demolition of non-listed public house within a conservation area

It was pointed out that, as this is only partial demolition, conservation area consent is not required. Photographs were shown to the members, indicating the area that is to be demolished.

- 3 **W10/0537 – 63 Greatheed Road, Leamington Spa**
Loft conversion and two dormer windows to rear.

Similar windows have been permitted in this terrace of properties. It was felt in general that the use of two dormer windows to the rear was appropriate. It was, however, considered that the staircase dormer, if possible, should be narrower (or the detailing improved on this dormer). It was also felt that the staircase dormer should have some glazing bars similar to the adjacent property, possibly with both windows having casements rather than one with a sash window. It was felt the roof lights to the front were inappropriate and should be controlled by removing permitted development rights.

- 4 **W10/0543 – 94 Northumberland Road, Leamington Spa**
Erection of single storey and two storey rear extension, removal of front dormer window and erection of roof extension, and erection of replacement front porch and front canopy.

This was felt to be acceptable and the removal of the front dormer was to be welcomed.

- 5 **W10/0558/0559/CA – 34 Russell Terrace, Leamington Spa**
Demolition of existing garage and erection of new two storey dwelling and associated parking to rear.

Councillor A Wilkinson declared an interest as he lives in Russell Terrace. The proposal was considered to be overdevelopment on this small site to create a three bedroom house. Concern was expressed that no garden was shown for the dwelling and no sustainable surfacing for the parking area. It was felt that the proposal does not enhance the conservation area.

- 6 **W10/0574/LB – Leamington Spa Railway Station, Old Warwick Road, Leamington Spa**
New structural opening between existing platform waiting room and café refurbishment of up and down platform waiting rooms, refurbishment of existing P and B room into proposed new café;

formation of new café including relocation of doors to their original position.

Mr Archie Pitts declared an interest in this application as he Chairs the Friends of Leamington Station.

Members welcomed the proposals and felt this would enhance the character of the listed station.

- 7 W10/0593/0594/LB – Jug and Jester Public House, 11-13 Bath Street, Leamington Spa**
Display of externally illuminated and non-illuminated individual fascia letters, an externally illuminated hanging sign, coloured vinyls, non-illuminated box menu, up lighters and a lantern.

This was considered to be appropriate, subject to larger scale detailing of the new boards and type of lettering. It was suggested the building was originally called the Jet and Whittle, after Sir Frank Whittle, and this may be a suitable name change which the owner should be notified of. (It was later confirmed to be the Chair and Rocket).

LEAMINGTON SPA – PART II ITEMS

- 1. W10/0535/LB – 13 Bath Street, Leamington Spa**
Refurbishment of existing public house including remodelling of existing kitchen and toilets.

Part II item – no comments.

- 2. W10/0551 – 56 Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa**
Proposed single storey ground floor garage extension at front and new roof over side extension (both garage and existing extension) and internal alterations.

Part II item – no comments.

- 3. W10/0555/0556/LB – 3 Clarendon Crescent, Leamington Spa**
Proposed single storey extension to rear. Replace existing wooden trellis screen at second floor with metal/obscured glass.

Members requested this application be presented at the next meeting.

- 4. W10/0582/0583/LB – 13 Bath Street, Leamington Spa**
New kitchen extract, remove existing extract and fittings and install in same location a new kitchen extract to run up side of building to just above soffit of roof.

Part II item – no comments.

5. **W10/0584 – 50 Warwick New Road, Leamington Spa**
Proposed single storey extension to rear of property

Part II item – no comments.

6. **W10/0589/0590/CA – 90 Radford Road, Leamington Spa**
New slate pitched roof to replace existing flat roof to existing detached garage. Flat roof infill extension to side elevation with three no. roof lights.

Part II item – no comments.

7. **W10/0597/LB – 13 Bath Street, Leamington Spa**
Installation of a modern air conditioning system in order to meet Environmental Health conditions and create an environment comfortable and suitable for both customers and staff.

Part II item – no comments.

WARWICK ITEMS

1. **W10/0521/0522/LB – 13 The Butts, Warwick**
Re-submission of W10/0104/0105/LB
Proposed changes to exterior including in fill of some existing windows on side elevation as well as some new openings. The proposal includes the replacement of existing windows in the rear elevation and new sash windows to match those on the neighbouring property. The proposal also includes the conversion of out building to self-contained living accommodation.

The change of windows to traditional sash windows with glazing bars was to be welcomed. The use of a glazed balcony detail, however, was still considered inappropriate on this listed building. It was felt a more traditional form of balcony railing should be maintained.

2. **W10/0523/0524/LB – 64/66 Market Place, Warwick**
Demolition of flat roof to rear, removal of existing external spiral staircase and demolition existing single storey lean-to structure to courtyard. Provision of new metal staircase and extension of existing landing. Removal of redundant timber stair in the rear building and the installation of WCs for both ambulant and disabled users in the dis-used storage room. Introduction of new internal spiral stair.

As this related mainly to internal features, it was felt that this application was appropriate.

WARWICK – PART II ITEMS

1. **W10/0566 – 22 Mill Street, Warwick**
Replacement of stone paving and timber decking over existing flat roof elevated terrace, together with erection of protective balustrades/hand rail.

Part II item – no comment.

2. **W10/0601/0602/LB – 9 Mill Street, Warwick**
Proposed retrospective application for demolition of lean to out building, proposed single storey extension to rear, and replacement of first floor bathroom window.

Part II item – no comment.

KENILWORTH ITEMS

1. **W10/0491/TC –**
Installation of no. 1 above ground jointing chamber outside 46 New Street, Kenilworth
2. **W10/0498 – Fronting 25 Castle Hill, Kenilworth**
Above ground jointing chamber.
3. **W10/0536 – St Johns Church, Warwick Road, Kenilworth**
New ground floor jointing chamber, green in colour.
4. **W10/0501/TC – side of High Street, Monmouth Close, Kenilworth**
Proposed new cabinet

Members felt that such boxes increase the visual clutter of the townscape and as a consequence would not enhance the Conservation Area. Concern was expressed at the one adjacent to 46 New Street, where the cabinet would actually be higher than the wall itself, it is in close proximity to a listed building. The colour of the street furniture is black, however, it is noted that the cabinets are to be green; it was felt that it would be better in this instance if all cabinets, if introduced, should be black.

5. **W10/0347 – Rose Cottage, Upper Spring Lane, Kenilworth**
Erection of single storey side extension linking to garage and garden store.

Considered to be over development of an existing cottage and garage, which should be refused as it does not enhance the conservation area or the particular building.

KENILWORTH – PART II ITEMS

1. **W10/0514 – The Royal Oak, 36 New Street, Kenilworth
Smoking shelter in rear garden.**

Part II item – no comment.

WHITNASH ITEMS

1. **W10/0191 – Halls Close/17 Whitnash Road, Leamington Spa
Proposed 4 new dwellings following demolition of existing
bungalow.**

Concerns were expressed at the impact of the four new dwellings on the listed timber framed cottage which is within the conservation area. It was felt that, possibly a bungalow/lower building to the front part of the site would still maintain the scale with the listed cottage, with possibly a pair of semi-detached houses at the rear of the site, similar to those already existing in Halls Close. It was felt that the houses as designed were very plain and uninteresting and would benefit from more appropriate architectural detailing. The possibility of a terrace of three houses was discussed, stepping down towards the listed building. Some concern was expressed that the front area adjacent to the listed property would be used for car parking, which was felt would be inappropriate. Concern was also expressed that the hedge around the existing property should be maintained as this does form part of the streetscape.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Thursday, 3 June 2010

Draft Minute from CAAF for Chandos Street Project

(To be considered at meeting 3 June 2010)

1. **W10/0340 Clarendon Arcade, Parade, Leamington Spa**

Erection of mixed use scheme (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5) uses, together with 9 town houses. Service access at basement level with two levels of car parking above the retail on second floor and third floors and a plant deck above part of the roof top parking. New entrance portico on Parade and extension and conversion of 17 Parade for retail and office purposes. New vehicular accesses and other alterations to the highways (accompanied by an Environmental Statement).

2. **W10/0341/LB Clarendon Arcade, Parade, Leamington Spa**

9 Parade – Partial demolition of single storey later edition and extension to Walton House, currently used as auction showrooms and offices/stores, currently occupied by Locke and England.

13-15 Parade – Demolition of modern two storey rear extension to number 13-15 Parade, currently used as an extension to the Coventry Building Society together with first floor storage and support accommodation for the ground floor shops. Demolition of four storey existing shops as detailed on drawings and described in the historic environment report.

20-22 Guy Street – Demolition of modern two storey building currently known as Argos which formed the rear extension to 19-21 Parade (formerly Sainsbury's).

3. **W10/0342/CA Clarendon Arcade, Parade, Leamington Spa**

69-71 Warwick Street – Complete demolition of the retail units formerly known as Priceless Shoes and Cargo Home Shop at ground floor and associated offices on 1st and 2nd floor levels.

73 Warwick Street – Complete demolition of the retail unit and associated offices, currently known as QS Store, which extends across lower ground, ground, first and second floors.

1 Guy Street & 1a Guy Place West – Complete demolition of the two storey Veterinary Surgery, including rear extensions and the first floor flat.

6 Guy Street – Complete demolition of the existing restaurant known as Chicos, including first floor residential element and associated rear extensions.

18 Guy Street – Complete demolition of the two storey mews building with rear modern two storey extension, formerly occupied by Locke and England as a showroom with associated storage and offices.

1 Guy Place West – Complete demolition of two storey residential property.

3 Guy Place West – Complete demolition of the two storey residential property.

2 & 4 Chandos Street – Complete demolition of two semi-detached houses.

81 Warwick Street – Demolition of the rear single storey modern or later unlisted addition to 83 Warwick Street, currently occupied by Parkes Hireware also accessed from Oxford Row.

7 Parade – Demolition of single storey modern unlisted outbuildings within the curtilage of number 7 Parade, used as storage space.

23-31 Parade – Demolition of modern unlisted electrical sub-station within the curtilage and to the rear of numbers 23-31 parade.

The Conservation Area Advisory Forum were given a copy of the Design and Access Statement for this project, prior to it being discussed at their next meeting. The project was presented in full by Mr John Beaumont, the Planning Officer for Leamington Spa at the CAAF meeting on 22 April 2010.

At an overall level, the members of CAAF felt that the scale of the project was too large and overwhelmed this part of the historic core of Leamington Spa. Particular concerns were expressed that the layout did not respect the historic street pattern of the town, particularly as the shopping mall has a dog leg at the department store and the line of Guy Street will then pass through the department store to the rear entrance rather than monitoring the line of the street. The street pattern of Leamington is an important part of its character and to place a building across the street in this monolithic form does not maintain the character of the town. Obliterating the street pattern in this way should be strongly resisted.

The scale of the building and impact on the surrounding streets and listed buildings was also considered unacceptable in the context of the historic environment. In particular, the impact of large areas of brickwork, particularly on Chandos Street and the impact on houses in Clarendon Street was felt to be unacceptable in the conservation area. The provision of car parking at high level was felt to be inappropriate as it manifested itself in high level brickwork with narrow vent slots which do not enhance the building. In particular the brickwork viewed from Chandos Street and above the entrance from Warwick Street were considered unacceptable. It was suggested car parking should be underground and possibly a roof garden created at the higher level. It was noted that the car parking has been set back to lessen the impact on the Clarendon Avenue

properties, however it was still felt this would make an unacceptable change to the residents of this area.

In terms of the provision of a mall itself, the character of the mall, as displayed in the drawings was felt to be out of character with Leamington Spa and did not create the same light and airy environment as in the original Royal Priors building. It was felt that the interior of the shopping mall, if it is to be a "street" should reflect the street character of the town itself, which it was felt this did not, and the second higher tier of shopping was considered questionable economically.

The loss of up to 18 trees on the car park was also considered unfortunate and unacceptable in the conservation area by some members.

The economic viability of producing such a scheme was also questioned by some members. It was also questioned, if the scheme is successful, profit margins should be capped for the developers to avoid excessive profit at the expense of the historic town.

The need for additional parking to the level provided was also questioned and the impact of bringing additional cars into the town was of significant concern. Similarly, the servicing of the project with heavy goods vehicles in this part of the town was of concern.

The environmental impact of the scheme was of concern and it was felt that if the project requires piling, then advantage could be taken of using and source heat pumps, together with significant use of roof space for solar energy.

At a detailed level, concerns were expressed at the entrance feature onto Warwick Street, particularly the visibility of the car park above, the detailing of the vent slots for the car park, the quality of the living spaces created by the single aspect housing and the fact that these did not fully mask the car park.

In terms of the impact on the town itself, two members considered that the town centre did not need any additional shopping and that shopping at this scale would be detrimental to the character of the town. There was therefore a majority in favour of additional shopping, however the proposal, as put forward, was not considered to be appropriate to Leamington and it was felt to have not been tailored to the specific historic character and attractive shopping experience that Leamington currently provides. Concerns were expressed that a Shopping Centre with no individuality, similar to Coventry, Solihull or Birmingham was being proposed.

The above comments reflect the views of the majority of the CAAF members, however, a strong minority view was expressed in favour of the scheme, which it was felt was needed to maintain and, to an extent, regenerate Leamington as a significant shopping centre. The supporting commenters had some minor reservation about detail; however they felt that fears that the scheme would produce yet another shopping centre akin to Coventry, Solihull or Birmingham, would not be the case and that this level of shopping and car parking was necessary for the viability of the town as a prime retail town centre, which in

turn was necessary for the future maintenance of the historic fabric of the town centre.

Some individual concerns were expressed as follows:

The scale of demolition compared with the scale of new build.

The impact on shopping in Warwick, it was felt, could be significant,

The quality of the model, which it was felt should have been coloured to reflect the development as proposed.

The gradual change of emphasis of the shopping centre in Leamington from the bottom of the Parade to the top and the impact it is having on the bottom end of the town.