Mr. A Mayes 6508 (Direct Line: 01926 456508) amayes@warwickdc.gov.uk AJM/HD/SW

11th March 2002

#### ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 7TH MARCH 2002

PRESENT: Councillor W. Gifford, Councillor G. Darmody, Councillor Mrs C

Hodgetts, Mr. L. Cave, Mr. D. Brown, Mrs M Watkin, Mr A

Forward, Mr M Sullivan.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor G Guest

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Mr. A Forward acted as substitute for Mrs R Benyon and Mrs M

Watkin acted as substitute for Mr P Edwards.

1. Minutes of meeting held on 14th February 2002. The minutes were accepted as a correct record with the following exceptions:-

- a) Item 8, wiring should read living.
- b) CCTV cameras.

Mr Cave circulated a paper recording his views on the CCTV camera. He pointed out

that the strength of the CAAF's objection to the cameras and the manner in which the consultation had been handled not strongly enough recorded in the minutes. He requested his paper to be attached to the present minutes. It was recommended that the contents of his paper could be forwarded to the District Council in a letter form.

#### 2. Update on Previous applications

An update list was circulated.

Mr Cave requested an update on the bus shelters. He pointed out that the present public consultation leaflet indicates the curved top bus shelters and red surface treatment for bus lay-bys bus shelter is therefore contrary to that recommended by the Forum. Mr Mayes suggested that Mr Waters from the County Council be invited to speak at the next Conservation Area Advisory Forum concerning current situation concerning bus shelters.

#### 3. Town Centre Help Points

A progress report for information. The Conservation Officer took the members through the help points from Clemens Street to the top of the Parade as follows:-

- i) **Bath Street/Clemens Street junction** It was suggested that the help point could be located in the recess of the bridge abutment adjacent to the old town information panel, rather than fitted to a pole.
- ii) Clemens Street This was considered acceptable.
- iii) **Parade/Junction with Dormer Place** It was suggested this should be incorporated onto the roundabout/give way pole.
- iv) **Parade/Regent Street Junction** It was suggested this might be located on the one way pole if the one way sign pole could be brought nearer to the junction with Regent Street and Parade.
- v) **Warwick Street/Parade Junction** It was suggested that the traffic light control could be located on the same pole as the help point.
- vi) Clarendon Avenue This was considered acceptable.

Generally it was felt that wherever possible they should be incorporated into the existing Poles. Concern was expressed that the control points needed to be yellow. It was suggested they could be stainless steel. The black poles were considered acceptable without any further embellishment.

#### 4. <u>W20011740 - 58 Clarendon Avenue, Leamington Spa</u> Erection of single storey extension (Revised Application of W20010622)

Differing opinions were expressed in respect of this application. The design was considered to be a good modern expression subject to detailing of the flashing adjacent to existing windows being resolved. It was also however felt that the closure of the yard area was unfortunate and a more traditional rear extension would be preferable.

### 5. <u>W20020180LB - Garden House, Clarendon Crescent, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Canopy addition to dwelling</u>

This was considered acceptable.

#### 6. <u>W20020181 - 12 Warwick Street, Learnington Spa</u> <u>Variation of condition on planning permission relating to opening hours</u>

This was considered unacceptable as there are residential properties in this area. It was suggested that 11.00p.m. be limit. Some concern was expressed also that other fish and chip shops are opening beyond 12.00p.m. in the Town Centre, possibly without permission.

#### 7. <u>W20020192 - 60-62 Parade, Leamington Spa</u>

#### New fire escape exit and replacement of existing roller shutter doors for Woolworth's retail use

The roller shutter was considered acceptable in this location.

## 8. <u>W20020193/4LB - 23 High Street, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Change of use from shopfront to restaurant, convert garage to kitchen and flue</u> from toilets in basement

Generally considered that this was not an appropriate location for a restaurant and also there was little parking. Some concern was expressed as to what would happen to the flue from the kitchen. Concern was also expressed that the shopfront had not been drawn correctly on the drawings.

### 9. <u>W20020204 - 23 High Street, Leamington Spa</u> Hanging sign and illumination of hanging sign and

It was suggested that the hanging sign would be inappropriate in this location. It was felt that the fascia should be reduced in depth and just a single line of lettering. It was generally felt that the drawings were not particularly adequate.

### 10. <u>W20020206/7LB - 19 Beauchamp Hill, Leamington Spa</u> Rear extension and part glazed roof to existing

Some concern was expressed at the need to raise the wall and then insert a window into this location. The window in the wall was considered particularly inappropriate to this listed building and fine boundary wall enclosure. It was also felt that there should be no roof visible above the wall which would be preferable not to raise in height. It was therefore suggested that any development in this area should be to the height of the existing wall.

## 11. <u>W20020208 - Stone the Crows, 64 Regent Street, Leamington Spa</u> Two projecting signs (retrospective application)

This was considered unacceptable, as it is not in line with the District Council's policy for projecting signs or banners. It was therefore considered that this should be refused.

# 12. W20020211 - Adjacent to 10 Hamilton Terrace, Leamington Spa Removal of temporary office structure to create three storey primary office development

There were differing views in respect of these proposals. There was a view that the proposals would provided for a very distinctive modern building which would be a worthy

addition to the Conservation Area. Some reservations were expressed about the side wall treatment which it was felt was less innovative than the front glazed detailing. It was also a strongly held view that the building was inappropriate in this location and would not add significantly to the Conservation Area, in particular, the treatment of the side and rear with the roller shutter was considered inappropriate as well as the glazing to the front. There was therefore too strongly held opposing views and no consensus on this proposal.

## 13. W20020246 - rear of 52/52A Warwick New Road, Leamington Spa Two dwellings for domestic use built to reflect the design of the adjoining detached and semi-detached Victorian dwellings

The two dwellings were considered inappropriate in this location and did not reflect the adjacent buildings. The drawings were considered to be particularly poor and did not adequately describe the scheme. Concern was expressed that this proposal was also opposite a road junction and therefore the site was not particularly appropriate for any form of development. Concern was also expressed that the possible change in levels and loss of trees.

# 14. W20020267 - Yates Wine Lodge, 44/46 Warwick Street, Leamington Spa New external lights, new paved finished to exterior glaze in placed to bottom panel of external doors. Also application for new illuminated signs and light fittings

The proposals were generally felt to be acceptable subject to detail, with the exception of the hanging sign which was not considered acceptable. It was pointed out that there is hanging sign on the Hogs Head opposite and it was requested whether or not this had approval.

#### 15. <u>W20020272 - 66 Clarendon Street, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Installation of railings 1300mm high cast iron head and square steel rods</u>

This was considered acceptable subject to the railings matching some existing railings within Clarendon Street.

## 16. W20020276/77CA - Rear of 40 Russell Terrace, Leamington Spa Demolition of garage; new coach house and garage (one side of previous coach house)

Concern was expressed that the design was considered to be particularly inappropriate and not like a mews building. It was also felt that a two storey mews buildings in this location was not appropriate and significant concern was expressed that this would be sold off as a separate house.

# 17. W20020251 - Milverton Primary School, Greatheed Road, Learnington Spa Erection of 9m long/1.1m high close boarded fence to rear of existing stone wall adjacent to the highway

Concern was expressed that the unacceptable impact of the close boarded fence in this location. It was suggested that either a hedge be planted or the existing trellis should be replaced and hedge or shrubs planted behind.

18. <u>W20020252/53CA - 9 Clarendon Avenue, Learnington Spa</u>
Change of use of dwelling to dental surgery on part ground floor and two no. self-

contained flats on ground floor and first floor; enlargement of vehicular access to Morrell Street; erection of close boarded entrance gates; provision of two parking spaces within rear garden, installation of new door opening and repainting of render façade; provision of 2 no. parking spaces within rear garden.

It was reported that the building was not to be listed. It was therefore considered that the proposals were more acceptable than the previous application and would be appropriate in this instance. Some concern was expressed that the existing staircase would be boxed in and it was suggested that possibly the balustrade could be retained.

#### 19. **Date of next meeting**

Thursday 4th April 2002.

[I:\conserv\CAAF Minutes&Agendas\caafmins7march2002.doc]