

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

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

18th February 2002

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

**PRESENT:** Councillor W. Gifford, Councillor G. Darmody, Mr. L. Cave, Mrs. R. Benyon, Mr. D. Brown, Mr. P. Edwards, Mr M Sullivan.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Mrs C Hodgetts, Councillor G Guest

**SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS:** Mrs. R. Benyon acted as substitute for Mr. G. Goddard-Pickett, representing C.L.A.R.A.

1. Minutes of meeting held on 24th January 2002. The minutes were accepted as a correct record.

2. **Matters arising from the minutes**

A) Mr. Edwards pointed out that the Newbold Comyn had now been registered as historic park and therefore the Garden History Society were commenting on the present cycle route application. Councillor Darmody pointed out that the application had been deferred to take account of the fact that the Comyn had now been registered.

B) Mr. Sullivan asked if there would be a planning forum on 21st February. He suggested that Conservation Area Advisory Forum Report might be taken to the Forum for discussion. The Chairman agreed that Alan Mayes would discuss this with John Archer.

C) The Conservation Officer reported on the position concerning CCTV cameras. He explained that since the Conservation Area Advisory Forum reports had been received, the town centre manager Mr. Ian Coker had endeavoured to take on board the Forum's views, particularly in respect of more visually acceptable cameras. Mr Mayes explained that initially all interested parties had been consulted on the proposal to extend the CCTV camera system.

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

The proposal had been passed to a consultant who prepared a bid based on the original CCTV system operating in the town.

The bid had been successful in obtaining government funding to carry out the work based on extension of the existing system. The Town Centre Manager had investigated with the consultants the possibility of the system incorporating bowl type fittings, however, these are less powerful than the fittings included in the bid and produce a less distinctive image and therefore additional cameras would be required. The possibility of extending the scheme to include traditional bowl type cameras would now most likely involve the loss of funding and therefore it was necessary for the scheme to go forward as designed. Unfortunately as the proposal was seen of an extension of the original system there had not been considered a need for an early consultation on the type of cameras to be used. The Conservation Officer pointed out that the original scheme had in many ways been more acceptable because the cameras were attached to buildings and not poles as the present system.

Significant concern was expressed by the Forum that they had not been consulted at the appropriate time about the type of cameras. It was also pointed out that where the cameras were attached to poles with slim bases very large boxes were being erected alongside on the pavement.

The Chairman concluded that there may be certain issues brought to the CAAF which would only be for information, it would not be possible in these instances for the CAAF comments to be acted upon.

3. **W20020034/35LB - 40 Portland Place, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation and replacement bay window and new external staircase and gate**

The alteration to the window was considered acceptable. However, some concern was expressed at the space available for the new staircase and the possibility of rubbish collecting in the inaccessible area. It was suggested that a detailed drawing of the staircase was necessary to ensure that this was avoided.

4. **W20020058LB - 17 & 19 Waterloo Place, Leamington Spa**  
**Internal Structural Openings at basement ground, first, second and third floor levels**  
**Together with construction of new internal partitions, removal of existing doors and**  
**Infilling of existing opening**

It was considered that this proposal was inappropriate particularly at the ground and first floor levels where the new corridor cuts through principal rooms at the front and rear of the building, which would contain cornices and also destroy the original planned formed of the building.

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

5. **W2002060/61LB - 13 Charlotte Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Conversion of self-contained flats to bedsit accommodation with shared facilities including refurbishment of basement to provide additional habitable use**

It was suggested that a high standard of finishing should be insisted upon and that there should be a condition that where possible all existing windows will be retained and repaired rather than replaced.

6. **W20020062 - 19 Waller Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of rear dormer window**

This was considered to be out of sympathy with the area and the character of the terrace houses and should be refused.

7. **W20020063 - Whittle Court, Upper Holly Walk, Leamington Spa**  
**Construction of external lift shaft to second floor level together with a single storey extension to provide lift/motor room and refuse area**

This was considered acceptable subject to matching brick being used.

8. **W20020083/84LB - 23 Dale Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Conversion and extension at second floor of building to provide 6 one-bedroomed self-contained flats including alterations to elevations**

It was considered it would be more appropriate for the building to be converted to three flats rather than six bedsitting rooms in terms of the wiring space and amenities available.

The addition of a further storey was generally considered acceptable however, it was suggested that the new fenestration might be reconsidered, in particular the balcony features which were in fact only railings and not proper balconies.

9. **W20020099 - The Woolwich plc, 136 Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of non illuminated fascia lettering**

It was felt that the red line was inappropriate and not in line with the Council's policy and therefore should be omitted. Comments were also made about the spacing of lettering and the style used for 'the' which does not match the lettering style for the main word. Generally the red line was considered to be the most inappropriate element.

10. **W20020100 - rear of 32 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of a detached dwelling, part demolition of existing boundary wall to be replaced with railings, demolition of existing garages**

It was felt that the principle of a house in this location was acceptable and also, picking up elements from the adjacent used Tyre Centre building. It was, however, felt that the use of Georgian detailing for the windows and doors was inappropriate and would not be

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

satisfactorily carried out on site. It was felt that a simpler approach to the windows may be more beneficial and also a building form which was more in scale with the adjacent

mews building. It was felt that the 'dolls house effect' must be avoided in this location. It was suggested that even a contemporary building could have been designed in this location.

11. **W20020108 - Victoria Court, 8 Dormer Place, Leamington Spa**  
**Works to improve disabled access incorporated, alterations to front playing area, side access in Riverside Terrace**

This was considered acceptable.

12. **W20020117 - 12 Guys Cliffe Avenue, Leamington Spa**  
**Proposed alterations and improvements to existing flats**

This was considered to be a good scheme. It was recommended that the stone detailing on the building should be restored and conditions inserted such that it was not possible to paint it. It was also suggested that stone to the columns either side of the front doors should be restored.

13. **W20020145 - 21 Portland Place East, Leamington Spa**  
**Amendment to existing approval to form a separate access to basement**

The Chairman declared an non-substantial non-pecuniary interest in this application. There were no adverse comments to this proposal.

14. **W2001179 - 28 Clarendon Avenue, Leamington Spa**  
**Proposed second flat in basement**

It was considered that the accommodation produced in this location was unacceptable and substandard, in particular, the small windows from the front basement lightwells into the kitchen. Concern was expressed that these rooms had originally been used as bedrooms with such small windows. It was considered that if it were necessary to enlarge the windows to meet Environmental Health standards, then this scheme was unacceptable. The UPVC windows at the front should be changed to timber.

15. **W20011731 - Warwickshire Fire & Rescue, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of 2 no. 30cm dish, 1 no. 30cm Ericsson dish, 5 no. 45cm x 8 cm Yagy tubes type antenna, 3 no. 27cm x 21cm flat plate antennae**

There were mixed views as to whether this was appropriate or not appropriate. The benefits of placing the installations on one tower were discussed, however, the number of installations were considered unacceptable by some members.

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

16. **W20020114 - Magnolia House, 32/34 Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Proposed construction of basement link and ground and first floor extension to rear to provide lifts, bedrooms and bathrooms**

The proposal was generally considered acceptable and a great improvement on the original submission, as the two storey link between the houses had now been omitted. It was suggested however, that the large car park at the front should be broken up with some form of planting to further reinforce the original appearance of two villas rather than one linked house.

17. **W20020116 - 8 Milverton Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation of new and replacement windows to side and rear elevations**

This was considered to be a good scheme. It was suggested that possibly the boundary treatment could be improved by reinstating either railings or balustrades to the front of the building.

18. **W20020118/9LB - 79 Upper Holly Walk, Leamington Spa**  
**Conversion of premises from 7 no. flats comprising internal alterations to dividing walls and opening; installation of new and replacement doors and windows, erection of external staircase, new parapet wall and provision of forecourt parking**

This was generally considered to be an acceptable scheme.

19. **W20020120 - 40/42 Portland Place East, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of conservatory to No. 42; erection of new garden wall to No. 40**

Concern was expressed at the removal of the garden wall between the properties to increase the size of the garden to No. 40. Concern was expressed at the use that this would be put to for parking and possibly also business use. The location of the conservatory under the balcony was considered acceptable subject to the conservatory design being reconsidered to provide a simpler conservatory without the numerous horizontal glazing bars.

20. **W20020126 - 122 Warwick Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of two storey extension with an existing courtyard including repositioning of staircases, installation of new windows and entrance gate to front elevation**

This was generally considered acceptable. Some concern was expressed at the very high parapet on the existing building. It was suggested the possibility of reducing this might be investigated.

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH FEBRUARY 2002**

21. **W20020136 - 101 Clarendon Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Demolition and extension to rear**

The general scheme was considered acceptable, however, the windows onto Cross Road were considered unacceptable. It was suggested that these could all be small narrow windows which could still in fact light the room adequately.

22. **W20020148 - 41 Bath Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Painting of shopfront and display of fascia sign illuminated solely by existing pelmet light (retrospective application)**

The plastic sign and the use of marbling on the shopfront were both considered unacceptable on this listed building and contrary to the original design of the shopfront, which had been restored with grant aid as a historical reproduction of a shopfront next door.

23. **W20020151LB - 14 Milverton Crescent, Leamington Spa**  
**Modify existing window opening to form new door opening to Listed Building**

The French door was considered acceptable however, the number of glazing bars and pattern of the door was considered unacceptable. It was suggested that this must be timber not uPVC and possibly a door with a vertical emphasis and glazing pattern that matched the windows in the main house would be more appropriate.

24. **W20020153 - 9 Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation of air conditioning to the first floor which will take 2 ducts externally**

Concern was expressed that the drawings did not adequately show where the new duct was to be placed. Subject to this being out of sight, it would be acceptable, however, the drawings at present were unclear.

25. **Date of next meeting**

Thursday 7th March 2002.