Mr. A.J. Mayes 6508 (Direct Line: 01926 456508) amayes®wawickdc.gov.uk AJM/ng

25 June 2001

ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 21ST JUNE, 2001

| Present : | Cllr. Mrs. C. Hodgetts, Cllr. Mrs. M. Begg, Mr. D. Brown, Mr. L. Cave, Mr. P. Edwards |
|------------|---|
| Apologies: | Cllr. W. Gifford, Cllr. G. Guest, Cllr. G. Darmody., Mr. G. Goddard-Pickett, |

Substitute Members: Cllr. Mrs. Begg acted for Cllr. W. Gifford

The Chair was taken by Cllr. Mrs. Hodgetts.

- 1. **The Minutes of the meeting held on 24th May, 2001** were accepted as a correct record. Mr. Cave passed on Mr. Goddard-Pickets's approval of the Minutes in his absence.
- 2. **Update of Previous Applications -**Mr. Mayes gave an update of the meeting held on 24th May, and it was agreed that previous applications still outstanding would be circulated together with the Minutes.
- 3. **Kerbing Proposals -** Mr. Mayes explained that the kerbs at Parade are to be replaced with "Country Kerbs" to match those used around the Bright Obelisk area at the bottom of Parade. The difficulty of bedding the existing granite kerbs adequately was appreciated. Significant concern was expressed at the loss of these important features in the Conservation Area. It was suggested that drilling and anchoring the kerbs would be an option to consider.
- 4. <u>W2001657/58 59, Holly Walk, Leamington Spa</u> Change of Use of part first and second floor accommodation from residential to office; demolition of external single storey garages ro surface car parking. It was considered that this should be a full planning application rather than change of use as there would be implications upon the building itself in terms of additional toilets, fire proofing, lifts, etc. It was therefore felt that support could not be given to the application in its present form.
- 5. <u>W20010666 1A Dormer Place, Leamington Spa</u> -Retention of part of premises as residential for a temporary period (variation of condition 1 of pap W9600802). This was considered as acceptable subject there being no other adverse effects.

- 6. <u>W20010667/68LB 8 Binswood Avenue, Leamington Spa</u> Internal alterations to extend kitchen into existing utility room and conservatory and external alterations to rear elevation. This was considered acceptable, however, concern was expressed at the design of the windows which it was felt should be conditioned to achieve a more appropriate design.
- 7. W20010669LB 11 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa Erection of a side extension on detached garage, installation of dormer window to rear slope dwelling; repositioning of garden wall and installation of window into existing doorway in rear elevation. Cllr. Mrs. Begg declared interest in this application as it is adjacent to her house. The extension to the garage was considered acceptable subject to safeguarding the existing garden wall during the building operations. Concern was expressed at the size of the dormer window which, it was felt, should be reduced.
- 8. <u>W20010675/76LB Manor Cottage, 3 Spencer Street, Leamington Spa -</u> Reinstatement of Chimney on roof from upper loft and existing flues. This was considered acceptable subject to appropriate large scale details being conditioned.
- 9. <u>W20010682 12 Grove Street, Leamington Spa</u> Conversion of rear wing to form new dwelling and alteration to front elevation comprising of installation of entrance portico; removal of bay window; installation of replacement sash windows to ground and first floor; new dormer window and roof parapet. The restoration of the front elevation was to be a welcomed subject to all detailing matching the adjacent properties. Concern was expressed at the conversion of the rear wing into a separate dwelling as it was felt that this could set a dangerous president for other properties and could also detract from amenity of the existing property.
- 10. W20010703 6 Parade, Leamington Spa Display of an internally illuminated fascia sign. This was considered inappropriate as it contradicts the Council's policy to reject any form of of any internally illuminated box sign. It was felt that the existing fascia sign was appropriate and should remain.
- 11. <u>W20010705 3 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa</u> Conversion of former caretaker's flat on third and fourth floors into two self-contained flats. Some concern was expressed at the number or rooflights needed in the roof and it was felt that these, possibly, could be rationalised. It was considered that if approval were granted it should be conditioned upon restoration of the portico which has already been granted in the previous application.
- 12. <u>W20010709-LB R/o 14 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa</u> Demolition of existing garage and erection of 2 no. dwellings. (Resubmission of W20010469/70LB with amended design). It was considered that any development in this area should be no more than a 2 storey development. The current proposals detracted heavily from the streetscene by introducing a gable to achieve second floor accommodation. It was felt that this was unacceptable.
- 13. W20010721 40 Arlington Avenue, Leamington Spa Extension and alteration to

existing garages and erection of a detached double garage and linked detached pair of garages. This was generally considered to be an acceptable scheme in this location. Some Members did question why so many garages were required for one house.

- 14. <u>Ashley, R/o 23 Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa</u> Erection of a two storey extension. Concern was expressed that this would detrimentally affect the Beech tree adjacent to the building. Concern was also expressed that the new gable weakened the design of the existing building and was therefore, unacceptable.
- 15. <u>W200100729 Argos Store, 22 Guy Street, Leamington Spa</u> Erection of an internally illuminated fascia sign. The Forum were told of the negotiations achieved thus far, which were welcomed. However, it was felt that a single sign in the centre of the fascia to the present design would be acceptable.
- 16. <u>W20010730 27A Clarendon Avenue, Leamington Spa</u> Erection of 4 dwellings (revised application to W200100138/138CA. Concerns were reiterated at the small amount of amenity space. It was generally felt that a simpler approach to the design detailing would be more acceptable in this location.
- 17. <u>W20010732</u> -70, Waller Street, Leamington Spa Change of Use from residential Class B 1 Business Use (Graphic Design Studio) with ancillary residential accommodation. It was felt that this was not a suitable location to permit a commercial operation; it was felt that a very difficult president could be set if this application were granted.
- 18. <u>W20010739 46 Portland Place, Leamington Spa</u> Demolition of rear kitchen extension, removal of internal basement walls and new sub-divisions; erection of sun room extension and installation of replacement French doors within wider opening. It was felt that the design of the French doors was unacceptable and that it may be preferable to leave the existing ones in place. It was felt that the timber conservatory needed to have simple traditional detailing.
- 19. <u>W20010752/53LB 5 Leam Terrace, Leamington Spa</u> Erection of a front verandah and front boundary wall with railings and pillars. Concern was expressed that by having a glazed roof it was not possible to reintroduce the curved roof which most verandahs retained. It was suggested that possibly a composite clear sheet could be used to provide some windows in the roof to increase the light. It was however, felt that with a south facing property a glass verandah was not necessary and it would be more appropriate to reinstate a traditional curved verandah with simpler ironwork. It was pointed out that this house originally had just a central porch which had been removed some years previously. The design of the railings was considered completely inappropriate for Leamington Spa and needed to be re-drawn.
- 20. <u>W20010615</u> <u>Woodlands, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa</u> Ground floor Conservatory extension and first floor alterations. The additional dormer windows were considered totally inappropriate on the rear elevation which already had one set of dormer windows at a higher level. It was also felt that this would be a difficult problem technically.

The Date of the next meeting - **Tuesday** 10th July, 2001 at 6 pm.