

Mr. A. J. Mayes
6508 (Direct Line 456508)
amayas@warwickdc.gov.uk
AJM/KW

26th January 2001

ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM
RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 25TH JANUARY 2001

Present: Cllr. W. Gifford, Cllr. Mrs. C. Hodgetts, Cllr. G. Darmody,
Cllr. G. Guest, Mr. G. Goddard-Pickett, Mr. B. Birdi, Mr. M. Sullivan,
Mr. L. Cave

Apologies: Mrs. M. Watkins

-
1. **The minutes of the meeting held on 4th January 2001** were accepted as a correct record with the exception that Cllr. Darmody and Cllr. Caborn's names had been missed off the attendance list.
 2. **Matters arising** - Mr. Cave asked if the Conservation Officer required written comments concerning the presentation on the Heritage Townscape Initiative grant bid. He said that any comments could be sent in writing preferably prior to the 8th February 2001 when a submission will be made to the Heritage Lottery Fund. It was agreed that Mr. Mayes would prepare a presentation on grant aid as the result of this bid and other grant fundings are resolved, prior to the start of the new financial year.
 3. **Update on previous applications** - these were tabled.
 4. **W20001698 - 36 Warwick Place, Leamington Spa - Conversion of basement to dwelling unit including provision of lightwell and formation of entrance with patio and external staircase, construction of new front wall and railing (amendment to existing parking and bin store arrangements)**

Concern was expressed that the proposal showing a patio at the basement level creates an unacceptably large basement area. The principle of converting the basement was not considered unacceptable and if a discrete basement area similar to the adjacent property could be created with a very small flight of steps, this would be acceptable. A larger flight of steps it was considered would be unacceptable. It would also be necessary for the railings to the front garden and around the basement lightwell to match those on the adjacent property. It was considered the adjacent lightwell worked because it was enclosed and had significant planting in the front garden. It was suggested that the unsuitable window in the porch be changed if this

application were to be granted. It was also suggested that the applicant should be encouraged as far as possible if this application were to be granted to change the rear windows to the property which are very unsympathetic. The Conservation Officer pointed out that the owners had already been approached concerning grant aid for the rear windows.

5. **W20001708 - Gordon Street, Leamington Spa - Erection of a detached dwelling with parking area (rear of 45 Russell Terrace)**

Concern was expressed that this could set a precedent for dwellings on this side of Russell Terrace which currently has no other residential properties with the exception of one original building on this side of the street. Concern was expressed at the loss of private garden to No. 45. The site plan showed the limited rear gardens of the properties on this side of Russell Terrace compared with those on the south side of Russell Terrace and the south side of Leam Terrace, where there are much larger gardens capable of taking properties at the rear. It was also considered the outlook from the property would be very poor over the roofs of garages.

6. **W20001711 - 59 Parade, Leamington Spa - Installation of 60 cm satellite dish**

There was no objection to this subject to it not being visible from any public areas. Some concern was expressed at the level of clutter on the roofs of the Royal Priors, however, this is generally not visible from the street level.

7. **W20001715 - 4 Church Street, Leamington Spa - Retention of garage for repair and service of vehicles (retrospective application)**

It was considered that this was an unsuitable location for such a business to be carried out and would set an unsatisfactory precedent and was detrimental to the setting of the Listed Building, and should be refused.

8. **W20001720 - Quicks, Station Approach, Leamington Spa - Erection of two apartment buildings containing 201 apartments and associated infrastructure**

Concern was expressed initially that this proposal would destroy the land allocation proposals set out for Site D which included for turning the station round and improving this area with public access. It was suggested that reference should be made back to the proposals set out in the Site D study. It was also suggested that a design brief would need to be prepared for this site. The proposals were considered to be overdevelopment with many of the flats having a very poor aspect over the railway lines. The social housing in particular had only aspects over the railway line or former coal yard. Concern was also expressed at the stopping off of the upper section of Station Approach thus destroying the existing one way system. Significant concern was expressed that the buildings would be visible over the top of the properties in Avenue Road across the bowling green. They would also be very visible at a distance travelling down Adelaide Road and would have a particularly dominant and detrimental effect upon this part of the Conservation Area. The design of the buildings was considered particularly unsuitable and it was generally considered the scheme should be refused.

9. **W20001020/21LB - The Other Place, 114-116 Warwick Street, Leamington Spa (Formerly Prince of Wales) - Part demolition of rear single storey extension, construction of new conservatory; reinstatement of lantern and repositioning of front door**

In terms of the new front door it was considered that a single large door would be more appropriate than a pair of double doors if the door is to be relocated to the centre of the building. Internally, concern was expressed at the loss of various sections of original wall which it was

RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 25TH JANUARY 2001

considered it may not structurally be possible to remove anyway. It was felt that where possible these walls should be retained. In terms of the conservatory, concern was expressed at the vulnerability of glazing adjacent to the footway. It was considered that the existing rear extension is an appropriate form of stop end to the building and should be retained. It was also considered that the seating out area is considerably in appropriately located overlooking the access to the kitchen and the bin store.

It was pointed out that this public house, together with the Star and Garter, are two of the oldest public houses in the town and, therefore, the retention of as much historic integrity as possible is important. It was also suggested the staircase be inspected to ensure that the modifications are not destroying any historic fabric. It was suggested that the unsympathetic side door adjacent to the rear extension should also be changed to a more appropriately designed door.

10. **Date of Next Meeting**

20001.