

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

24th April 2002

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 5TH APRIL 2002**

**PRESENT:** Councillor W. Gifford, Councillor G. Darmody, Councillor Mrs C. Hodgetts, Mrs. R. Benyon, Mr. Paul Edwards, Mr. L. Cave, Mr. M. Baxter, Mr M Sullivan, Dr. Forward.

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor G. Guest.

**SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS:** Dr. Forward acted as substitute for Mr. Brown.

1. **Minutes of meeting held on 4th April 2002.**

These were accepted as a correct record. Dr. Forward indicated that he had been present.

2. **Urban Mixed Priority Route for the Parade, Leamington Spa**

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Roger Bennett from Warwickshire County Council to introduce the scheme. Mr. Bennett explained that the Urban Mixed Priority Route must comprise traffic, pedestrians, cycles, delivery vehicles but is not a pedestrianisation scheme. A bid was made last May as the Parade fell within national criteria, the aim of which is to reduce pedestrian casualties. The bid was drawn up using material produced by the Town Centre Management Initiative Plan and incorporating other initiatives such as Route 66 bus priority and Sustrans Route 52 and the priority for Leamington Spa Old Town. The main theme of the bid was a 20 mile an hour speed limit, two lane traffic, segregated cycling, a bus gate and bus priority at the top of the Parade, together with integration for Route 66, Sustrans requirements and pedestrian priority, with non standard crossing fields. Bath Street would also be included in the option although this would not be funded by the main bid. A bid was made for £897,000 worth of work together with a further £200,000 worth of work to be paid for by Warwickshire County Council.

Once it was known the bid had been successful, a Working Group was established to focus on the options available and to facilitate ongoing workshops. The Working Group is chaired by Margaret Watkin and includes representatives from various interests in the Town Centre. Various ground rules were established by the Working Group to reduce casualties, introduce greater safety, reallocation of road space and to bring innovation into the scheme, and particularly recognising that the Parade is a significant street within the Conservation Area.

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 18TH APRIL 2002**

Mr. Bennett then opened the discussion. A question was raised concerning the bus shelters for Route 66. Concern was expressed that the flat top shelter recommended by the CAAF did not appear to be adopted.

Roger Bennett and Alan Mayes pointed out that the discussion is still ongoing and that the results of the full public consultation would be presented to Warwickshire County Council members. Roger Bennett pointed out that he had had discussion with Nicholas Ripley and Warwickshire County Council's Arts Officer and Regenesi concerning public art in the scheme. Some further discussion took place on an article concerning the sale of adverts on lampposts. It was felt by everyone that this was an inappropriate thing to do. The possible use of York Stone was discussed and it was pointed out that the funding would not cover this type of complete reinstatement.

The question of the inclusion of more pedestrian crossings was raised in line with the Town Centre Initiative Groups original recommendations particularly in the subsidiary streets which would be leading into the Town Centre Priority Initiative on the Parade.

Some concern was expressed at the loss of parking spaces on the Parade, in particular disabled parking and it was suggested that some passing bays could be introduced into the Parade to avoid excessive queuing. Concern was also expressed as to what would happen with emergency vehicles, given that there would only two lanes of traffic.

Significant discussion took place on the loss of the central light columns. It was felt by some members that this could be an improvement particularly if attractive light fittings such as those used in Clemens Street were fitted to the buildings. One member supported the retention of the light fittings and all members felt that the retention of a central reservation would still assist with crossing the road.

All members felt that the amount of street clutter needed to be reduced. The Parade needed to be looked at as a clean slate and all street furniture reassessed and grouped in an attractive format. The need for high quality materials were stressed by all members. The possible introduction of trees was discussed and generally felt to be inappropriate as the Parade had never been designed with trees. The possible introduction of some incidental trees to replace those which had been lost was considered, for example, the chestnut at the Post Office and other mature trees in Euston Place that had originally existed. Some concern was expressed at the use of public art and how this could be integrated into every day items of street furniture. The possible relocation of the bright obelisk to the top of the Parade was mentioned although this was felt to be inappropriate. Roger Bennett points out that some work would be needed around the obelisk.

It was generally felt by members that a visit from Mr. Waters from the County Council to discuss bus shelters was still needed by the Forum.

3. **W20020421LB - 86 Regent Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Change of signage on Listed Building**

The fascia sign was considered acceptable, however the 'V' sign and projecting light were considered inappropriate and it was felt that the 'V' and projection box should be

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 18TH APRIL 2002**

removed.

4. **W20020422/3CA - 3A Swan Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Demolition of existing building and erection of 7 No. dwellings**

This was considered to be over-development and whilst the site could be developed on a much more modest scale, the amount of overlooking and the intensity of the scheme was considered completely inappropriate.

5. **W20020424LB - 33-47 Royal Priors, Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Refurbishment of existing mall entrance as part of overall centre enhancement programme, specifically replacement of existing egg crate ceiling, panel floored tiles/entrance matting and external tiles**

It was felt that the use of mat wells would be an improvement to the slippery services on the sloping entrances. It was felt that samples of the material were needed and it was suggested that the Conservation Officer could take a delegated decision on these issues.

6. **W20020426 - 19 Priory Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Conversion of loft space, insertion of dormer windows to side elevation**

This was considered acceptable if it matched the other dormer window allowed on the similar buildings. It was suggested that the files should be checked against the previous approval.

7. **W20020434 - Royal Priors and Park Street Car Park, Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed construction of shopmobility facility**

This was considered acceptable.

8. **W20020438 - Flat D, 2 Warwick New Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of first floor rear**

This was considered acceptable

9. **W20020440/41 - 3 Oxford Place, Leamington Spa**  
**Demolition of existing workshop and erection of detached dwelling**

This was considered to be an inappropriate design for this site, in particular, too tall for the site, which would have an adverse affect on the surrounding area and provide unacceptable dwellings in this location.

10. **W20020431 - 8 Church Hill, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of two storey extension**

The loss of the bay window was considered unfortunate even though the building was not listed. It was felt that the proposed extension was not appropriate and did not enhance the rear of the building. It was felt that a section would more fully explain the building.

11. **W20020443LB - 20 Milverton Terrace, Leamington Spa**

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 18TH APRIL 2002**

**Single storey lean-to extension to kitchen**

Some concern was expressed that the lean-to was not in the normal position for an extension to these building. It was felt that the loss of an existing side wall and possibly loss of a traditional window was not acceptable. It was felt a more traditional window was not acceptable. Extension beyond the rear wing would be more appropriate

12. **W20020442 - 2 Woodbine Cottages, Woodbine Street, Leamington Spa**  
**UPVC Conservatory and dwarf walls to match existing brickwork and glass ultra framed roof**

It was felt this was inappropriate as it occupied most of the garden and was very close to the boundary. Significant concern was expressed that this would no longer be permissible under the Building Regulations. The use of uPVC was also considered unacceptable.

13. **W20020484 - 31 Lillington Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Demolition of existing garage and workshop, erection of detached two bedroomed bungalow with hardstanding (residential use), existing wall from Arlington Mews to be retained**

Various views were expressed concerning the provision of a bungalow or retention of the existing garden in this location. Concerns were expressed that the loss of town centre gardens was unfortunate, although some members felt that a bungalow could be provided subject to the wall and gates being retained. There was a general feeling that the gates within the wall should be retained and thus maintaining the existing appearance of Arlington Mews. (It had been pointed out that only the wall is within the Conservation Area).

14. **W20020330 - 30 Avenue Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Change of use from 3 flats to 5 flats**

This was a resubmission from the previous week. The scheme was fully explained. It was regrettably felt that the increase to five flats was acceptable given there were no external changes to the building and the surrounding uses of other properties.

15. **W20020496 - The Town House Hotel and Garden Café, 2 Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Removal of Condition 10 of planning permission no. W20011782 of the 22nd March 2002**

It was felt that the drop kerb should be reinstated and the areas between the buildings retained as pedestrian/patio areas as per the original approval and that vehicles should not be allowed into these spaces.

16. **W20020492 - 5 Leam Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Front door to porch in timber and trellis painted with covered canopy**

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 18TH APRIL 2002**

Mr. Paul Edwards withdrew as he was the agent for this application. This was considered acceptable as the house had originally had a similar porch.

17. **W20020497 - Arnold Lodge School, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Metal staircase and banister rail to Art Room**

This was considered acceptable.

18. **W20020508/09LB - 2 Victoria Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**New Brewery signage**

This was considered completely unacceptable in this location and should be refused. It was felt detrimental to the appearance of the Listed Building and not in character with it.

19. **W20020506/07LB - 1 Binswood Avenue, Leamington Spa**  
**Proposed change of use of part of Grade II Listed residential property for use as dental surgery**

It was felt that as this is a residential area it was inappropriate to introduce professional usages such as dental surgery. Concern was also expressed at the side entrance to the listed building and the need for a ramp which it was felt would probably not work in that location.

20. **W20020510 - 73 Willes Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Single storey sun lounge**

This was considered inappropriate as it is shown as uPVC. Concern was also expressed that it would not meet Building Regulations by opening up the wall between the house and the conservatory.

21. **W20020513LB - 21-23 Lansdowne Crescent, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation of boiler flue outlets to rear of building**

Concern was expressed that the boiler flues as shown would be obtrusive. It was felt that if it was not possible to re-route the flues into existing chimneys then a more discreet form of terminal should be investigated.

22. **W20020531 - 5 Adelaide Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Alteration/reconstruction of existing back kitchen**

Dr. Forward expressed non-substantial non-pecuniary interest in this application and withdrew. It was generally felt that whilst the kitchen could be extended/reconstructed the proposals as shown were inappropriate. Concern was expressed they appeared non symmetrical and that the high level glazing in the gable end was not appropriate for the style of building. It was also felt that the rooflights would properly not work as shown on the drawing. It was suggested that in the reconstruction of such a rear wing, it should be maintained monopitch with the party wall running down the centre.

23. **W20020500/501LB - Arden House, 18-20 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa**  
**New lift installation, alteration and reduction of existing dormers and internal**

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON 18TH APRIL 2002**

**alterations to existing third floor**

This was generally felt to be acceptable. Some discussion took place on the size of the reduced bay windows as to whether they should all conform to the same size. It was generally felt the chimney system masking the lift tower was ingenious and acceptable, however, it was suggested the chimney should be slightly higher to match the actual chimneys of the building.

24. **Date of next meeting**

Thursday 6th June 2002.