

## **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM HELD ON 18TH DECEMBER 2003.**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs C Hodgetts, Councillor C Davis, Councillor B Gill, Mr J Turner, Mr J Darwin, Mr M Faulks, Mrs R Bennion, Mr P Edwards, Mr L Cave, Mrs J Illingworth

**APOLOGIES:** There were no apologies.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Faulks who will be representing the Georgian Group. The Chairman also thanked Mr Darwin for his valuable contribution as the Georgian Group Representative.

### **Record of Proceedings.**

The record of the previous meeting was accepted as a correct record.

### **Leamington Spa Items.**

#### **1. Former Dixon's Building, Warwick Street.**

The Conservation Architect explained that the current approval had been granted as modified extending opening hours to midnight and not 1 a.m. The owners will also be required to provide a log book of opening hours which should be made available to the Planning Department.

#### **2. 30 Portland Place (Million Pound House).**

The Conservation Officer gave an update following the showing of the programme where items of concern had been illustrated. The presentation had not brought out the discussions and reasons behind certain of the alterations made to the building, which was unfortunate both from a professionals point of view and also from the lay persons understanding of restoration of a listed building. Enforcement action had been threatened in respect of the glazing bars to the windows however the BBC have now agreed to rectify those in the ground floor window.

#### **3. CAAF Annual Review**

The Conservation Officer gave a brief resume of the annual report requirements and invited discussion on topics of membership, effectiveness, administration and presentation, and member and officer time. It was felt that members that do not attend should be contacted in writing and it was suggested that if they do not wish to send a representative they may wish to relinquish their place on the Forum. It was also pointed out that members should represent the Forum first and their society second. It was suggested that maybe the Kenilworth High Street Traders Association may wish to be represented instead of the Kenilworth Chamber of Trade. In terms of effectiveness Councillor Davies said that the comments of CAAF were appreciated by the Planning Committee, however it was pointed out by the Chairman that there had been a problem with not coinciding properly with the Planning Committee cycle and therefore CAAF comments not appearing in the Planning Committee reports. This had now improved but needed to be monitored.

Concerns were expressed at the standard of drawings being accepted on certain applications which it was felt were inadequate to fully explain the scheme. Some discussion took place as to whether there is a standard format of acceptability which could be followed, although it was appreciated that this was not a direct CAAF issue.

4. **W20031678 – 22, Clarendon Street, Leamington Spa  
Kitchen Extension.**

The general principle was accepted, however some concerns were expressed at the design of the new French doors and the kitchen window.

5. **W20031787 – 18, Royal Priors, Lower Mall, Leamington Spa  
Proposed Change of Use of Shop Front from A1 (Retail) to A3 (Food and Drink)  
and the erection of glazed extension window entrance doors.**

It was felt that this was an erosion of the open space around the shopping centre and looked bitty and awkward. Some concerns were expressed at the change of use from A1 to A3 when this can be controlled for café use only.

6. **W20031799 – 38-40, Regent Street, Leamington Spa  
Display of Projected Illuminated Shop Sign.**

This was considered to be too large and inappropriate in its proposed location. Also there was no indication how the sign was to be illuminated on the drawings.

7. **W20031835 – Land Rear of 9, Guys Cliffe Road, Leamington Spa  
Erection of a Dwelling in Guntery Terrace.**

There was no objection to the principle of a dwelling in this location. Some concerns were expressed at the appearance of the gabled roof next to the existing hipped roof, however it was suggested that the scheme as proposed could be acceptable providing the pitch of the new roof corresponds with that of the adjoining dwelling so that in the future the two roofs could be joined together if the neighbouring hipped roof was infilled.

8. **W20031846 – 106, Parade, Leamington Spa  
1 Number Set of Illuminated Letters. Logo and underline, overall 5860 mm by 450  
mm; Capital letter N 270 mm.**

This was considered inappropriate on this building and the existing signage to be much more appropriate in this location. The underlining and logo are against the Council's policy for the Parade and the type face and use of a metal finish to the fascia were all inappropriate in the conservation area. It is also unclear from the drawing whether the letters are in fact halo illuminated or will allow light through the front face which again would be inappropriate. It was suggested that the applicant be encouraged to restore the whole building back to its original Georgian appearance.

9. **W20031850/52LB – 20, Portland Place West, Leamington Spa  
Installation of 2 Basement Sash Windows to Front Elevation, Two Roof Lights to  
Front Roof Slope to basement doors in rear elevation two patio Doors, and at  
Ground First Floor Level, Replacement sash windows at Second and Third Floor  
Level and Roof Dormer Window.**

The change of this back to a single dwelling together with the reinstatement of many missing architectural details was to be welcomed. It was felt that the balcony had been drawn slightly wrongly as it did not appear to match quite exactly the proportions of the adjacent existing balconies and this needed to be looked at.

10. **W20031868 – 42, Granville Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Formation of Room in the Roof Space with Rear Dormer Extension.**

It was felt that the dormer window was rather too large and the drawings were inaccurate as one showed the ridge of the dormer well below the main ridge and the main section showed it almost above. It was suggested that possibly this could be reduced in height to try and reduce the impact of the dormer.

#### **Kenilworth Items**

11. **W20031843/45LB – 40, New Street, Kenilworth**  
**Erection of Rear Bay Window at Ground at First Floor, enlargement of Front Light Wells and Reduction of Ground Level to Rear to Create Patio at Lower Ground Level and Various Internal alterations and alterations to conservatory.**

This currently a relatively unaltered very good Grade II Listed Building and the proposals to alter it are very extensive and will drastically alter certain aspects of it. In particular the lightwells at the front were considered inappropriate as no other properties have such large lightwells in that part of New Street. Also the alterations to the back are very radical and remove original sash windows and significantly alter the appearance at the back of the building. It was felt a much more modest approach to the restoration of the building would be more appropriate.

#### **Warwick Items**

12. **W20031808 – 13, Swan Street/50 Brook Street, Warwick**  
**Change of Use from Retail (Class A1) to Restaurant (Class A3), Staircase to rear and new shop front.**

Objections were made to the change of use from A1 to A3, however architecturally it was felt that the new shop front would improve the corner of Swan Street and Brook Street. Some concerns were expressed at the appearance of the new staircase to the rear. It was also pointed out that advertisement consent would be needed as it appeared that the signage may be illuminated.

13. **W20031728 – 4, St Nicholas Church Street, Warwick**  
**Erection of a First Floor Extension.**

It was felt that a simple brick extension would be much more appropriate subject to the first floor extension abutting the original building not affecting the timber framed back wall. The opening between the new building and the old building at first floor level may break through timber framing and this needs to be investigated. It was felt that the use of artificial timber framing was completely inappropriate in this situation. The windows are also inappropriate. Concerns were expressed at the standard of drawing and presentation of this item.

14. **W20031780 – The Abbotsford, 10, Market Place, Warwick**  
**Conversion to 4, Number Apartments (Ground, First, Second and Third Floors Only) Plus 4 Number Parking spaces.**

It was felt that this was an unacceptable conversion of this Grade II\* Listed Building. No attempt had been made to retain or return back to the original room sizes. A very peculiar bathroom with three large windows had been created to the rear of the staircase. It was felt that if this is to be used residentially attempts should be made to maintain the larger rooms possibly by limiting the amount of accommodation. It was also felt inappropriate to alter the rear door pattern. No indication is shown as to where bins

will be stored for the flats. Concern was also expressed at the future of the 1960's bridge link which no longer serves a function and should ideally be demolished or could even be infilled underneath to create the image of a separate building.

15. **W20031816 – 18, Neville Court, Castle Lane, Warwick**  
**Construction of a Balcony.**

It was felt that a balcony at this level alters the character and is inappropriate in this location as the strength of the building is in its simplicity.

16. **Date of Next Meeting.**

The date of the next meeting is 21<sup>st</sup> January 2004.