WARWICK DISTRICT TOWNS CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM

Present: Councillor Mrs C Hodgetts, Councillor J Holland, Councillor B Gifford, Mr P Edwards, Mr M Sullivan, Mr L Cave, Mr M Baxter, Mrs J Illingworth, Mr J Turner.

Apologies: There were no apologies.

1. <u>Record of Proceedings</u>

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

2. The update of previous applications was circulated. The Chairman raised the issue of the condition of the workmanship at the Pageant House ramp, the Conservation Officer agreed to look into this matter.

Leamington Spa

3. <u>W05/1956/1957LB – The Voodoo, 35 Regent Street, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Erection of a Single Storey Lounge Extension. Addition of pitched Roof</u> <u>with Roof Lights, New Door and Window Openings and Erection of Bin</u> <u>Store/WC. Extension to existing Single Storey Rear Extension and</u> <u>Internal Alterations to Provide a new kitchen and new WC facilities.</u>

The introduction of a pitched roof was felt to be an improvement to the building and the lounge extension, if detailed correctly was felt to be acceptable as did marginally reduce the external drinking area. Concern was expressed at the possibility of having folding doors to all of the external openings which would open up the lounge area to the garden could increase the noise problems. It was proposed that all the new windows should be at least double glazed to reduce the noise emission. The need for roof lights was guestioned in the new roof. Introduction of French doors into the existing bay window in the original part of the building was felt to be inappropriate and it was suggested that this outstanding approval should be withdrawn. Concerns were expressed at the marguee which is erected as a temporary structure in the garden and it was felt if possible this should be controlled as a condition of granting the current application. It was also pointed out that the metal planters on the wall do not have the benefit of planning approval and their removal should be conditioned as part of any new approval to be granted.

4. <u>W05/1963 – 32a Clemens Street, Leamington Spa</u> Installation of External Roller Shutter and Three Number Cycle Stands.

Concern was expressed at the use of an external shutter which is not in line with the District Council's Policy Document on roller shutters. It was proposed that the shutter should be inside the window as a Council's normal recommendation. Concern was also expressed at the cycle racks in front of the shop window, it was suggested that these could be located in the recessed area adjacent to the shop, in front of Somerfields.

5. <u>W05/1967 – 61 Clarendon Street, Leamington Spa</u> Conversion to Form 3 No Offices and 3 No Self Contained Apartments Including Formation of Front and Rear Lightwells, installation of New Bay Window to Front Elevation, New Doors and Windows, Extensions and Roof Alterations to Rear Wing.

Concerns were expressed at the use of the basement as a dwelling. It was felt that a very large lightwell was required to make this into an adequate habitable space. It was suggested the basement should become offices and the living accommodation be located on the upper floors of the building. Concern was expressed that the door appeared to have no surround. Traditionally the doors in Clarendon Street have surrounds and in some cases hoods and it was felt that this should match the traditional hood on the adjacent building. It was also requested that the glazing bars should be reinstated to the first floor window. Adequate details of the railing should also be requested to ensure they are of a traditional design.

5. <u>W05/1967CA – 12 Gaveston Road, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Erection of a Rear Dormer Window Extension.</u>

This was felt to be totally unacceptable as it was a large box dormer which is considered completely unacceptable in the Conservation Area.

6. <u>W05/1905/1908CA – Rear of 49 Russell Terrace, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Erection of a Single Dwelling.</u>

The principal of a dwelling was considered to be acceptable in this location. It was felt that possibly a flat roofed building which could be disguised readily behind the high wall, would be more acceptable. Discussion took place as to whether it needed to mimic garages or whether a simple high wall with the dwelling hidden behind would be more appropriate.

7. <u>W05/1912 – 25, Highfield Terrace, Leamington Spa</u> Loft Conversion to Provide Bedroom.

As this is a large box dormer it was considered unacceptable in the Conservation Area.

8. W05/1914 – Kentmere House, 2a Union Road, Learnington Spa Erection of a proposed Single Storey Rear Extension and Conversion of Basement to Physiotherapy and Pilates Clinic.

Mr Cave declared an interest as he knows the people who live next door. It was pointed out that there is nothing else like this in the rest of the street; as although the adjacent house fronting Warwick Place has a similar rear extension, this does not extend to the road and is hidden behind the garden wall. It was felt that the extension was of a poor design and would set a very difficult precedent if permission was granted for an extension which brought the building right forward as far as the back payment. Concerns were also expressed at this approach to the physiotherapy studio which separated the physiotherapy activity too much from the dwelling as this is essentially a residential area. The use of the basement for physiotherapy purposes, accessible through part of the dwelling, was considered to be more acceptable. Concern was expressed at the loss of parking spaces by the creation of the new extension.

9. <u>W05/1918 – 37 Mary's Road, Learnington Spa</u> Basement Conversion to Existing House and Multiple Occupation.

It was pointed out that this is a cellar and not a basement and that significant lightwells needed to be created the likes of which do not exist anywhere else in St Mary's Road. It was therefore felt that this would set a difficult precedent and that the accommodation created would be very substandard anyway. It was therefore felt that this should be refused.

10. <u>W05/1865 – 65, Willes Road, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Change of Use From Dwelling From 8 Bed House in Multiple Occupation,</u> <u>For a Temporary Period Expiring on 30th June 2006.</u>

It was felt this should be refused as although only until June it would set a difficult precedent if it were to be granted. It was pointed out that DAP2 in the Local Plan supports the use of listed buildings, in their original use unless this is no longer viable which is not the case in this instance (concern was expressed that a window on the front and a window on the side had not been re-glazed with small panes and the Conservation Officer agreed to look into this matter).

11. <u>W05/1925 – 21 Claremont Road, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Construction of a Detached Garage.</u>

Some concern was expressed at the loss of the garden though consideration was given to the fact that a lean-to is to be demolished which is presumed will be returned to garden space. Concerns were expressed that if permitted the garage doors are painted an appropriate colour.

12. W05/1929 – 50 Warwick Street, Leamington Spa Extension to an Apartment at Third Floor Level.

The C.A.A.F. has already commented on this application previously and it was felt that nothing significantly had changed the same comments would apply. These included the obtrusiveness of the Mansard roof which is non traditional in Learnington Spa and the use of a roof deck at high level both of which were considered unacceptable in this location.

13. <u>W05/1945 – 6 Dormer Place, Leamington Spa</u> <u>Refurbishment of Existing Office Building and Three Storey Extension.</u>

Whilst the maintenance of the original building was considered to be of merit, it was felt that the proposed extension dwarfed the existing building and was significant overdevelopment of the site. It was felt that the additional floor added onto the existing building took no account of the design of the existing building and that the design of the new building behind also bore little resemblance to the scale and massing of the existing building or to its neighbours. It was felt that the riverside view would spoil the view of the river and would significantly detract from the Conservation Area. Concern was also expressed that the drawings showed no other buildings alongside and did not show how it related to the trees along the riverbank. Whilst the principal of an extension on the car park was considered acceptable this building was considered to be completely inappropriate.

Warwick

14. <u>W05/1893 – 17 Old Square, Warwick</u> <u>Display of Un-Illuminated Projecting Sign.</u>

It was felt that the sign was too high and should be lower, nearer to the line of the fascia. It was also felt that the drawings did not adequately indicate how the illumination would affect the sign. It was felt that a smaller sign with more discreet illuminations should be negotiated.

15. W05/1927 – 5-7 Jury Street, Warwick

Change of Use at Ground Floor From A1 (Shop to Mixed A3/A4 use) Restaurant and Bar. Installation of a new kitchen extract and air conditioning units to the rear, rear conservatory extension, extension, alteration to Existing Store and New Shopfront.

Concern was expressed on a number of issues relating to this application. Firstly the change of use to a bar was felt to be inappropriate in this part of Jury Street as there are already a significant number of bars within this part of the town. Concern was expressed at the folding doors to the front of the property which would effectively open up the restaurant to the street which

was felt unacceptable for this part of the Conservation Area. Concerns were expressed at the lack of bin storage and the need to bring all the rubbish through the main door of the building. Concerns were expressed that the upper part of the building is still residential and this could lead to disturbance from below. The fire escape is into the neighbouring garden which is unacceptable as this is a private residence. The large flue to the rear was felt to be unacceptable and there would be noise and smell disturbance from this usage. It was suggested that a residential mixed use scheme may be more appropriate on this site which would enable the concrete sectional building which is inappropriate to be removed.

16. W05/1971LB – 85 Whitnash Road, Learnington Spa

Internal and External Alterations, Removal of Sub Partition Walls and Installation of a Reclaimed oak Beam, Installation of New Doors to New and Existing Openings and Provision of Latex Coating to Existing Concrete Floors. Re-thatching, repaving and redecoration works, Erection of Replacement Fences and New Driveway, Entrance Gates, Driveway Extension, Excavation of New Pond in Front Garden, Demolition of Greenhouse.

The second application was also considered which includes the erection of a **garden room**. The alterations to the building itself internally, were considered to be acceptable generally subject to detailing be considered appropriate by the Conservation Officer. Concern was expressed at the design of the new fieldgate which was felt could be simpler.

The main concerns were expressed at the design of the new garden room. This was felt to be too solid and inappropriate for a Grade II listed building. The use of a flat roof and timber framed extension were all considered to be unacceptable. It was suggested that possibly a detached building in the garden or an extension to the garage may be more appropriate as a garden room rather than extending the building itself. This is a significant Grade II timber framed building in Whitnash which needs careful consideration in terms of any additions or alterations.

General Concern

- 17. Concern was expressed at the possible introduction of bollards onto the Parade to stop parking on the path, it was requested that design of these should be brought to the C.A.A.F.
- 18. It was pointed out that two health clubs in Bedford Street are for sale and that some consideration should be given to a design brief for this part of the town. The Conservation Officer did point out that some discussions have taken place on certain of the sites on this street and that he was aware of the need to take an integrated approach.

19. Mrs Illingworth raised an issue concerning an item on Part II. W05/1122/1942LB. It was pointed out that if the works carried out to created the privacy screen were instructed it would not be possible to carry out early alterations that had been applied for this property.

20. Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting is 19th January 2006.

I:\conserv\CAAF\CAAF 2005\MINS\caafmins - 29th December 2005.doc