

WARWICK DISTRICT TOWNS CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM

MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS HELD ON 3 April 2008**

PRESENT: Councillor Ms J Dean
Councillor A Hatfield
Councillor J Illingworth
Mr J Turner
Mrs R Benyon
Mr P Edwards
Dr C Hodgetts
Mr O Brock
Mr M Sullivan
Mr L Cave
Mr M Baxter

APOLOGIES: Councillor N Pittarello

ANNUAL REPORT

Alan Mayes explained that the annual report had now been accepted by the EEPF and the members of the CAAF were thanked for their services. It had been suggested that the CAAFs from other local authorities be investigated and members were also encouraged to take the option to speak at Planning Committee. They were also reminded that surveys were to be carried out of the effectiveness of CAAF.

ARTICLE 4 DIRECTIONS

A discussion took place on the new Heritage Bill and the use of Article 4 Directions. Alan Mayes explained that this was something which the Council is currently investigating. It was also suggested that once the Heritage Bill is in place, a session could be devoted to the changes that will be taking place.

REFERRALS

21 Adelaide Road had been referred for the next Planning Committee and Mr Malcolm Baxter agreed to speak on this on behalf of CAAF.

LEAMINGTON SPA ITEMS

1. **W07/0317 – 21 Priory Terrace, Leamington Spa**
Pitched roof dormer window to second floor

It was felt that this was too large for the small roofs and did not follow the small scale detailing of these houses. The real benefit of providing it was also questioned as it would only create a very small room. It was felt that a small roof light above the existing window would be a more appropriate way of highlighting the space. It was felt that this current proposal should be refused.

2. W08/0322 – 86 Northumberland Road, Leamington Spa
2 story side and rear extension

The alterations to the front elevation, with the exception of the garage, were felt to be better as they appeared to retain the existing windows. Concerns were expressed at the small scale window on the garage extension and the unusual roof left by the extent of the first floor extension. It was suggested that the first floor window could be increased in depth. The rear elevation was felt to be less satisfactory and too complicated. It was recommended that the rear elevation and the treatment of the garage extension could be reconsidered.

3. W08/0332 / W08/0334/LB – 36 Willes Road, Leamington Spa
Replacement of hardwood and new PVC windows with painted French doors to first and ground floor. Replace UPVC windows with sliding sash windows on first floor of building

It was felt that the window replacements are to be welcomed, particularly the sliding sash windows. Concerns were expressed at the two French casements which had already been installed. It was felt that the fenestration of the casements was not appropriate and the use of a Juliet balcony in this location was also not appropriate. It was felt that some advice should be given on the replacement of the two casement windows where it may have been better to insert sliding sash windows.

4. W08/0339 – 15 Warwick Place, Leamington Spa
Formation of hard standing and cross over to front garden and off road parking

It was felt that this garden holds the fabric of the frontage in this part of the Conservation Area and that the loss of the garden would be very regrettable. It was therefore considered that this application, in line with the previous recommendations of the CAAF, should be refused.

5. W08/0346 – Workshop Premises, Spencers Yard, Leamington Spa
Retention of 1.1.5m high wall and proposed 1.1.5 palacade fencing with gates

Concern was expressed at the effect of the fence on the existing trees. It was felt important to get the right form of boundary treatment for this particular area of Leamington Spa. It was suggested that the two side walls could be increased in height to simple brick walls with a coping without piers and that the section between the trees could be palisade fencing set to avoid tree roots.

6. W08/0373 – 113 Warwick Street, Leamington Spa
Alterations to shop front including installation of new door to upper floors

It was felt that the present arrangement was not satisfactory and detracted from the shop front. It was suggested that either a lobby be created within the existing doorway serving both premises, or the second door be moved to the other side of the shop front. It was also suggested that the depth of the fascia

could be reduced, possibly the second signage incorporated into the arched panel above one of the doors.

7. **W08/0382 / W08/0386 – 2 North Villiers Street, Leamington Spa**
Creation of new room within existing roof space, including the construction of new pitched dormer to rear.

It was felt to be an oddly proportioned dormer, with no precedent from other dormers in this section of North Villiers Street. It was felt this should be refused as it is out of keeping with the area. It does not provide a particularly adequate living space.

8. **W08/0385 – 65 Regent Street, Leamington Spa**
Change of use from A1 shop to class A4 drinking establishment.

The counter arguments put forward concerning the previous refusal were considered by the CAAF. It was felt that arguments were not convincing and were taking certain statements out of context. CAAF still felt that premises were unsatisfactory without a disabled toilet at ground floor level.

9. **W08/0442 – Marlborough House, Holly Walk, Leamington Spa**
Replace existing purple coloured signage with stainless steel lettering.

It was recommended that the lettering should be reduced in size to 300mm and it would be better if moved to the left hand side of the building, as it would sit more happily with the asymmetry of the building. It was also recommended that, rather than stainless steel lettering, a darker solid coloured letter would be more appropriate.

10. **W08/0179 – Yew Tree House, 87 Radford Road, Leamington Spa**
Reconstruction and extension of orangery

Reconstruction of the orangery was welcomed, however its reconstruction, it was felt, should be detailed to match exactly the existing structure. One recommendation was to replace the glazed roof, however if this was felt impractical, it was felt that the slate roof was acceptable. Concern was expressed that the junction of the new structure with the bay window had not been adequately considered and this needed a more detailed study of the junction. It was also recommended that the retention of trees on the site should be adequately covered in the approval document.

11. **W08/0211 - 4 Cross Street, Leamington Spa**
Roof veranda at rear (retrospective application)

The structure was considered to be out of scale and particularly unneighbourly in this location. It was also felt this would set a precedent in the Conservation Area, which could considerably change the character of the Conservation Area.

WARWICK ITEMS

1. **W08/0420 / W08/0422/CA – 31-35 Smith Street, Warwick**
Proposed alterations and extensions to existing restaurants and shops and to existing flats

Concern was expressed at the changes to the front of the building, in particular the widening of the access and the introduction iron gates which it was felt were unsuitable in this instance. The balance of the building would be disrupted by the reduction of the shop front and the introduction of the wider archway. Concern was expressed at the loss of the original shop front (former clock shop) which retained its original shutters. It was felt it would be more appropriate to refurbish this and the adjacent shop to create the delicatessen shop, but whilst retaining the existing access to the rear. Concerns were expressed at the complete roofing over of the rear of the property with a flat roof and the loss of all the outbuildings. It was felt that a more acceptable approach would be to investigate the retention of some of the outbuildings and possibly glazing over the existing rear yard, thus creating much more interesting building as a restaurant. It was felt in its present form, the application should be refused.

2. **W08/0305 – Warwick Castle, Castle Hill, Warwick**
Installation of children's adventure playground and new access path

Significant concern was expressed at the location of the adventure playground which would be visible from the garden in front of the conservatory and would destroy the original concept of the tree belt and the historic planting in this grade 1 park. It was felt in its present location, the playground should be refused. It was suggested that the playground might be located in the car park by the loss of a number of car parking bays, or it could be located in the alternative position by the stables car park if a bridge access could be formed over the steps to the side of the stables. If it is felt necessary for the castle to have an adventure playground then this should be located where it does not affect the grade 1 listed landscape. Discussion took place as to whether the historic Castle does in fact need an adventure playground of this type.

3. **W08/0347 – Westgate Car Park, Puckerings Lane, Warwick**
Construction of transport interchange comprising five bus bays, bus station and four bus shelters waiting information room, pedestrian areas and car park information boards, pay and display machines, together with landscaping and lighting.

Generally, the introduction of the bus station in this location was accepted, however, it was felt that more landscaping in the form of trees was needed, in particular more evergreen landscaping that would be visible throughout the winter, possibly in the form of laurel hedging. Concern was expressed that buses should switch off their engines when parked in the bus station bays.

KENILWORTH ITEMS

**1. W08/0302 / W08/0304 – 17 Castle Hill, Kenilworth
Construction of conservatory to rear of house**

Concerns were expressed at the design of the conservatory and the fact that it had a solid base construction. A detached or more lightweight building may be appropriate, however, after discussion it was felt that this type of house, in particular this important group of late medieval houses, as viewed from Abbey Field should not be spoilt by the interruption of a conservatory. Therefore it was considered in this instance that a conservatory was not appropriate in this location.

**2. W08/0330 – 35 Castle Hill, Kenilworth
Extension of existing house.**

Whilst the retention of the building was welcomed, it was felt the present extensions overwhelmed it. Particularly at the side view, the rear extension masked the original pyramid roof and is a very large bland structure. Provision of a garage at the side also reduces the lightweight nature of the veranda. It was suggested that it may be more appropriate to consider having two smaller pyramid extensions, one to the side and one to the rear, rather than the large solid extension that is currently proposed, thus retaining the lightweight small scale nature of the group of buildings.

**3. W08/0406 – 41 Clinton Lane, Kenilworth
Loft conversion with flat roofed dormer window to rear elevation**

Given the selection of existing dormers in this location, it was felt that it may be difficult to refuse this particular dormer, although a better window detail was suggested, with more simple casements. Concerns, however, were expressed at the ground floor extension which was said to be permitted development. It was suggested this should be investigated. The impact on the neighbour would be significant and the impact on the interior of the house by reducing the available daylight.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING – 24 APRIL 2008