

*Mr. A. Mayes*  
*6508 (Direct Line: 01926 456508)*  
*amayes@wawickdc.gov.uk*  
*AJM/KW*

24<sup>th</sup> September 2001

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

**PRESENT:** Councillor W. Gifford, Councillor G. Darmody, Mr. D. Brown, Mr. M. Sullivan, Mr. L. Cave, Mr. G. Goddard-Pickett; Mr. P. Edwards, Mr. P. Birdi, Mr. M Baxter

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor Mrs. C. Hodgetts, Councillor G. Guest

1. **The Minutes of the Meeting held on the 17<sup>th</sup> August 2001** were accepted as a correct record.
2. **W20010483/484LB/485LB/486LB/487CA/488LB/489LB/499CA**  
**Regent Hotel and Site E applications, including application for 90 Regent Street**  
John Archer was welcomed by the Chairman to the meeting to give a presentation on the update of the applications for the Regent Hotel/Site E. Following presentation of the changes to the scheme since the last C.A.A.F. at which these applications were presented, comments were invited. It was pointed out that the comments taken at the meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> May would still be held current and any further comments made to day would be an addition to those previously recorded.

Mr. Goddard-Pickett requested clarification on the types of recommendation that could be given, and the possible date for a committee. Mr. Archer pointed out that this would only be once all information had been gathered from all consultees. Mr. Cave representing the Ancient Monuments Society tabled his comments in written form and these are attached to the minutes.

**Mr. Edwards** representing the Leamington Society tabled a press release from the Leamington Society, which is attached to these minutes. To this press release, Mr. Edwards added the following comments. It was considered by the Leamington Society that the Architecture is rather dull compared with that of the Royal Priors and Regency

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

Arcade. He reiterated the major concern of the Leamington Society was the loss of the hotel as a fully functioning hotel. It was clarified in Mr. Edwards statement that the previous application had not been called in by the Secretary of State, following the full councils resolution.

Mr. P. Edwards pointed out that in the statement submitted with the application, the terminology used in the first paragraph, “deteriorating fabric and lack of demand”, about the hotel is untrue.

**Mr. Baxter** representing the Victorian Society explained that the Victorian Society were pressing for the retention of the hotel as a working hotel. He is also expressed concern at the numbers and type of flats and the ratio of flats to shops in the scheme. It was considered that the first plan in the previous consultation was better, the architecture is now bland using mixed styles done poorly and cheaply.

Mr. Baxter pointed out that perhaps there should be a design brief for this site.

**Mr. Birdi** representing the Royal Leamington Spa Chamber of Trade expressed significant concern that the car park survey was a shoddy piece of work, slanted in favour of the developers. The lack of any additional parking and the removal of on-street parking in the town centre made the scheme unsustainable. It was felt that the scheme will not add to the vitality of the town centre.

**Mr. Brown** representing the Coventry and Warwickshire Society of Architects said that his previous comments were still valid and that he could see a lot of good things in the scheme. Elevationally, it was felt that the scheme was too repetitious with a hard kind of architecture. The fact that both sides of the new street were similar in appearance gave a blandness to the scheme. These comments are not opposed to todays technology and meeting todays needs and upgrading the hotel, however, it was felt that Benoy as architects could produce a better scheme. The Regent Grove elevation is a poor elevation which could be improved by the two centre bays being recessed giving added character to this elevation, more in line with the Regency rhythm.

**Mr. Sullivan**, representing the Royal Town Planning Institute, considered that the proposal does not comply with the Local Plan, and no explanation is given in Wilson Bowden’s statement as to why there is a non-compliance. The quality of the design is considered to be poor. It was felt that English Heritage’s response to the scheme did not give them much credence. It was felt that the hotel should be put on the market which would be in accordance with P.P.G.15 that the Council should advise the owners to do this accordingly. It was felt that the design of the new street was being led by Building Regulations needs to set the building back and thus create the single storey shops at ground level. It was felt that a tighter, lanes type, image should be created. It was felt that the architecture has taken a backwards step, particularly the move away from the classic approach in Regent Grove. It was felt that the height of some of the shopfronts

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

is excessive, indicating that mezzanines may be planned. In the design segments, reference is made to Leamington as a city which is quite wrong, and gives an indicator of the type of architecture that these designs would be best suited for, not provincial towns such as Leamington Spa. The treatment of the Regent Street buildings was considered highly unsatisfactory.

**Mr. Goddard-Pickett**, representing CLARA, circulated a written statement which is attached to these minutes. The following comments were added to the statement. CLARA want the memorandum of agreement brought into the public realm. This had been sent to Mr. David Ward. A viability study had been carried out by CLARA and it is considered that the last owners of the hotel were not working the assets properly. It was also re-stated that there was interest in the hotel being run as a single hotel, in the form of a niche market hotel. CLARA had been approached by Meridian who gave an offer to Mr. David Ward, this was eventually rejected. CLARA consider that the door is not yet closed to an operator coming forward who would run the building as a fully operating hotel. Under P.P.G.15, the viability situation should be viewed in terms of the previous offers made which could affect viability issues upon which the English Heritage decision was made.

Mr. G. Goddard-Pickett pointed out that at Solihull 1,800 new car parking spaces were being provided with their new development.

It was pointed out that CLARA did support the street concept of the design, however, they are concerned at the extent of A3 use on Regent Grove. It was felt that the design of the residential part of the scheme is very poor and it was felt that when the scheme had only 60 flats this was more appropriate and less cramped.

Councillor Gifford summed up the feelings of the discussion as follows:-

- There is a strong feeling to keep the hotel as a fully functioning hotel retaining the south wing. It was felt that it was still possible to be run in a viable manner as a fully functioning hotel and this potential had not been fully explored by the present developers.
- It was felt unanimously that the architectural designs were unsatisfactory.
- There was significant concern about inadequate car parking.
- The new street idea found favour in general.
- There was concern about the mix of shops and flats. There was also concern at the number of flats compared with the car parking spaces provided.

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

- There was concern about the waste disposal system. A waste disposal plan has been submitted and it was felt that this needed careful consideration to ascertain whether or not it would work properly.

3. **W20010963 - Barouque, 32 Clarendon Avenue, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of 400 mm high individual halo illuminated letters applied to existing fascia panels, 2 no. 670 x 600 mm externally illuminated projecting hanging signs and 1 no. 810 x 590 mm internally illuminated sign**

It was requested that the Conservation Officer negotiate a more appropriate sign as considered necessary.

4. **W2000964 - Bizz, Spencer Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Creation of two new staircases in western elevation, external staircase, erection of two sets of railings across the forecourt either side of front entrance doors to Spencer Street, installation of replacement windows to front elevation**

It was felt that the ground floor treatment to the main entrance could be improved upon with detailing reflecting rather more of the art deco nature of the building. It was also felt that the word "Bizz" should be centralised and placed in the panel below the main frieze rather than on top of it.

5. **W20010970/71LB - Rear of 35 Beauchamp Avenue, Leamington Spa**  
**Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey garage with store over access onto Trinity Street**

This was considered acceptable subject to it not becoming a residential building in future.

6. **W20010975/76LB - 55 Leam Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of a conservatory**

This was considered to be a traditional conservatory, replacing one that had previously occupied the site and, therefore, acceptable.

7. **W20010979/80LB - 53 Lansdowne Crescent, Leamington Spa**  
**Conversion of basement to one bedroomed self-contained flat, erection of a new garage installation, erection of external staircase, internal alterations**

Some concern was expressed at the loss of this as a separate basement as this is otherwise a single dwelling. Concern was expressed at the loss of the internal staircase and the loss of the original basement level windows to the rear of the property. The replacement french doors were to be welcomed. The rainwater pipe at the front as proposed was considered unacceptable. Some concern was also expressed at the double garage to the

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

rear of the building, with a pitched roof. It was felt that a single garage door in the garden wall would be a better approach with a flat roofed garage, possibly as a tandem garage if this is to take two cars.

8. **W20010983LB - 66 Clemens Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation of street light (on front elevation)**

This had already been granted but was considered acceptable.

9. **W20011020 - 7 Park Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of 1 no. 800 x 800 mm curved fascia panel externally illuminated, 4 no. spotlights and 1 no. 800 x 800 mm non-illuminated hanging sign**

The curved fascia sign was considered unacceptable, together with the spotlights which are contrary to the Council's shopfront policy.

10. **W20011021 - 30 St. Mary's Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of a rear single storey extension**

The extension was considered acceptable in principle, however, it was considered that the treatment of the windows in the gable elevation could be improved upon to make them more in character with the rest of the house.

11. **W20011022 - 53 Clarendon Avenue, Leamington Spa**  
**Conversion of dental surgery with living accommodation to three flats including alteration to door and windows and insertion of a new rooflight to rear slope**

This was considered an acceptable change subject to appropriate detailing. Concern was expressed that the inappropriate large dormer window at the second floor level should be changed or improved upon as part of these alterations.

12. **W20011023 - 23 Dale Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Change of use of printers and offices to offices**

This was considered acceptable. It was pointed out that the toilet was internal and had no apparent means of ventilation.

13. **W20011024/25LB - 56 Bath Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Retention of internally illuminated fascia signs to rear elevation (retrospective application) and display of non-illuminated lettering to front elevation**

The proposed replacement lettering to the front elevation was welcomed. It was considered acceptable to retain just one sign to the rear elevation. The lighting conduit on the rear elevation should be painted to match the wall colour.

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

14. **W20011028/29LB - The Works, Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of set of 300 mm high individually halo illuminated letters to read The Works and 2 no. non-illuminated logos either side and installation of 300 mm high individual illuminated fascia letters and non-illuminated logos and installation of ornamental beading to form panelling to stall risers and doors**

The lettering was considered to be acceptable without the book logos. The rest of the shopfront was generally considered acceptable.

15. **W20011032 - Land r/o 11 Milverton Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of a detached dwelling, re-siting of access and removal of timber fence**

It was pointed out that Woodbine Street is a very narrow street and that there are no new dwellings on that side of the street. It was considered that it would be unacceptable to set a precedent for new dwellings on that side of Woodbine Street. It was also felt that the design was inappropriate and the patio at the front unacceptable in design terms.

16. **W2001133 - 6 Lillington Road, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation of a pitched roof to a single storey extension**

This was considered an acceptable improvement.

17. **W20011034 - 101 Leam Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of uPVC conservatory**

In the circumstances, this being a modern dwelling, it was considered that a uPVC conservatory would be acceptable.

18. **W20011035/36LB - 2 Newbold Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Change of use and conversion of basement to an access centre**

This was considered acceptable.

19. **W20011055/56 - Garden Apartment, 32 Portland Place West, Leamington Spa**  
**Retention of rear conservatory (retrospective application)**

This was considered to be unacceptable on a prominent elevation of these Listed Buildings. Concern was also expressed at the fence in the car park area and the lack of gates closing off this area, thus exposing the fence. It was felt the conservatory should be removed.

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

20. **W20011061/62 - Walton House, 7-15 Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Installation of a 300 mm diameter microwave satellite dish**

It was generally felt that as this was only 300 mm, it would be an acceptable addition to the roofscape on this building.

21. **W20011063 - 15/17 Clemens Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of 600 x 760 mm non-illuminated hanging sign**

This was considered acceptable

22. **W20011065 - 19 Regent Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Retention of pole mounted sign**

This was considered unacceptable in its present location. It was felt that it could be wall mounted by the side of the first floor access door and also could be re-designed to incorporate to the Applejack sign which is currently above the suggested location.

23. **W20011069LB - 32 Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of non-illuminated fascia sign**

This was considered acceptable but concern was expressed that it had been carried out prior to consent being granted.

24. **W20011071 - Vogue International Retail, 2-4 Tavistock Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Alteration to front elevation and internal alterations, construction of new pitched roof with two rooflights and new flat roof to rear elevation**

Concern was expressed that the continuous fascia would no longer match the fascias on the adjacent shops. It was felt that the fascia would be taken higher than the adjacent shops and that combining the two shop fascias would create an unacceptably large shopfront which no longer followed the rhythm of the building above. It was also felt that the large v sign and v signs on the windows were inappropriate. It was also felt that the blocked doorway should retain the appearance of a doorway rather than a narrow window.

25. **W20011079 - 68 Russell Terrace, Leamington Spa**  
**Retention of vehicular access onto Farley Street (retrospective application)**

It was felt that the gates used in this location were inappropriate and that simple close boarded timber gates would be more acceptable.

Cont...

**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

26. **W20011081/82LB - 57 Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of non-illuminated fascia lettering**

This was considered acceptable, however, concern was expressed that it had been carried out prior to consent being granted.

27. **W20011087LB - 33 Regent Street and 40 Windsor Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Internal alterations to upper floors including provision of an additional bedsit unit**

This was considered acceptable. A satellite dish on the building was pointed out which does not have the benefit of consent.

28. **W20011124 - Royal Priors, Leamington Spa**  
**Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed refurbishment of the Royal Priors**

Some concerns were expressed at the loss of the present interior detailing to this building, in particular the ironwork which it was felt was very appropriate and relevant to the Leamington situation. It was suggested that the ironwork might be retained as part of refurbishment.

29. **Open Door Information Kiosk Panel, Clemens Street, Leamington Spa**

This was considered acceptable in the location against the bridge abutment. It was felt that the colour should be investigated as a garish colour scheme would not be acceptable.

30. **W20010850 - 25/29 Augusta Place, Leamington Spa**  
**Creation of basement lightwell and the erection of 2 dwarf walls and railings alongside**

It was felt that the staircase would be better located adjacent to the proposed area and thus the bin store could remain adjacent to the building in its present location, rather than being isolated in the new location to the south of the proposed staircase.

31. **W2001137 - 12 Leicester Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Erection of replacement fencing and gates**

This was considered acceptable.

Cont...



**ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY FORUM**  
**RECORD OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2001**

32. **W20011147 - Tesco Store, 22/28 Parade, Leamington Spa**  
**Display of non-illuminated fascia lettering sign to Parade and Tavistock Street, repositioning of replacement projecting sign and display of wall mounted welcome sign to Tavistock Street**

The signage was considered to be unacceptable because of its size, detailing and underlining. It was also noted that it was proposed to relocate the entrance doors to the shopfront. It was considered that a major refurbishment should be carried out to the front elevation of the building using timber windows and more appropriately detailed doors, with the fascia lettering set on rusticated rendering rather than the existing marble fascia.

33. **W20011148 - Royal Priors, Parade**  
**Change of use of part of retail to public conveniences and changing rooms**

This was considered acceptable.

34. **W20011153 - 51C High Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Change of use from retail to Internet café**

This was considered acceptable subject to the shopfront detailing.

35. **W20011156LB - 15 Charlotte Street, Leamington Spa**  
**Siting of satellite dish**

The drawings were considered inadequate.

36. **W20011157 - 19 Church Hill, Leamington Spa**

This was considered acceptable but details of the gate are needed.

**Date of next meeting**

Thursday, 4<sup>th</sup> October 2001.

P:\CAAF Minutes&Agendas\caaf minutes 13.9.2001.wpd