



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 16/01868/AR

ADDRESS: Lidl, Herman Miller Building, Lower Bristol Road

PROPOSAL: Display of 1no illuminated static pylon sign

CASE OFFICER: Martin Almond

DATE: 18 May 2016

COMMENT: STRONG OBJECTION

Bath Heritage Watchdog strongly objects to this application.

When determining all applications for new shopfronts and signage we ask that the following guidelines are observed.

The context, or general setting, of Bath should be understood, respected and reflected in any proposed work to shopfronts.

Design, materials and workmanship should be of the highest quality.

Any proposed or altered shopfront should be historically credible.

House styles which do not meet the requirements of style, lettering, materials and signs are not acceptable. Multiples should be required to adapt their proposals to the special conditions of the city.

Standard designs of any sort are not acceptable. They should be specifically designed for their context.

(Bath City Council: Bath Shopfronts, Guidelines for Design & Conservation 1993).

We also maintain our objection to unnecessary illuminated signage.

No justification has been provided for this sign. The store is in a well-known location, on a very busy arterial route and from the experience of members is not suffering from a lack of custom. We can therefore see no requirement for this sign at all.

The sign is proposed in the curtilage of a listed building and although one is not yet available for comment, it is considered that a Listed Building application is also required for this proposal.

The design and materials are garish and inappropriate and would be detrimental to the setting of the listed building and there is also concern at the danger that may be caused to traffic at a junction which is already becoming dangerous and pedestrians using the adjacent crossing.

It is also noted that a similar sign was previously proposed (14/03738/AR) and was removed from that application as it was considered unacceptable. Circumstances have not changed and no evidence to the contrary has been provided as part of the application.

The works, by virtue of excessive signage, use of inferior materials, strident colours and unnecessary illumination is detrimental to the listed building contrary to S16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 12 'Conserving & Enhancing the Historic Environment' of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy B4 and Saved Local Plan Policies BH2 and BH17 and should be refused.