



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/01046/LBA

ADDRESS: Sub 13, 4 Edgar Buildings, George Street

PROPOSAL: Internal and external alterations to install new fire doors, replace existing rear garden door with glazed door, extend rear doorstep, replace steel bars over rear lightwell, box in various electric cabling and fire alarm panels and attach new signage to front elevation.

CASE OFFICER: Laura Batham

DATE: 19 March 2017

COMMENT: 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.*

This proposal is for the addition of a sign at ground floor level.

There are no large scale drawings provided for the signage. Whilst photomontages are a useful tool they are no substitute for accurate scale drawings. Such information is requisite especially for listed buildings.

The sign proposed is to be constructed of a '*textured (mottled) aluminium tray and acrylic letters*'. Neither material is considered acceptable for use on a listed building – it should be a timber sign which is traditionally signwritten.

That proposed is excessive in size and would need to be reduced in size by at least half to be acceptable.

As can be seen where previous signage has been removed it has left scarring and holes. If any signage is to be permitted here then we would expect existing holes to be utilised.

We also note that there are a number of signs fixed to the railings at the pavement edge and one (similar to that proposed in this application) fixed to the external basement wall. We can find no consent for any of these and therefore believe them to be unauthorised. We would request that these signs are removed. If the applicants wish to apply for their consent this should be done in due course, though we would not consider them acceptable.

## **SUMMARY**

Companies must be prepared to tailor their corporate desires with the very special circumstances that exist in Bath.

The works by virtue of the use of inappropriate and inferior materials, excessive size and lack of scale drawings are considered to be detrimental to the special architectural and historic character and interest of the listed building, adjacent listed buildings and the conservation area contrary to S16 and S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 12 'Conserving & Enhancing the Historic Environment of the NPPF and Local Plan Policies B1, B2 and CP6 of the BANES Core Strategy and saved policies BH2, BH6 and BH17 of the BANES local plan and should be refused in its current format.

The unauthorised signage should then be reported to the Enforcement Team for the appropriate action.