



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/01138/REG03

ADDRESS: Street Record, Southgate Street

PROPOSAL: Installation of broadband network access points at various locations across the city

CASE OFFICER: Anna Jotcham

DATE: 2 August 2017

COMMENT: REOBJECTION

\*\*\*\*\*

We note the additional photomontages which have finally been provided. We have reviewed the individual locations and our position remains one of objection.

We make the following comments:-

AP1	We strongly oppose the use of an extension pole in this position. It is incongruous in the locality and clearly impacts on the views of Charles Street and especially Holy Trinity Church
AP2, 3 & 4	Neutral impact therefore no objection
AP5	We strongly oppose the use of an extension pole in this position. It is incongruous in the locality and clearly impacts on the views of Holy Trinity Church
AP6	Even if this lamp post is a modern copy, the installation of such equipment is incongruous. We therefore object to this position.
AP7	Neutral impact therefore no objection
AP8, 9 & 10	Neutral impact therefore no objection
AP11	The impact on the locality, especially Beau Nash House (Popjoys) is unacceptable. We therefore object to this position
AP12	Less damaging than first proposed, but we still have concerns given this most important setpiece.
AP13	Would appear fairly neutral but we still have concern
AP14	Remain concerned. If this is to be permitted we would request some of the other clutter on the pole be removed.
AP15	The extension pole is incongruous and the impact Milsom Street (Lloyds Bank building) is clear to see. We strongly object to this position
AP16b & AP17	We oppose this position due to the impact on the Grade II* listed Northumberland Buildings

AP18	Remain concerned but less harmful than that originally proposed
AP19	There is already enough clutter fixed to what appears to be an historic lamppost, therefore not considered acceptable unless other clutter is removed.
AP20	The position is totally incongruous with the style of lamp post. An alternative position should be found.
AP21	The extension pole is totally incongruous and would adversely impact on one of the setpiece views in the city towards the Circus. We strongly oppose this location
AP21b	No provided so presumably removed from proposals
AP22	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP23	Concerns at impact on the Grade II* listed Mineral Water Hospital. Would request other clutter from the post is removed to offset.
AP24	Location is incongruous. Could the equipment be moved to the top of the post where it would be less obvious.
AP25	Extension pole is totally incongruous and therefore harmful to the listed Post Office. We strongly object to this location.
AP26	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP27	Strongly object due to impact on the architectural detailing of the listed Saracens Head
AP28	Could the equipment be located behind the CCTV camera to lessen the impact
AP29	Strongly object due to the impact on such a sensitive position.
AP31	Use of an extension pole is unacceptable. Object to this position.
AP32	Harmful to the setting of the Guildhall. We strongly object to this position
AP34	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP36	Considered unacceptable due to harm to the Roman Baths complex. Equipment is completely incongruous with the style of lamp. We therefore strongly object to this location
AP37, AP38	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP39	Would be less incongruous if moved towards the top of the lamp post
AP40	Less harmful than first indicated but remains concerned
AP41	Strongly object due to the adverse impact on the Grade II* listed railway station
AP42, AP43, AP44	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP45b	Not desirable but less harmful than first indicated
AP46, 47	Concerns remain due to the impact on the listed buildings
AP48	Fail to see why another piece of equipment is proposed given the close proximity to AP47. Incongruous with the style of lamp post. We object to this position.
AP49, AP50	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP51	Less harmful than before but question the requirement given the close proximity to AP49 & 50
AP52	Appears neutral therefore no objection
AP53	We object to this location given the impact on photos taken of the Abbey Tower from this position, where the coaches drop visitors
AP55a	This is clearly harmful to the Empire Hotel. We strongly object to this location

Given the substantial harm to the historic environment described in the above table, we do not believe that any public benefit is sufficient to outweigh the overall adverse impact. Nor do we believe it is actually as beneficial as it claims to be: free wifi is already available inside and outside most pubs, cafes and restaurants and several other retail premises, many local buses, and from BT and Virgin Media installed wifi hubs (for those of their customers away from home). Most tourists already have internet access via mobile phone technology on their smartphones too.

This comment should be read together with our original objection, the overall tenet of which remains.

Should these locations and this application be given consent, it should be on the condition that no more such equipment is proposed. We should be aiming to reduce unnecessary and harmful clutter and we would like to see a concerted effort in this.