



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/01556/LBA

ADDRESS: Unit 1, Retail Units, East End of Lidl Building

PROPOSAL: Retail fit out of retail unit that has been constructed by the landlord withing the listed former Herman Miller Building.

CASE OFFICER: Laura Batham

DATE: 31st March 2017

COMMENT: GENERAL COMMENT

Bath Heritage Watchdog submits a General Comment to this application.

As mentioned previously in our comments to 17/00810/AR and 17/01167/LBA we still do not believe the address point for these applications to be correct. We have checked all the applications, including the original consent for subdivision to 3 units and believe that the unit Hobbycraft intends to fill is Unit 2. Pets at Home are in Unit 3, with permissions granted for CarpetRight in Unit 1. This appears to be borne out by drawing J00075a-A2-00 D (Proposed General Arrangement Plan) which is actually annotated Unit 2. We believe all three applications need to be corrected

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.

We also maintain our objection to unnecessary illumination.

We are pleased to see that the applicants have responded to advice given to remove the proposed sign to the car park elevation. It is this which allows us to submit a general comment rather than an objection.

The sign is considered to be in an acceptable place. The use of aluminium is considerable acceptable in this industrial context, however the use of some sort of digital vinyl applied to the face is not considered appropriate. It gives a cheap acrylic appearance.

We do not favour illumination, however we note that the applicants have responded to advice to use external illumination rather than internal. This maintains a common style which preserves the visual integrity of the site.

We would also ask that the lighting is turned off outside of business opening hours via time switch and that constraint is conditioned as part of any permission.