



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/01700/LBA

ADDRESS: The Westgate, 38 Westgate Street

PROPOSAL: External alterations to replace existing public house signage with new

CASE OFFICER: Sasha Berezina

DATE: 13 April 2017

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.

We maintain our objection to unnecessary illumination in the Conservation Area.

NPPF Section 12 ‘Conserving & Enhancing the Historic Environment’ para 128 –

‘In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary’.

No historic appraisal has been provided with this application. There is no mention of the listed status of the building, nor the location in the Bath Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. Whilst not expecting a major thesis the very least that is to be expected is consultation of the English Heritage Register which is easily accessible online.

This is a very poorly presented application, well short of that to be expected for a listed building. There are no large scale drawings of each sign or the fixings and information is missing on the proposed materials. We are also concerned as to whether there is an intention to change the colour of the paintwork. The photomontage appears to have a somewhat ‘orange’ glow similar to that on the Crystal Palace. No information has been provided. We do not believe that it should have been validated in this form.

Taking each sign in turn:-

SIGN 01

Although this is annotated on the proposed elevation drawing, no details can be found of what it relates to.

SIGN 02

The projecting sign is excessive in size (should be reduced by half) and is of a ‘bus stop’ style which is wholly unacceptable on a listed building. The existing hanging sign should be taken as a guide. It should be timber and traditionally signwritten.

SIGN 03

This sign is superfluous given all the other signage and should be removed from proposals. No accurate colouring is given with there being a considerable difference between the photomontage and the individual signage information.

SIGN 04

No objection to this sign. However we believe the brass plaque should be mounted on a traditional timber plinth.

SIGN 05

No objection to the menu holder. The photomontage appears to show illumination but this is not noted in the details. Clarification is required.

SIGN 07

LED lights along the façade of the building are completely unnecessary and unsympathetic. They should be removed from the application.

SIGN 08

The fascia sign using fret cut letters. In principle this is considered acceptable. Again clarification is required on the materials and how the letters are to be fixed.

The trough light is unsympathetic and should be removed from proposals. The retention of the current lanterns is preferable.

SIGN 09

No details are provided in respect of this sign.

SIGNS 12A & 12B

The signs should be timber and traditionally signwritten. We would suggest that one of the signs is omitted.

SUMMARY

Whilst appreciating that businesses wish to use their corporate identity, they should be prepared to amend their proposals due to the very special circumstances that existing in Bath.

The works, by virtue of excessive and disproportionate signage, the introduction of a huge bus stop projecting sign and unnecessary illumination is 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.