



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/02895/LBA

ADDRESS: Bath Sushi, 3 Victoria Buildings

PROPOSAL: Internal and external alterations including the painting of shop front, alterations to basement layout and erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing lean-to rear extension

CASE OFFICER: Chris Griggs-Trevarthen

DATE: 26 August 2017

COMMENT: OBJECTION

Bath Heritage Watchdog objects to this application in its current format.

There is no objection to the proposed rear extension and the removal of existing structures. This is considered to be an improvement.

Our objection relates to the proposed works to the shopfront, or what are stated to be proposed works to the shopfront.

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.

The elevation drawings appear to be showing the frontage going from a dark brown colour to a light brown colour, yet a site visit has shown that the existing frontage is a beige colour. It is not therefore clear whether this is to regularise the existing frontage or to change the colour again. Clearly the existing colour and signage is unauthorised as we cannot find consent online.

The only information provided is within the Design & Access Statement which simply says *'It is proposed that the exposed timber be treated with a water based colour to match the proposed elevations. To reduce the impact on the heritage asset care will be taken to minimise non reversible alterations to the shop frontage'*.

Although the existing and proposed elevation drawings denote a lighter colour, no information about that colour has been provided, nor a colour swatch or pantone reference. The statement refers to *'exposed'* timber. It is not clear what this means, nor what a *'water based colour'* is. There is concern that there may be an intention to carry out similar work to that at the neighbouring *'Burger & Barrels'* where a water based varnish has been used without consent and to the detriment of the building. The application cannot and should not be determined until such detailed information has been provided for public comment.

We are increasingly concerned at the overall state of this small rank of shops. No1 has signage not according to their consent, No2 has no consent and it would also appear that No3 has an unauthorised frontage. This is leading to a severe deterioration in the historic environment which we believe needs to be strongly tackled.

The works, by virtue of a lack of information leaving considerable doubt as to what precisely is proposed is considered to be detrimental to the special architectural and historic character and interest of 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 Policies CP6, D1, D2, D9, HE1 and ST7 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be refused.*