



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/03412/AR

ADDRESS: Hobbycraft, Unit 2, Mero Retail Park

PROPOSAL: Erection of 1no low level non-illuminated sign

CASE OFFICER: Laura Batham

DATE: 30 July 2017

COMMENT: OBJECTION

\*\*\*\*\*

Bath Heritage Watchdog 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.*

It is unfortunate that the applications for the various businesses in this building have been submitted in an ad hoc and very confusing manner. The result, at present, is very cluttered and less than acceptable.

In respect of this application we note that the proposed sign has already been fixed to the road elevation of the building. This application should therefore be marked as retrospective.

The sign is a corporate standard and made of materials which are not considered acceptable for use on a listed building.

It is noted that the application for the totem sign for all the businesses is yet to be determined, the changed location of which at present is being debated as part of that application. We consider that given the close proximity of the totem sign to this application site, that should the totem be granted consent that all signage on this elevation of the building should be removed. The combination of elevational signage and a totem would be excessive and harmful at this location.

The works, by virtue of the use of inferior materials and the excessive signage to the building, are 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.