



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/04521/AR

ADDRESS: Zizzi, 8 Sawclose

PROPOSAL: Display of internally illuminated fascia text and non illuminated fascia text

CASE OFFICER: Alice Barnes

DATE: 24 September 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.*

Although the application building is part of the new build and therefore not listed, it nonetheless forms part of the setting of numerous listed buildings, not least the Theatre Royal, Bluecoat School and the Gala Bingo Building. It is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument and is located in the Bath Conservation Area.

We are fully aware of the aspirations to convert this historic area into an 'eating quarter' but would hope that regardless of this that our comments are carefully considered in order to respect this sensitive location.

The 'ZIZZI' sign itself is stated to be made from polished copper. We have no objection to this but query whether actual copper is to be used given the likelihood that the verdigris that will form is likely to cause marking on the stone beneath.

We strongly object to the proposed use of '*Fairground Lights*' as part of that signage. Such lighting is cheap and lacks taste. It is not considered either appropriate or necessary. If illumination is deemed to be acceptable then we would suggest discreet external LED lighting, perhaps uplighters.

We are opposed to the use of acrylic/aluminium (presumably dibond) lettering for the other signage being an inferior material and also do not consider the pink colour as being appropriate.

Turning to the jumberellas, we consider them to be too large, swamping the entire area. The dark blue colour shown in the photomontages would be acceptable, but drawing 595806-3 states '*Pink RAL3015 Canvas Cover*'. Clarification is required. The use of the pink colour would not be acceptable. We also do not believe that there should be a logo on any of the jumberellas.

The proposed planters are considered acceptable providing they are well maintained. Again we do not believe it necessary or desirable for them to bear logos.

The works, by virtue of the use of an inferior material, unnecessary and inappropriate lighting, excessively large jumberellas and conflicting information leaving considerable doubt as to what is proposed is considered to be detrimental to the special architectural and historic character and interest of adjacent listed buildings, the Scheduled Ancient Monument 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 D1, D2, D3, D4, D8, D9, D10 and HE1 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be revised or refused in its current format.