



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 17/05360/AR

ADDRESS: Northgate House, Upper Borough Walls

PROPOSAL: Display of 1 no. internally illuminated letters sign above entrance to Northgate House, 1 no. temporary PVC banner to be installed on the corners of Upper Borough Walls and A 3039, 1 no. letters sign on external wall between the first and second floors of Northgate House with 2 no. temporary PVC banners either side of this lettering and 1 no. projecting sign above current TK max sign, on Upper Borough Walls.

CASE OFFICER: Dominic Battrick

DATE: 12 November 2017

### COMMENT:

\*\*\*\*\*

Bath Heritage Watchdog strongly objects to this application.

Although Northgate House is not listed, it is located in the Bath Conservation Area and is in the setting of listed buildings, not least the Grade I listed Guildhall.

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.

We first have to comment on the fact that there are no scale drawings of the proposed signage. Whilst photomontages give a good indication, they are no substitute for accurately scaled drawings. We do not consider this application should have been validated without such drawings.

### SIGN 1

The use of acrylic is unwelcome. We would suggest offset anodised metal lettering. The illumination should be removed.

### SIGN 2

Although this may be described as ‘temporary’ it is clear that it’s inclusion in the application means that it is not. Either way this sign is excessive, tacky and unnecessary. It could also be considered a distraction to drivers. It should be removed from proposals.

### SIGN 3

This sign is also superfluous and should be removed from proposals.

Should officers consider a sign acceptable in this location, as with sign 1 it should be of anodised metal lettering and all illumination removed.

### SIGN 4

Again although stated to be ‘temporary’ their inclusion in the application effectively means they are not. Again the use of such PVC banners is not considered appropriate, especially in the setting of listed buildings, not least the Grade I listed Guildhall. These signs should be removed from proposals.

### SIGN 5

This sign is undesirable and again not considered necessary. If officers consider a sign appropriate in this location it should be a timber hanging sign and traditionally signwritten. Illumination should be removed.

This sign is to be located above the existing TK Maxx projecting sign. We have searched the portal but have been unable to find consent for this sign, nor any of the TK Maxx signage. It therefore cannot be taken as a precedent and indeed the matter should be referred to Enforcement to deal with this matter.

### SUMMARY

The works as proposed are 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 Policies DW1, CP6, D1, D2, D3, D8, D9, D10, and HE1 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be revised or refused in its current format.