



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/00499/AR

ADDRESS: Old Crown Inn, 131 High Street, Twerton

PROPOSAL: Display of 1no externally-illuminated fascia sign, 1no non-illuminated hanging sign, 3no non-illuminated aluminium signs and 1no lantern

CASE OFFICER: Emily Smithers

DATE: 11 February 2018

COMMENT: OBJECTION

\*\*\*\*\*

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

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 would concur that the building could certainly do with some attention and there is no objection in general to the design of the proposed signage. We do, however, have issues with certain aspects.

### SIGN A – Hanging Sign

There is no objection to the replacement sign. However, it should be timber and traditionally signwritten and not aluminium.

### SIGN B – Fascia

We object to the proposed fascia.

A traditionally signwritten timber fascia is preferable on a listed building. As there is already a timber fascia in place we would encourage this method. However we recognise that currently there are offset letters in place at present. If offset letters are to be used they should be either anodised metal or timber and not the inferior foamex currently proposed. Currently no information has been provided of their colour or that of the actual fascia.

The Sky Sports and BT Sports logos are superfluous and should be removed from proposals.

The removal of the swan neck lamps is supported, however we would recommend the use of LED spotlights rather than a trough light.

### SIGN C – Amenity Board

This sign is moved from the existing position. We do not consider there is justification for this relocation and indeed will simply involve the drilling of additional holes causing damage. If it is to be retained it should be located as existing.

Again we oppose the use of aluminium for the sign. It again should be either timber and signwritten or a chalkboard. Again the inclusion of Sky Sports and BT Sports logos should be discouraged.

### SIGN D – Lantern

We do not consider the addition of a lantern necessary.

### SIGN E – Plaques

Again the use of aluminium is proposed. We query the requirement of the ‘craft union’ sign and would recommend it is omitted. Whilst understanding the requirement of the ‘age 25’ sign, we query if this could be placed elsewhere, perhaps on an internal door or wall. It would simplify the front elevation and provide enhancement.

## SUMMARY

The works, by virtue of the use of inappropriate and inferior materials, the addition of unnecessary logos, signs and lantern, relocation of a sign and the lack of information regarding colours to the fascia and frontage are considered 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, 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.