



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/00834/AR

ADDRESS: Proposed Hotel, 7 Sawclose

PROPOSAL: Display of advertisements for the new Casino at Sawclose

CASE OFFICER: Helen Ellison

DATE: 4 March 2018

COMMENT: STRONG OBJECTION

Bath Heritage Watchdog strongly 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.

We maintain our objection to unnecessary illumination in the conservation area.

There are several aspects to this application and we take each one in turn:-

FASCIA SIGNAGE – SAWCLOSE & SEVEN DIALS ELEVATIONS

Offset acrylic lettering with halo illumination is proposed. This is wholly unacceptable. Any signage should be traditionally signwritten as is appropriate for a listed building. Illumination is not required or acceptable.

We also have concerns at the style of font which is overtly modern and does not sit well against the historic building.

We are unconvinced at the requirement for a fascia sign to the Seven Dials elevation.

HANGING SIGN

We are unconvinced of the necessity of a hanging sign. Although it is recognised that there is already a bracket in place we consider that a hanging sign in this position would be detrimental and appears in isolation from the ground floor of the building. The design of the sign is also poor. It would appear more logical to have a sign at fascia level, perhaps on the corner. We have searched the Planning Portal and cannot see that consent was ever received for previous signage which makes this unauthorised.

The proposed material for the hanging sign is not stated, though as it states '*double sided folded projecting sign*' it has to be presumed that this is aluminium with acrylic vinyls. Both aluminium and vinyl are inferior materials unacceptable on a listed building. If a hanging sign is to be permitted then it should be timber and traditionally signwritten.

The document also shows a photo illustrating hanging sign illumination. The drawing does not show such illumination. Illumination is unacceptable and unnecessary but the actual proposal needs to be clarified.

LOCKABLE CASE

The requirement for a lockable case is not stated. This is not a restaurant therefore it cannot relate to a menu. Its purpose is therefore questionable. Its design, size, materials and illumination are again considered inappropriate for a listed building. If the case is for information then we cannot see why this could not be hung in the window or perhaps internally.

The example given of the Zizzi case is irrelevant as that is on an unlisted building.

OTHER WORK

Although not shown on the drawings the CGI image clearly shows glass canopies over the casino entrance and the Regency Building. We have searched previous applications and cannot find previous consent for such structures. They are considered unnecessary and undesirable and indeed in sloping backwards towards the buildings are likely to cause damage by channelling rainwater onto the stonework. There is concern that this is an attempt to slip additional work through and confirmation is required that this is an error.

SUMMARY

The works, as proposed, due to the use of inferior materials, poor design, illumination and unnecessary additional signage 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.