



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/01970/FUL

ADDRESS: Pratts Hotel, 4-8 South Parade

PROPOSAL: Provision of pavement seating area and associated drop off area.

CASE OFFICER: Rae Mepham

DATE: 18 May 2018

COMMENT: STRONG OBJECTION

Bath Heritage Watchdog strongly objects to this application.

South Parade, dating from 1743, by John Wood the Elder, was part of a wider scheme for the Abbey Orchard, to rebuild a Royal Forum, including North Parade, Pierrepont Street and Duke Street, similar to Queen Square, which was never completed. Wood designed the façade of Bath Stone. The area which Wood envisaged as an area of sunken gardens matching the houses is now a car park. Historically streets such as South Parade, North Parade, etc were used as areas where the well to do would promenade. It is one of the key characteristics of Georgian architecture in Bath.

Whilst accepting that permission has previously been given for the use of some of the pavement for outdoor dining, this has been on a much smaller scale and without the use of jumberellas or other such clutter. The proposals as submitted are far more extensive.

It is disappointing having spent considerable funds restoring these buildings that they are then going to be extensively obscured by the installation of street clutter. Unfortunately the overall image from the 'concept' document is more akin to a line of fairground stalls than something which is appropriate in a Grade I terrace in Bath.

Certainly the removal of the jumberellas would go some way to lessening the visual harm that would be caused.

We are also concerned at the amount of damage that may be caused to the stone pennants from the constant scraping of metal furniture every day, both by customers but also staff who are likely to be less than careful at the end of a long day when packing the items away for storage.

Should proposals be given consent we would seek assurances that neither illumination nor external heating will be utilised.

The proposals, by virtue of the visual harm that would be caused to the Grade I listed terrace and pavement are considered to be 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, D4, D9, D10, and HE1 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be revised or refused in its current format.