



Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/03194/AR

ADDRESS: Twerton Mill, Lower Bristol Road

PROPOSAL: Display of 1 set of halo illuminated vertical text, 2 no. non-illuminated totems, and 2 no. non-illuminated roundels.

CASE OFFICER: Dominic Battrick

DATE: 27 July 2018

COMMENT: STRONG OBJECTION

Bath Heritage Watchdog strongly 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 maintain our objection to unnecessary illumination in the conservation area.

Twerton Mill student housing is in the setting of listed buildings, not least the Grade II listed Brunel Viaduct directly opposite. Therefore any harm to the protected assets has to be carefully weighed.

We strongly object to the use of any illumination for any of the signs. This is a main arterial route into Bath (which is well lit) and the building is well known and easy to find. Such illumination is unjustified and considered harmful to the listed assets and should be removed from proposals.

Sign 3 is a roundel to be fixed to one of the pillars of the monumental gateway. Whilst this gateway is not listed, it is an undesignated heritage asset, the last remaining vestige of the former Carrs Mill which was sadly demolished to make way for this complex. Given the size of the overall complex we see no justification for this sign or its position and it should be removed from proposals.

Sign 2 is for totem signs to be placed in two different locations. This form of signage is alien in this area and again they are considered to be unnecessary and undesirable. They should be removed from proposals.

The works as proposed are considered to be detrimental to the historic character and interest of the adjacent listed buildings, 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.