



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/03485/AR

ADDRESS: Best One, 17-18 Broad Street, Bath

PROPOSAL: Display of 1no internally illuminated fascia sign and display of non-illuminated mural and shop signage. (Regularisation)

CASE OFFICER: Nicola Little

DATE: 12 August 2018

COMMENT: OBJECTION

\*\*\*\*\*

Bath Heritage Watchdog 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 the use of illumination in the Conservation Area.

We first have to address the issue of the retrospective application. Unauthorised works to a listed building are a criminal offence and cannot be condoned. Ignorance of listing is not a defence where work is undertaken without the necessary consent. The listing is revealed in conveyance searches and the Historic England Register is freely available online. Advice on the Local Authority website is also easily accessible as is the 'Shopfronts Guide' which we refer to. Using retrospective applications shows disdain for the democratic planning processes.

There are several aspects to this application.

Firstly it is stated that the shopfront has been repainted using black gloss paint. Whilst we do not object to the use of black in this instance, the finish should be matt, eggshell or satin.

The newly installed sign obscures the arched window moulding and overlights which is unacceptable. This sign should be removed and any damage made good. There is an existing fascia board, albeit small, which is where a traditionally signwritten name can be put.

Turning to the window vinyls, again the one on the right also obscures the arched window mouldings and overlights to the detriment of the building. This should be removed along with the other window vinyls. We would suggest a suitably attractive window dressing would do more to attract customers than blanking out the windows completely.

Although the description of this application does not mention illumination, the parallel AR application does. It is clear that illumination is not only unnecessary but unacceptable.

We also note that no large scale detailed drawings of any of the signage has been provided for assessment.

The works 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, D9, D10, and HE1 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be refused in its current format.

The case should then be referred to the Enforcement Team to ensure the signage is removed within a short length of time.