



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/03760/LBA

ADDRESS: Red Lion, 468 Wellsway, Bath

PROPOSAL: External work to facilitate the installation of external signage, both illuminated and non-illuminated

CASE OFFICER: Dominic Batterick

DATE: 26 August 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.*

The Red Lion is a Grade II listed building. It is disappointing to find another application for a multitude of additional and replacement signs, clearly forming a standard corporate approach.

We take each sign in turn:-

## SIGN 1

This sign is both unnecessary and wholly inappropriate in both design and materials. The location on the front of the Grade II listed building would cause substantial harm and it should be removed from proposals.

The pub is well known (even the roundabout is known as the Red Lion roundabout) and therefore the existing signage to the plat band is considered sufficient.

The proposed illumination is also inappropriate and unnecessary.

## SIGNS 2 & 5

Again signage to the listed building. Although painted signage is usually acceptable on a listed building, the signs are not considered necessary and again would be harmful to the listed building. They should be removed from proposals.

The proposed illumination is also inappropriate and unnecessary.

## SIGN 3

As this is to replace an existing traditional pub sign, we do not object in principal. However, the sign should be constructed of timber and be traditionally signwritten. The drawing provided has 'TBC' across it, therefore clarification is required on what precisely is proposed.

## SIGNS 4A & 4B

These can be considered an improvement on those already in place. We would prefer a traditional timber sign approach rather than aluminium.

## SIGN 6

This lantern is oversized and unnecessary. It would also create harm from its fixings.

## SIGN 8

Whilst we consider this sign unnecessary it is on a later wing extension and could be accepted. However the illumination should be removed from proposals.

## SUMMARY

The works as proposed 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.