



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/04502/AR

ADDRESS: 7 Edgar Buildings

PROPOSAL: Display of 3no. Replacement window vinyl graphics. 1no. non-illuminated projecting sign with painted timber panel. 1no. Retractable awning with sign written graphics. 1no. Clinicians sign. 1no. Opening hours sign. 1no. removable post sign in planter

CASE OFFICER: Emily Smithers

DATE: 12 October 2018

COMMENT: OBJECTION

\*\*\*\*\*

Bath Heritage Watchdog 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 are disappointed to find this application is a bit of a corporate ad-fest. Whilst we recognise that businesses need to make their existence known, in the case of establishments such as dentists, doctors, etc it is less of a case of passing business than those such as retail.

We take aspect of the application in turn

#### BRASS PLAQUES (CLINICIANS SIGN)

There is no objection to the proposed plaques. This is the traditional signage for such professional establishments.

#### BRASS PLAQUES (OPENING TIMES)

Although this is traditional signage we do not consider it necessary. Opening hours can be easily displayed in other ways. If it is to be considered then we would suggest the removal of the name plate and the contact plate which are superfluous.

#### AWNING

We strongly object to the awning which clearly has no other purpose than for advertising (no justification has been provided). No historic context has been provided nor does there seem to be any evidence to the façade of the building that there may have been one in the past. The fixings would cause considerable damage to the façade where at present the stonework is in good condition. Awnings are not traditional over a traditional doorway.

This aspect of the application should be omitted.

#### PLANTER POST SIGN

Although we recognise that there are already planters at the entrance to the building, they are traditional in form. The planter post sign proposed uses aluminium which is an inferior material for use in a listed building. If a sign is to be considered it should be constructed from timber and traditionally signwritten.

We consider that proposed to be excessive in size and would further clutter the area.

This aspect of the application should be omitted.

#### PROJECTING SIGN

We object to the introduction of a hanging sign. There are none at this height at present and we consider that this addition would spoil the extent of the terrace and it would be difficult to resist further signs if given consent. The size is also excessive.

The proposed bracket is modern in style and lacks finesse.

This aspect of the application should be omitted.

## WINDOW VINYL

Whilst it is appreciated that these are to replace existing window vinyls we would suggest as an alternative the use of blinds.

## 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, D4 D8, D9, D10, NE1 and HE1 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be revised or refused in its current format.