



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/05562/FUL

ADDRESS: 39 Milsom Street

PROPOSAL: Installation of 1no. canopy above the main entrance door to the western (front) elevation (Retrospective).

CASE OFFICER: Helen Ellison

DATE: 22 December 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.*

As the application acknowledges the offending canopy has already been installed. Unauthorised works to a listed building are a criminal offence and cannot be condoned. The applicants cannot claim ignorance to this having gone through several previous listed building applications for the establishment of the restaurant. We therefore consider their complete disregard of this particularly concerning. Using retrospective applications shows disdain for the democratic planning processes.

Strong justification for works to a listed building should be given. In this case the narrowness of the entrance and therefore lack of waiting space meaning customers waiting outside with the canopy required to give shelter.

We find this reasoning extremely spurious and unacceptable. The applicants applied for the change of use from a bank to a restaurant and at that time the future layout of the building was decided upon. It is at this point in time that consideration should have been made for such matters.

Somersetshire Buildings are Grade II\* listed and form an important focal point in Milsom Street. It is architecturally detailed and it is argued that there is already too much clutter to the frontage in the form of planters, A boards etc. The canopy is clearly obtrusive and incongruous and upsets the overall balance of the frontage. The addition of the signage to the front of the canopy is also unacceptable. Additionally it obscures the decorative fanlight over the door.

The applicants state that 'concerns' were raised when the canopy was included in the original listed building application. In fact the canopy was widely condemned hence being removed from the application. We see no change in circumstances to reconsider this.

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, D8, D9, D10, and HE1 of the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan and should be refused.

The applicants should be given a very short timescale in which to remove the offending canopy and make good any damage caused by the fixings.