



## Bath Heritage Watchdog

contact@bathheritagewatchdog.org

APPLICATION NUMBER: 18/05703/LBA

ADDRESS: 3-4 Bath Street

PROPOSAL: External alterations to include the provision of new signage and area of pennant stone floor outside premises

CASE OFFICER: Samantha Mason

DATE: 13 January 2019

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.*

Whilst the Planning Statement refers many times to a Heritage Assessment, none has been provided with the application. However, the building is Grade I listed and forms part of an important Grade I listed streetscape. This is the paramount consideration when assessing these proposals.

## BATH STREET ELEVATION

We have no objection to the painting of the timberwork the proposed grey colour and are pleased to note that an eggshell finish is to be used.

The internal perforated steel privacy screen is inappropriate and unacceptable. Bath Street retains its formal characteristic and this would be a harmful intrusion. It should be omitted from the application.

The internal neon sign is also extremely harmful. Neon is never acceptable on a listed building and indeed is not acceptable anywhere in Bath. It should be omitted from the application.

We do not favour the use of window vinyls and frosted manifestations and in this case do not consider them necessary. If the applicant considers them essential for the proposed use then maybe this is not the correct building to operate from.

Turning to the 'FLY' sign. Whilst we do not favour offset lettering, in this case we recognise that it is probably the least damaging. We would request that previous holes are utilised where possible to limit further damage. Anodised metal or painted timber should be used.

Two hanging signs are proposed. We do not consider this necessary and would suggest that just one hanging sign is permitted in the same position as the previous one and combines both into one. The fixing plate to the wall is excessively large/long and is particularly crude. This should be revised. We would request that the hanging sign is traditionally signwritten rather than offset letters or vinyl and that instead of black which is particularly stark, that the same grey paint as the main timberwork is used.

We turn now to the pavement proposals. The proposed tables and chairs are strongly opposed. As mentioned above the building forms part of a formal and historic streetscene which is unsullied by such furniture. This is not a question of width of pavement and access, it is purely the detrimental impact that it would have on the streetscene. There are no circumstances under which tables and chairs should be permitted.

## BIBURY LANE ELEVATION

The FUELD sign is unnecessary and, in addition with black being proposed, is harmful. It should be removed from proposals.

We do not see the necessity for blanking out the windows with black vinyl. Such works create a dead elevation and certainly would discourage people from going in. If signage is required advertising a café then we would suggest a simple hanging menu sign in the window.

We turn now to the pavement proposals. There is no objection to the replacement of the concrete surface with pennant stone but this must be conditioned to provide a sample to ensure the correct and appropriate quality is used. However the proposed tables and chairs are strongly opposed. As mentioned above the building forms part of a formal and historic streetscene which is unsullied by such furniture. This is not a question of width of pavement and access, it is purely the detrimental impact that it would have on the streetscene. There are no circumstances under which tables and chairs should be permitted.

### 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.