

Application Number: 09/03869/AR

Address:

Kiosk
2 New Marchants Passage
City Centre
Bath BA1 1AR

Proposal:

Display of 2no non-illuminated fascia signs at Kiosk 2 & 3 New Marchants Passage

Comments: submitted at 27/10/2009 13:01:33

09/03689/AR Timpson Ltd Kiosk 2 New Marchants Passage Bath BA1 1AR

Bath Heritage Watchdog objects to this application.

Bath Heritage Watchdog has been paying particular attention to shop fronts fitted in Bath as Bath has one of the finest collections of period shop fronts in the country. There are fine examples from Georgian though to Victorian and Edwardian into the 20C (including Art Deco, etc) right up to the present day where traditional shop fronts have been installed to replace inferior designs in both listed and unlisted buildings.

We have recently become accustomed to work being carried prior to determination of application or work being carried following refusal of application and in a number of cases work being carried out that is inconsistent with that granted permission. However again we have another pair of applications that will be complete before the site notice is posted!

We are consistently informed that comments are considered right up to the determination date but once again this stretches the credibility of such claims . The other issue this raises is one of pre-determination.

The tenant fit out guide Revision J February 2009 section 5.2.7 states "works may only commence on site after the preconditions listed have been satisfied" on that list are the words "Planning Consent where applicable"

The works therefore are unauthorised. What is taking place is an abuse of the democratic planning system.

In this case our objection lies more with the process than the actual design we cannot condone what in effect is unauthorised work regardless of the acceptability or not of the design

The application description and documentation states this is to be a hardwood timber fascia and shop front with such details as a hardwood header, what we have seen installed appears to be once again plywood which we will repeat is not timber. Therefore the materials do not appear to comply with the approved plans.

The designs themselves are acceptable given the fairly confined location with the exception of the Perspex letters which are inappropriate material for a Conservation Area and the gloss finish which should be semi-matt. There is no particular objection to the cream and burgundy proposed.

We would also ask that the following is taken into account.

Following a less than democratic passage through the planning process that led to the approval of the latest revisions to the SouthGate Shop Front Guide, all current proposals submitted for SouthGate that take advantage of the newly introduced laxity in the guide fall far short of what is considered appropriate for a World Heritage City in both style and materials despite what is theoretically deemed acceptable. We would draw your attention to the fact that all proposals submitted so far are contrary to the advice given by Bath & North East Somerset Council's Senior Conservation Officer whose clear statement of "not acceptable in the current form" was ignored. Therefore the statement in the tenants fit out guide section 5 Design Policy and approval Procedure. That "there are strict guidelines regarding tenants shop front as agreed with B&NES and Environmental heritage" is untrue as it quite clearly does not have the support of the Senior Conservation Officer in its current form.

We cannot understand the logic of any shop moving into a prestige development and installing shop fronts and signage that detracts from its surroundings.

In its current form the application contravenes local plan policies BH6, BH17, BH19, S5, D2 & D4 and with guidance contained within PPG15 and should therefore be refused.