

DRAFT MINUTES

OF THE MEETING OF THE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL
HELD AT CITY HALL ON
TUESDAY 17th APRIL 2018

Members Present:

Quentin Alder	Victorian Society (Chair)
Mike Bone	Avon Industrial Buildings Trust and Bristol Industrial Archaeological Society
Linda Edwards	Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society
Roger Leech	Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society
Stephen Morris	Redland and Cotham Amenities Society
Tony Mason	Montpelier Conservation Group
Jeremy Newick	Kingsdown Conservation Group
Richard Pedlar	Society of Bristol Architects
Frances Russell	Avon Gardens Trust
Stephen Wickham	Bristol Civic Society

1 Apologies for absence: Julie Laming, Izaak Hudson

2 Conflicts of Interest:

3 Minutes of previous meeting: No amendments

4. Matters arising:

The need for CAP to meet the requirements of GDPR was discussed and members would identify appropriate documentation for the next meeting.

5. Declarations of Interest:

RP declared a non-pecuniary interest in 12E Alfred Place

6. Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:

6.1 Bristol University Temporary Lecture Theatres

The Panel understands the requirement for temporary accommodation. The proposed building was dire in appearance and thus inappropriate for the proposed location. Any consent must be limited to two years with no extension of this period.

7 Planning and Listed Building Applications:

7.1 Court House Tailors Court – 18/00910/LA

The Panel considers the new Heritage Statement to still be inadequate. There was no intellectual curiosity by the author of the document. The building was in fact a purpose built tavern of 1692 and one of the 3 best surviving of this period in the city. The Heritage Statement did not refer to the Historic England publication *The Town House in Medieval and Early Modern Bristol*.

There is not a full and adequate audit of historic fabric. It was not clear if the plans of the existing layout included the recent unauthorised alterations and this must be made clear. The works would require acoustic and fire resistance treatment to floors and partitions which must be provided as part of this application to allow assessment of their impact on historic fabric.

The works should be informed by the historic analysis rather than vice versa.

7.2 Mortimer House Nursing Home Clifton Down Road – 18/01375/LA

The Panel supported the earlier application which has been refused and continues to believe that there should be no parking to the front of the building.

The Panel's comments on the refused application (17/05186/LA):

The Panel understood the proposals to consist of reinstating the carriage sweep and removing all car parking at the front and creating car parking spaces for 10 cars in the rear garden. The Design, Access and Heritage Statement showed a plan of 1828 but it was pointed out that there was an earlier report by Dr Roger Leech for Cultural Heritage Services which included an earlier plan of c.1750 showing the front garden merely as 'court', a potentially useful reference.

The Panel accepted the proposals provided the construction for grass to be planted under the parking areas was effective and that there was sufficient planting to screen the parked cars.

7.3 12E Alfred Place Kingsdown - 17/01805/H

RP recused himself from discussion of this item.

The document entitled “Heritage Statement” did not contain any assessment of the significance of the building. Contrary to the statements made by the applicant, the unauthorised third floor extension is clearly visible from the public domain.

The house is one of a row of careful reconstructions of Georgian buildings which had been destroyed by bombing. The rear elevations reflect the form of period buildings and the roof extension is completely at odds with the spirit of the design.

The Panel considers retrospective consent must not be granted for these unauthorised works.

7.4 Senate House – 18/00861/F

The Panel recognises that this was a well considered proposal. It is essential that the construction be carried out to the high standard indicated in the documents.

7.5 7A Richmond Hill Avenue – 18/01519/LA

The Panel recognises an improvement over the previous applications and did not object to the construction of an additional first floor. However the proposed cladding of brick and vertical black boarding do not seem to be appropriate materials in this location in the Conservation area.

7.6 15 Richmond Terrace - 18/01537/LA

While the creation of the open areas to the proposed bedrooms is an improvement on previous proposals the application still remains unacceptable without further information.

A full audit of the interior must be provided. Details of the remedial work to the stone surrounds of the reinstated basement areas must be provided and also details of the waterproofing of interior surfaces, which must not be a cementitious coating. Further details of the two exterior doors, which must be appropriate for their location, must be provided.

7.7 5 Beaufort Buildings Suspension Bridge Road - 18/01100/LA

The Panel considers this application to be totally insufficient and unacceptable. The documents display a complete lack of understanding of the significance of the building and of the fact that the interior was listed as well as the exterior. The documents also display a lack of understanding of historic buildings.

Before removal of these walls can be contemplated a proper analysis of the development of this building and the significance of the fabric must be provided.

7.8 191 Wick Road – 18/00132/LA & 18/00133/F

The Panel considers the unauthorised subdivisions to be unacceptable without prior justification and analysis.

7.9 Outside Prudential Building Wine Street - 18/01300/F & 18/01301/A

The Panel considers that these proposals are merely a cover for external digital advertising. The digital screens would be a distraction to drivers and would block the pavement.

Planning Advice Note 8 indicates that internally illuminated fascia signs are inappropriate on traditional buildings. These proposals should be assessed under the same criteria because of their impact on Conservation Areas.

The illuminated screens would also be detrimental to the character of Conservation Areas and the setting of heritage assets.

The Panel noted that the national mood increasingly rejects the proliferation of signage.

7.10 Henderson House, Dove Street South – 18/01215/F

The Panel is aware that the design of this proposal replicated an extant planning consent for this site.

7.11 60 Old Market Street - 18/01189/LA

It is not clear whether this application was to discharge conditions on a consented scheme or whether it consisted of works beyond the scope of that consent. If it is the latter then a much higher level of detail is required.

7.12 47A Zetland Road – 18/00939/P

The existing front screen is one of the most important structures on Zetland Road and should be retained and protected. The Panel considered its loss would have a significant detrimental impact on the character of this part of the conservation area.

The proposal for 9 flats would be an overdevelopment of the site, especially as most of them would be 1 bedroom flats. This overdevelopment causes a lack of amenity space within the site, overlooking between dwellings and the siting of the rear building too close to the steep railway embankment. The use of reconstituted stone and uPVC windows is not acceptable in the Conservation Area.

The pair of steeply pitched gables to the front elevation replicates the adjacent pair of houses but this form is not typical of the street and is therefore not appropriate.

8 Any Other Business none

9 Future Meetings:

22nd May, 19th June, 17th July, 21st August, 18th September, 16th October, 20th November & 18th December