

MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL
HELD AT CITY HALL ON
TUESDAY 20th FEBRUARY 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
Andrew Kenyon	Redland and Cotham Amenities Society
Tony Mason	Montpelier Conservation Group
Jeremy Newick	Kingsdown Conservation Group
Richard Pedlar	Society of Bristol Architects
Stephen Wickham	Bristol Civic Society
Margaret Cartledge	Observer
David Martyn	Senior Conservation Officer

1 Apologies for absence: Julie Laming, Izaak Hudson

2 Declarations of Interest:
QA 100 Shirehampton Road, Tec House
RP 1 Richmond Hill Avenue

3 Minutes of previous meeting: No amendments

4. Matters arising: None

5. Policy Items: None

6. Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:

6.1 Old BRI Building Marlborough Street (South Side) – 17/02413/F

The Panel was aware that the chapel had been listed, but the application had not been amended to take this into account. The heritage assessment was therefore insufficient. It was also inadequate in its coverage of Church House and the remains of St James's Priory. Reference to the selective inventory on CD accompanying English Heritage's 2014 *The Town House in Medieval and Early Modern Bristol* would have revealed that Church House incorporates medieval fabric including part of the two storey cloister range. The Panel was also concerned that strategies should be in place to ensure the preservation of any important structural remains of the priory that might be discovered in any building works. The panel was assured by David Martyn that an evaluation of what archaeological work would be necessary was being prepared by Peter Insole.

The Panel reiterates its original minute:

The Panel strongly objects to this application.

The revised proposal has reverted to an earlier ambition of the developer to completely clear the site and put up replacement buildings. The current application remains of distinctly poor quality and, once again, would involve the demolition of the two locally listed buildings, whose significance and potential has been rightly emphasised by many others.

It is ironic that now most of the boundary walls and all structures on site have been removed (apart from these two buildings) views into the site allow a better appreciation of the formerly partly concealed chapel. Neither the Old Building nor the chapel should be lost. Their survival should inform any application for this site and the failure of the current proposal to make the most of such heritage assets has emphasised the vacuous nature of the proposed replacement buildings.

The Panel is very concerned about the negative impact of the proposed new structure on adjoining listed buildings and their setting, the St James's Parade Conservation Area and, of course, St James's Priory itself. The excessive, overall height of the new buildings, especially to the southerly part of the site, would be problematic. The architectural context of neighbouring buildings and the broader cityscape would be substantially harmed by the mass and scale of the proposed development. Furthermore, the elevations were mere pattern making and without underlying principle. Such modish architectural detailing should be avoided.

The Panel refers to the reasons for refusal of the previous planning application ref 16/01888 which still applied:

The proposed development by reason of its height, scale, massing, overall design quality and appearance would be unacceptable in design terms and would fail to preserve the special interest and setting of relevant heritage assets contrary to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed building and

Conservation Areas) Act 1990; Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012); Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Core Strategy (June 2011); Policies DM26, DM27 and DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (July 2014); Policy BCAP43 of the Bristol Central Area Plan (March 2015) and Supplementary Planning Document 1: Tall Buildings (January 2005).

The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties at St James Priory by reason of its overbearing effect and noise and disturbance impact and would be contrary to Policies BCS21 and BCS23 of the Bristol Core Strategy (June 2011); and Policies DM2 (i), DM27 and DM29 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (July 2014).

6.2 Lakota & Former Coroner's Court

Coroner's Court: The Panel considered the proposed new building compromised the setting of the heritage asset. The lowering of the boundary wall was not acceptable. Details of the new sub-divisions and the impact on the existing fabric was necessary.

Lakota (Maltings): This is the former malt house of the Stokes Croft Brewery, most of which was demolished in the 1970s. It is one of the few surviving examples of one of the most numerous and familiar industrial buildings in 19th century Bristol, as is apparent from study of the 1:500 OS plans of the 1880s that are now readily available to view on Bristol City Council's Knowyourplace website. McArthur's Warehouse on Gas Ferry Road is another former maltings but is soon to be demolished thus adding urgency to the need for a sympathetic scheme for the adaptive reuse of the Lakota building. This needs to conserve the distinctive features of historic malt houses, identified by Sir J M Richards, a distinguished former editor of *The Architectural Review*, as 'In the whole wide range of anonymous industrial architecture.....probably the buildings whose beauties have been least noticed'. The Panel considered the form of the roof extension to be far too prominent, the existing gables and pitched roof should be retained and any modifications should be of a restrained design that make as few external changes as possible.

New building: A new building in this position was considered acceptable but the proposals at 5 storeys was too high. The new building must be subservient to the heritage assets with the eaves lower than the eaves to the Coroner's Court. The 'divided gables' was only pattern making and made the building even more prominent. The building should be built to the back of pavement to continue the existing pattern and not set back.

The setted road surface and kerbs to Backfields must be protected during the works from damage and excavation for services.

7 Planning and Listed Building Applications:

7.1 Norland House 33 Canynge Road – 18/00076/LA

The Panel was concerned that the character of this building must be retained. There was a conflict between the existing state of the building and any new domestic use. An active use would help to ensure the maintenance of the building, but in order to maintain the appreciation of the interior and to be reversible the new accommodation should be in freestanding pods.

The new glazed doors would mean that the original timber doors could be standing open at all times and extra precautions must be provided to protect them from the weather.

The new aluminium sliding glazed doors in the north elevation are not acceptable. The roof lights must be conservation pattern.

The drawings contained references to notes which could not be found.

7.2 71A Princess Victoria Street – 18/00115/H

The Panel considered the existing building, although 20th century, provided an interesting and varied roof line with its neighbours which should not be lost. The removal of the mansard would actually gain only a very small additional floor area. The replacement of the timber sash windows with aluminium was unacceptable in this conservation area. The proposals would neither preserve or enhance the conservation area.

The Panel welcomed the reinstatement of the garage, which echoed the original function of the buildings on this road.

7.3 1 Richmond Hill Avenue - 18/00332/LA

RP recused himself from consideration of this item.

The Panel had no objection in principle to a new small dwelling. However the glazed screen to the former garage door opening needed to be reconsidered, to express more of the character of the original building.

7.4 181 Whiteladies Road – 17/06849/LA

The Panel had no objection, but some provision for storage of refuse and recycling must be made.

7.5 46 High Street City Centre – 17/06774/LA

The Panel praised the excellent archaeological assessment. However the proposals for the conversion did not appear to have been informed by study of the contents of the report.

The building is an interesting anomaly, with the front rooms never built. The brickwork to the rear is of a high quality; the Panel believed the rear corner windows were always blind and should not be opened up.

Internal fittings such as the stairs, chimneypieces, architraves etc survive largely intact. The proposals did not take account of these and the impact of the subdivisions on the rooms and the fittings was unacceptable.

A skilled and experienced specialist in historic buildings should be engaged for any proposals for this building.

If the missing front section of the building were to be built the conversion of the rear areas could be much more sensitive and much less intense and damaging. A high quality contemporary design would be appropriate.

7.6 6 All Saints Lane - 17/07109/LA

The Panel was not convinced that the issues raised in its two previous minutes relating to the change of use of this building had been adequately addressed, especially with regard to bin and bike storage.

Minute for 16/06700/LA, repeated for 17/05308/LA:

The Panel does not object to this application.

However, the Panel would like to make the point that this is a poor quality application that is not worthy of a listed building of this nature. The heritage assessment is of an extremely poor quality and the application demonstrates very little assessment or understanding of the historic value of this building. A much more detailed audit of this building must be undertaken, alongside the production of a Statement of Significance. It would appear that internally this building remains intact and is of great architectural and historic significance. As such any works to this building must be closely monitored.

The cycle storage and bin store are not situated in an easily accessible location. This element of the design should be reconsidered.

7.7 Land To The East Of Colston Street - 16/05681/LA

The Panel continues to support this amended application and welcomes the innovation and interest of this design.

The building must be capable of being converted from student accommodation to residential use.

The pavement and enclosing wall must be protected during construction.

7.8 Land To Rear Of Tec House 6 Marsh Street – 18/00386/F

QA recused himself from consideration of this item

The Panel considered that this land-locked site had been severely compromised by the extent that recent buildings on neighbouring plots had extended into the centre of the enclosed area, and also by their height. This restricted the possibilities for developments which included accommodation of any nature.

The proposed building was not an appropriate solution for this enclosed and constrained site and would have a negative impact on the amenity of surrounding buildings, and therefore also harm the Conservation Area.

A building with a different configuration or for a different use may be acceptable.

7.9 Becket Hall St Thomas Street – 17/06434/F

The Panel supported the proposals to remove the outbuildings and to construct the new timber framed structure.

The Design and Access Statement referred to shelter provided by the new building and the Panel considered the front wall could be made more permeable to allow greater access to and from the play area, the overhangs of the jettying could also be more generous to provide more shelter at ground level.

The balustrade between the tower and the new building should be glass to avoid it being a prominent element in views of the church and tower.

7.10 117 Ashley Road - 18/00020/LA

The Panel was surprised that the applicants had been unaware that the works already carried out require Listed Building Consent. Even if 117 Ashley Road were not listed, extending the building would require planning consent as the site is within the Montpelier Conservation Area.

The Heritage Statement was insufficient. The 1828 Ashmead map shows a building in the location of the coach house, and the decorative features of the coach house's facade are consistent with it being contemporary with the 1825 main house.

The Panel was concerned that the character of the brick coach house and the boundary wall to Brook Lane should be retained.

The removal of the original brick rear wall and infilling of the wide coach house entrance on Brook Lane would lose an important element of the historic character of the building and cause significant harm to both the Listed Building and this part of the Conservation Area. It is therefore unacceptable.

The Panel cannot support the advice that rendered blockwork is acceptable in this situation.

A side extension to the coach house could be acceptable, but it must be a high quality design, clearly distinct from, but complementing, the original building. The proposed extension is not appropriate, and the balcony and its railings would detract from the coach house's appearance and also be harmful to the setting of the listed house.

7.11 93 Cotham Brow – 17/06074/F

The Panel could not support this application. The existing building had a quaint charm but the new building did not maintain this.

The asymmetrical roof form and the cut-out to the front corner created an unnecessarily complicated and assertive form. The relocation of the ramped section of the boundary wall was not acceptable. A more restricted palette of materials would be more appropriate.

The plastic rainwater goods and the reconstituted slate are not acceptable in the conservation area. There would be amenity issues with the adjoining building.

A simplified proposal taking cues from the other side of Southfield Road may be acceptable.

7.12 19 Somerset Street Kingsdown - 17/07091/LA

The Panel supports the modest and carefully designed proposal for this site, where the boundary wall to Dove Street has already been lost.

7.13 20 Somerset Street Kingsdown - 17/07093/LA

The Panel supports the modest and carefully designed proposal for this site. The doorway in the rebuilt wall should have brick jambs, as at present.

7.14 416 Hotwell Road - 17/05221/LA

While the Panel was sympathetic to the aspirations of the applicants to make good the harm caused to this building by previous owners, a much higher standard of documentation and drawings is required for a Grade II* Listed Building.

There should be a proper investigation into historic records for this building, and if nothing can be found then neighbouring houses in the Colonnade should be examined for suitable sources for the design of windows, doors and other fittings.

The involvement of a suitably experienced professional would be advantageous.

7.15 Henbury Village Hall Church Close - 18/00004/LA

The Panel commended the quality of research in the Heritage Statement.

The separation between the new extension and the main hall would be more clearly expressed if the roof glazing ran the full width of the roof and did not extend down over the toilet or meeting room. The rubble stone facing to the extension seemed to be an unnecessary expense and a roughcast lime render would be satisfactory.

7.16 125 Westbury Road - 17/06637/F

The Panel was informed that the house is considered to be an undesignated Heritage Asset.

The Heritage Statement was not sufficient as it did not make any assessment of the contribution of the house to the Conservation Area. Large houses in large verdant grounds made up the character of this Conservation Area.

The existing house is of a very high quality; at present it is screened by vegetation and the stone boundary wall but also glimpsed on the brow of the hill from numerous vantage points. The screening would be removed by the new houses which would be far too prominent and would also block views of the existing house.

A large area of hard surface was proposed with car parking spaces and a drive around 3 sides of the existing house. The large parking and turning area inside the

entrance would be highly visible and damaging to the setting of the house and to the Conservation Area.

The proposed houses were of an inappropriate design.

7.17 100 Shirehampton Road - 18/00273/F

QA recused himself from consideration of this item.

The Panel considered that the building responded sensitively to the context of the Conservation Area. The selection of materials and quality of finish will be key to the success of the proposed building.

8 Any Other Business none

9 Future Meetings:

20th March, 17th April, 15th May, 19th June, 17th July, 21st August, 18th September, 16th October, 20th November & 18th December