

# MINUTES

OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL  
HELD AT CITY HALL ON  
TUESDAY 16<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2018

**Members Present:**

Quentin Alder	Victorian Society (Chair)
Mike Bone	Avon Industrial Buildings Trust and Bristol Industrial Archaeological Society
Margaret Cartledge	Society of Bristol Architects
Linda Edwards	Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society
Izaak Hudson	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Julie Laming	Neighbourhood Planning Network
Roger Leech	Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society
Tony Mason	Montpelier Conservation Group
Stephen Morris	Redland and Cotham Amenities Group
Jeremy Newick	Kingsdown Conservation Group
Stephen Wickham	Bristol Civic Society
Andrew Kenyon	Observer

**1 Apologies for absence:**

None

**2 Declarations of Interest:**

QA – Bristol Cathedral Choir School

**3 Minutes of previous meeting:**

No amendments

**4. Matters arising:**

QA notified the Panel with regret of the death of Gavin Stamp, author of *Piloti in Private Eye*.

QA informed the Panel that eight historic pubs had been added to the Local List. QA to raise the exclusion of The Rhubarb Tavern on the Local List with Peter Insole. MB recommended using Know Your Place to request consideration of sites.

The Panel expressed concern at the lack of action taken by Bristol City Council regarding repairs to the bridge at Kingsweston that was damaged by a lorry collision over 800 days ago. QA to raise this with Peter Insole.

**5. Policy Items:**

None

**6. Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:**

None.

**7 Planning and Listed Building Applications:**

**7.1 Somerset House, 18 Canynge Road – 17/06635/F**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel was aware that the appeal for the previous application was dismissed. The main reason being the houses at the front had an adverse impact on the houses on Canynge Road. A subsequent complaint was successful regarding the Inspector's lack of consideration regarding the effect on relevant heritage assets.

The inherent development strategy and massing for the site is incorrect, and this is leading to a lot of the issues with overlooking, loss of amenity, uninspiring design and overbearing appearance that are going back and forth between the applicant, Council and appeal inspector. The fact that the existing office can be converted to housing under permitted development is not a strong enough argument to simply replicate its form and massing, as this directly causes the townhouses to be marooned and elevated on the site.

The side wall of one of the two replacement houses on Canynge Road are now about 2m closer to the rear of properties 1-3 Canynge Square than the existing office building. This will adversely affect the setting and residential amenity of these listed buildings.

The Panel considered the site's strategic design solution causes a series of inherent problems. One of these is positioning of the two houses fronting Canynge Road which has created an 'island' surrounded by 'open space'. Not only does this create an uncomfortable series of open spaces within the site itself but it has led to the townhouse gardens to be situated on top of their respective garages which will generate overlooking issues with the new flats and the rear of 4-6 Canynge Square. Not only is this considered to be contrary to the character of this part of the conservation area, but the height and position of the first floor level gardens will adversely impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring buildings and future occupants.

The Panel considers that the revised scheme does little to address the issues raised in the previously dismissed appeal. The public benefits of the proposal does not outweigh the harm caused to the conservation area and nearby listed buildings and as such does not meet the relevant tests of the NPPF (para 134).

## **7.2 Bristol Cathedral Choir School, College Square – 17/06479/LA**

QA recused himself.

The Panel supports this application.

However, this application does not contain sufficient archaeological assessment and information to make an informed decision on the impact of the proposal on designated heritage assets. This needs to be produced and submitted as part of the application package before a decision can be taken.

The Panel is concerned that there is a danger that this building may be subject to value engineering at post determination stage. A high quality materials palette is required in this sensitive location. It is not considered that the use of Bath Stone curtain walling is appropriate in this instance. The Council needs to ensure that the details of the materials and weathering of the proposed materials are provided, as per the intentions advocated in the DAS. In addition to this the coping details need to be addressed.

QA re-joined the meeting.

## **7.3 Clifton Observatory, Clifton Down - 17/06585/LA**

The Panel supports this application.

However, the design would benefit from simplification. The current design of the side extension with the roof at two levels - part glazed and part solid with a dividing stone pier appears to be too elaborate. The two new side windows to the new porch and extension are unconvincing in terms of their design. A little more thought on style and size is required.

The Panel welcomes Historic England's view on the archaeological work undertaken to date.

## **7.4 19 West Mall – 17/06761/LA**

The Panel objects to this application.

These proposals are completely unacceptable for works to a grade II\* listed building. The Panel was disappointed with the quality of the application submission. A comment from Historic England should be sought at the earliest opportunity.

The proposed roof terrace necessitates a privacy screen up to 2m in height which would be a very intrusive element to add to a highly visible Grade II\* listed building. The installation of the proposed, misleadingly named, 'Georgian style' tri-fold doors would result in the removal of an unacceptable level of historic fabric and are of an inappropriate design.

**7.5 76 Park Street - 17/06607/LA**

The Panel objects to this application.

Whilst the Panel welcomes the reintroduction of residential accommodation at upper floor level on Park Street it was very concerned at the absence of a heritage assessment of the interior and the unrestrained approach to internal demolition and remodelling.

Para 2.8 of the submitted Heritage Assessment states that only the building's exterior has been assessed as it was not possible to gain access to the interior of the building. As such the survival, condition and relative significance of interior features of special architectural and historic interest have not been confirmed. The Panel questions the scheme's significant level of alteration to the building without any assessment of significance and robust justification. This is completely unjustified and contrary to para 128 of the NPPF. This assessment must be undertaken before any decision on the application's outcome can be made.

**7.6 68-70 Park Street - 17/0662/LA**

The Panel has no comment to make.

**7.7 St Mary's Hospital, Upper Byron Place – 17/07088/F**

The Panel objects to this application.

The proposal is a repetition of previous failed proposals that were considered to be over development, would have an adverse impact on the existing buildings and affect the relationship with Brandon Hill.

Whilst the Panel welcomes the retention and reuse of the main building, the replacement roof should be reinstated at the same height as the existing section of roof.

The Panel objects to the new build extension (Block B). Despite the use of green walls, which have clearly been incorporated in an attempt to integrate the building with the green backdrop of Brandon Hill, this is essentially a large scale box. It looks uncomfortable and has a difficult relationship with the existing building in terms of scale and volume.

The townhouses (Block C) provide a strident addition to the streetscene.

The Pavillion (Block D) is over-development of the site. It creates very close

relationships with the rest of the site. It also generates a poor relationship with the properties on Upper Berkeley Place

The refurbishment of the Lodge (Block E) is welcomed.

There is an issue with the location and proximity of the refuse and waste storage facilities adjacent to the retaining wall. This will have a detrimental effect on the amenity of residents on Byron Place.

#### **7.8 15 Richmond Terrace – 17/07008/LA**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel was concerned about the lack of detail for the proposed alterations to this building. Interventions of this extent for buildings of this designation require much more detail. The proposed living conditions relying on roof lights and internal windows would be of an unacceptably low standard. The creation of a fake open area at ground floor level and its infilling with structural glass will result in the loss of historic fabric. There is no indication of the scale of works to convert the building into a residential unit, particularly in terms of those required to damp-proof the space and the impact this will have on historic fabric.

#### **7.9 37 Canynge Road - 17/07046/LA**

The Panel objects to this application.

This proposal attempts to convert a traditional vertical dwelling into a modern horizontal dwelling to the detriment of its historic character. This proposal involves too much removal of historic fabric and does nothing to enhance the appearance of this listed building. The public benefits of the alterations to this building do not outweigh the harm caused to its significance. As such this proposal is contrary to para 134 of the NPPF.

#### **7.10 Land adjacent to The Quays, Cumberland Road – 17/05149/F**

The Panel objects to this application

The proposed new building fails to link The Quays with the Umberslade site. It is too large on plan and too high in relation to The Quays. The expansive range of windows on the northern elevation would be very dominant feature that is an inappropriate addition to the architectural grain of the docks. The alterations to the retaining wall onto the quay wall with a large opening for access to the car parking area is not acceptable. This proposal does not provide a quality building that contributes to or enhances the setting of this part of the conservation area and as such the proposal is contrary to the requirements of para 137 of the NPPF.

#### **7.11 Site to the rear of 28-36 Picton Street - 17/06834/LA**

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel welcomes the description of the clear changes made to the scheme contained within the Heritage Statement and DAS. The panel welcomes the retention of an element of commercial use. The design makes an attempt to respect the historic plot boundaries and is a well considered and positive application.

As previously minuted the bedroom windows located below a valley gutter should be repositioned.

**7.12 Clifton College, Guthrie Road - 17/06853/LA**

The Panel supports this application.

**7.13 115 Cromwell Road, Montpelier – 17/07106/F**

The Panel supports this application.

**7.14 Eastwood Farm, Wyndham Crescent - 17/06952/LA**

The Panel supports this application.

This is a rare agricultural building within Bristol. The Panel welcomed the scheme and the quality of the Statement of Significance and Heritage. Large scale details of the glass lobby should be conditioned.

**8 Any Other Business:**

CAP welcomed the Development Control Committee's refusal of the planning application for the conversion of 15 Small Street into student accommodation, following the demolition of the historic ceiling.

**9 Future Meetings:**

*20<sup>th</sup> February, 20<sup>th</sup> March, 17<sup>th</sup> April, 15<sup>th</sup> May, 19<sup>th</sup> June, 17<sup>th</sup> July, 21<sup>st</sup> August, 18<sup>th</sup> September, 16<sup>th</sup> October, 20<sup>th</sup> November & 18<sup>th</sup> December*