

DRAFT MINUTES

OF THE MEETING OF THE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

HELD AT CITY HALL ON
TUESDAY 22nd MAY 2018

Members Present:

Quentin Alder	Victorian Society (Chair)
Mike Bone	Avon Industrial Buildings Trust and Bristol Industrial Archaeological Society
Julie Laming	Neighbourhood Planning Network
Roger Leech	Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society
David Martyn	Bristol City Council
Tony Mason	Montpelier Conservation Group
Jeremy Newick	Kingsdown Conservation Group
Frances Russell	Avon Gardens Trust
Stephen Wickham	Bristol Civic Society

1. **Apologies for absence:** Linda Edwards, Izaak Hudson and Richard Pedlar

2. **Declarations of Interest:** None

3. **Minutes of the previous meeting:** No changes required.

4. **Matters arising:**

4.1 There was concern that not all CAP comments have been referenced or used as part of the determination process. QA had contacted Peter Insole to ensure that all CAP comments are correctly referenced as part of an application determination process.

4.2 The roof extension for 12E Alfred Place is visible from the public domain. CAP asked DM to look into this application in more detail. DM had not seen this application and advised that this was probably being dealt with by his Urban Design colleagues.

4.3 CAP was informed that the Old BRI Building has not been listed. CAP could not understand the rationale behind this unfortunate and regrettable decision.

5. **Pre Application Enquiries and Requests for Consultation:** None

6. **Planning and Listed Building Applications:**

6.1 **6 Kingsdown Parade - 18/01535/F**

The Panel supports this application.

CAP supports the renaissance of the extant building and notes that the most important elements of the plot, the boundary walls, are to be retained. The northern elevation is however, fussy and unnecessarily breaks down both the elements of the façade and the boundary wall, this should be simplified. The materials palette should also be simplified to better reflect the context of the immediate area.

6.2 6 Kingsdown Parade - 18/0205/F

The Panel supports this application.

The previous minute of July 2012 is still relevant:

The Panel welcomed the redevelopment of this long neglected site. The development should retain as much as possible of the original material in the Marlborough Hill boundary. There was concern about the negative impact on neighbouring properties of on-site car parking. The restoration of 6 Kingsdown Parade should be a condition of the permission including the former, curved roof. The Design and Access Statement states 'We believe that we agree that the corner house should be renovated as part of the development. We are trying to locate a photograph to show the condition of the house 30 or so years ago'. The applicant's attention could usefully be drawn to the Cultural Heritage Services report of 1998 which includes (Fig.8) a photograph of 1975, i.e. 40 years ago. [This also] ... indicates very clearly the positions of former stairs and partitions. The recording, Fig.9, of the standing stone and brick remains of the demolished summerhouse, fails to include the evidence for the position of the ground floor window, clearly shown in the photograph, Fig.10, ... shown also on Figs.9.37-8 in The Town House in Medieval and Early Modern Bristol, English Heritage 2014. Further recording is required of the possible arched opening shown in (the Potter report) on Fig.8. It was suggested in the earlier 1998 report (p.8, The plan of the garden) that this was possibly a garden feature of the 18th century, such as a natural spring or grotto, set midway between two tower-like summerhouses, see Fig.7 in the 1998 report.

Historically several archaeological statements have been produced for the site. Whilst those statements provide sufficient information to inform a scheme for this site, the current application has not utilised that resource nor taken sufficient account of the remnants of the original buildings; neither has the application proposal taken the opportunity to reinstate the original buildings.

The Panel considers that as there is sufficient information to determine the footprint, size and scale of the three original Garden Houses. The proposal should take the opportunity to reinstate the footprints of two of the three original Garden Houses.

There is insufficient landscape information submitted as part of the application package to determine the impact of the proposed landscape scheme. This would either need to be provided as part of the application submission or conditioned to provide further details.

6.3 27a Great George Street - 18/01499/F

The Panel objects to this application.

Whilst CAP welcomes the redevelopment of this tired and dated building, it is considered that the more extravagant elements of the scheme should focus on and orientate towards the garden elevations; equally the Bigwood Lane elevation should remain as original as possible in form and appearance. The angled and cantilevered bedroom would be unnecessarily intrusive. As the rubble stone wall fronting Bigwood Lane forms an integral part of the character of the immediate area, the existing external coach doors and single door openings within the building should be retained and not replaced with inappropriate openings.

6.4 Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade and land rear of 36-40 East Street, Lombard Street - 18/01093/LA

The Panel makes no comment other than welcoming the archaeological assessment undertaken for the site, the assessment of the heritage of both the former tannery and the remains of a medieval priory hospital.

6.5 The Bell, 7 Prewett Street - 18/01890/F

The Panel objects to this application.

Whilst it is noted that this mid 18th century public house has been considered to be too heavily altered to warrant local listing, it is nonetheless an integral part of the historic street pattern and activity of this part of the area. The submitted heritage assessment is weak and takes no account of the wider townscape of the Redcliffe Estate (a high quality post war residential estate), the adverse impact of the proposal on the setting of the adjacent Redcliffe Conservation Area and associated listed heritage assets. The proposal would have a significant adverse impact on St. Mary Redcliffe when viewed from a range of surrounding locations within and beyond the city and from other Conservation Areas.

The archaeological desktop assessment is inadequate as it has not assessed the historic context of the immediate vicinity. The Panel was somewhat surprised to see the shadow study showed excessive northern sunlight, yet acknowledged that the impact on daylight and sunlight for about 56 adjacent residential properties was significant.

The Panel was concerned that the applicant had made no reference to the pre application process and the range of issues raised. Furthermore, the current scheme appeared to be larger in size and scale than the pre application scheme. The application proposal was considered to be wholly inappropriate for its context and would substantially harm the significance of relevant heritage assets with limited public benefit. As such this is considered contrary to relevant Local Plan policies and the requirements of para 133 of the NPPF.

6.6 Land adjacent to Avon Cottage, World's End Lane, Clifton - 18/01741/F

The Panel objects to this application.

The submitted heritage assessment is weak in terms of its assessment of the impact of the proposal on adjacent listed buildings and the site's historic context. The proposal building would not sit comfortably within the plot or as part of the immediate context.

This site deserves either a high quality period replica, as opposed to pastiche, style or contemporary house that would sit comfortably with the adjacent terrace and listed buildings. This needs further refinement and should not be approved in the current form. As it stands, the proposal is considered to be contrary to relevant Local Plan policies and the requirements of the NPPF.

6.7 Oculus House, Lime Kiln Road - 18/00711/LA

The Panel supports this application.

CAP supports the use of brick for the newly built wall and agrees that this should be used to distinguish between old and new fabric. However, the coping must be natural stone, rather than pre-cast concrete. This element of scheme should be revisited before the application is determined.

6.8 r/o Ambrose Road, Rosemount Terrace, Clifton - 18/01993/F

The Panel objects to this application.

Whilst CAP recognises the need for residential re-development within this part of the city, this should not be at the expense of harm to the character of the Conservation Area. The overall design is rather bland and uninspiring in style and there was concern over the eastern elevation's blank facade. The design could be better as it does not succeed in enhancing the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. There are inconsistencies between the submitted plans and the CGIs which need to be rectified before the application can be determined.

6.9 Turnpike Lodge, 3a Stoke Hill - 18/02058/H

The Panel objects to this application.

CAP cannot support the application in its current form. Despite the mundane quality of the existing bungalow the severe appearance and size of the proposed building does not reflect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore does not succeed in enhancing its character and appearance.

6.10 Royal Fort Courtyard - 18/02253/F

The Panel supports only the temporary nature of this application. The Panel hoped that the dreadful appearance of these Portacabins would ensure their existence could only be temporary.

6.11 r/o 6 Cotham Lawn Road - 18/00447/F

The Panel supports this application.

6.12 The Pineapple, 37 St Georges Road - 18/01818/F

The Panel objects to this application.

It is noted that Bristol City Council is to issue a Building Preservation Notice for this building, of circa 1670, and to seek its formal listing under Historic England's listing criteria.

The submitted Heritage Assessment is very weak with limited appraisal of the historic integrity and character of the building. Further assessment needs to be undertaken before consideration of the application could be taken further.

BCC's senior Conservation Officer's efforts to assess this value of this building and the work undertaken to seek the protection of the building were congratulated. The Panel felt that CGMS work was woefully inadequate and needed to be addressed.

6.13 Mortimer House, Clifton Down Road - 18/01375/LA

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel welcomes the proposed removal of all parking from the front garden. However, a landscape detail must be provided, such as a deep kerb, to prevent any car parking off the curved in/out drive, either before the application is determined or secured through condition. The current landscape plan does not appear to reflect the latest version of the scheme; therefore, a revised landscape plan should be submitted to reflect the latest scheme.

7. Any Other Business: none

8. Future Meetings: *19th June, 17th July, 21st August, 18th September, 16th October, 20th November & 18th December*