

MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL
HELD AT CITY HALL ON
TUESDAY 16th APRIL 2019

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
Izaak Hudson	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Tony Mason	Montpelier Conservation Group
Jeremy Newick	Kingsdown Conservation Group
Frances Russell	Avon Gardens Trust
Steve Wickham	Bristol Civic Society
David Martyn	Bristol City Council

1 Apologies for absence: Julie Laming, Richard Pedlar

2 Declarations of Interest:

Quentin Alder: 13 Caledonia Place, The Stables Cote Road, St Mary Magdalene

David Martyn: Kings Weston Footbridge

Izaak Hudson: North Side of Ambra Vale East

Frances Russell: 28 Ambrose Road, North Side of Ambra Vale East

3 Minutes of previous meeting:

No amendments.

4. Matters arising:

None

5. Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:

19/01213/FB Stoke Park Road, Stapleton

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel supported the restoration of the historic carriage drive as an accessible route. The Panel endorsed the comments of Historic England that the new spurs should be clearly differentiated from the main path.

6. Planning and Listed Building Applications:

6.1 Footway Bridge over Kings Weston Road – 19/01368/LA

DM recused himself for this item.

The Panel supports the reinstatement of the Kings Weston footbridge.

It is not apparent from the application that a particularly exhaustive process to investigate transport solutions has been undertaken; repairing the bridge in-situ would by far be the cheapest and less harmful option if the possibility of future bridge strikes could be minimised by traffic management. There is no reason why HGVs need to use this road apart from as a short-cut. There is no in-depth transport study as part of the application to investigate re-routing of HGVs away from the road entirely (and enforcement by way of fixed width concrete barriers disguised as planters at a remote distance from the historic cutting to physically bar HGVs from the road).

Notwithstanding this omission, raising the bridge is the least harmful solution of the four limited options investigated by the Council.

The Heritage Statement is very thorough and clearly explains the history and significance of the bridge, and is to be commended. However there is no detailed assessment of the visual impact on the preferred option of raising the bridge by over a metre on the key views from the eight adjoining heritage assets identified in the Heritage Statement. This is a fundamental consideration for the application, and without this visual impact assessment, particularly a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and much better quality three-dimensional drawings or montages, the negative impact of raising the bridge on the adjacent heritage assets and 1820s cutting are obscured.

The documents describe the bridge being raised by approximately 1 metre when the document stated that regulations required a raising of 1.3 metres for new structures. The Panel questions whether this limited work would be sufficient to protect the bridge for the future.

The application drawings only show a 1:75 scale general arrangement plan, one 1:75 scale elevation and one 1:30 scale section. A complex and unsightly arrangement of approach ramps, landings and steps is proposed to facilitate a minimum 1:12 approach to the raised bridge. There is no information on materials for the surfacing, copings, retaining walls, steps and balustrades, and no information on how the 1820s cutting walls are to be raised, and in what material. There is no detail on what the new elements look like, only notes such as “TBC”, “indicative” and “to be agreed”. The drawings are hatched with a generic CAD boulder hatch making assessment of the visual implication of the proposal practically impossible. The original local Pennant Stone is no longer available, and this is not addressed. The application drawings showing the new interventions are not developed to an acceptable standard for a listing building consent application. Much more thought needs to be applied to the design, and drawn and material detail needs to be provided.

The footpath over the bridge is part of the Community Forest Path from Shirehampton to Limekiln Wood. It is not a bridleway so horses and bicycles should not use the bridge. Most other stretches of the footpath, including the existing approaches to the bridge with steep gradients and anti-motorcycle barriers, are not compliant with disabled access in terms of surfacing, obstacles and levels. A question therefore has to be asked as to whether disabled ramp access to the bridge is really necessary, or a good use of public funds. Simple steps at either end would be a more appropriate design.

The current proposal of access ramps with complicated doglegs and returns will be unwieldy to use and the visual appearance will detract considerably from the setting of the bridge and other adjacent heritage assets and will be harmful.

A detailed method statement for the removal and storage of the bridge was critical together with a firm timescale for its reinstatement.

All additional details must form part of the application and not be submitted as conditions.

6.2 Avon Fire & Rescue Service HQ, Temple Back – 19/01255/F

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel understands that the current proposals have not been amended in accordance with the pre-application advice. The pre-application proposal had also not been presented to CAP.

It is considered that this is not an appropriate location for such a tall building. The 16 storey tower would have an adverse effect on the listed Generator Building both in terms of scale and overshadowing. It would also dwarf other important local buildings such as Temple Church and the Shot Tower.

The entrance would be better located in the southern corner where it would be visible from the bridge and would complement the Generator Building. The building was a dull brick box which must be of a much higher quality of design and materials in this location.

The archaeological study is inadequate in scope. It fails to reference the 2014 English Heritage study or to research the histories of individual properties on the site with plans where appropriate.

The panel endorses the views of Historic England on the application.

6.3 5 Kingsdown Parade – 19/00961/F

The Panel objects to this application.

The application does not contain a heritage statement which is essential for registration in a conservation area.

The rear building does not respond to the original plot boundaries. The entirety of the proposed front elevation to Kingsdown Parade lacks cohesion and fails to respond to the character of the conservation area and to the form of adjacent buildings. The frontage would not follow the curved boundary line.

Certain elements of the proposed street facade appear particularly inappropriate. The false historicism of the rustic, semicircular arch would conflict with the contemporary character of the overall composition. The chamfered flat arch would

be ill at ease beneath the unsatisfactory oriel, which, in turn, would thereby have an unresolved relationship both above and below. The blue, false mansard would be far too prominent in colour and massing, and would be, in fact, a third storey, clad in order to appear as if it were not.

Insufficient consideration has been given to the retention of the structures shown in figures 9.37 and 9.38 of the 2014 English Heritage study of Bristol Town Houses.

The front elevation is far too discordant and does not respond to the character of the local conservation area. The angled arched to the building and the semicircular arch in the raised boundary wall are not appropriate.

6.4 44 Kingsdown Parade - 19/00284/LA

The Panel objects to this application.

This house contains a very large quantity of original historic fabric which must be retained. The proposed removal of the panelled partition at first floor level and the removal of stair balustrades and the enclosure of the very fine staircase was completely unacceptable.

The replacement of the windows with double glazed windows with fake glazing bars was contrary to policy. The window above the front door, which may contain crown glass which must be repaired and retained.

The proposed additional dormer at the front was based on the existing which was not of sufficient quality. The formation of a gate in the existing railings has not been fully justified or detailed,

6.5 Basement Flat 13 Caledonia Place, Clifton – 19/00761/LA

QA recused himself for this item

The Panel objects to this application.

In this Grade II* building the removal of original historic fabric is not acceptable.

The loss of cellar vaults, stone flooring and the wine store would be a substantial loss of significance.

The proposed injected damp proof course would not be appropriate in a stone structure such as this building. The Panel questioned whether the removal of supporting walls and insertion of a steel beam as shown in the drawings would be structurally sound.

The proposed enclosure of the area below the balcony, attached to the balcony structure lacked detail. It risked potential harm to the historic fabric and is not acceptable.

6.6 69-71 South Parade, Oakfield Road - 19/00984/LA

The Panel objects to this application.

The new building on Whiteladies Road should not be regarded as a precedent for tall buildings along Brighton Mews. The 3 storey office building would be due south of an existing house and would be overbearing, reduce privacy and cast shadows.

The rubble stone and brick elevations were copied from the nearby houses but this mews aesthetic was not composed or sustained.

The two separate plots relating to the buildings on Oakfield Road should be expressed in the new building. A building which stepped down and masked the flank wall to the new Whiteladies Road building would be more successful, perhaps more similar to the pre-application design, but of a lesser height.

6.7 Land r/o 28 Ambrose Road, Cliftonwood – 19/01320/F

FR recused herself for this item

The Panel objects to this application.

The minor changes from the most recent, refused application have done nothing to respond to the Reasons for Refusal or change the Panel's view, which was:

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.

6.8 North Side of Ambra Vale East Cliftonwood – 19/01086/F

IH and FR recused themselves for this item

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel is concerned whether views from Goldney Gardens would be blocked by the top storey of the proposed house. Amendment of the form of the top storey or justification of its design is required.

**6.9 Floating Pontoon between Bristol Temple Quay and Cattle Market Road
19/01051/LA**

The Panel objects to this application.

The use and justification for this pontoon walkway is queried in the light of the scrapping of the arena and by the recent university proposals for the cattle market site. It should be reconsidered in the light of future plans for the area..

The proposals were lacking in detail: the success of the pontoon was dependent on the fine detail of the walkway and the handrailing. In addition, lighting for night time use had not been described, any moorings to the pontoon must be for temporary or short term use only and any impact on protected species such as otters must be properly explored.

6.10 The Stables, Cote Road, Stoke Bishop - 19/01160/F

QA recused himself for this item.

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel considered the proposed large new house would adversely affect the grade II listed Cote Lodge. The aggrandising of the existing house was unsuccessful and unacceptable in this prominent location. The drawings were inaccurate with incorrectly detailed windows. The form of the ramped parapet failed to replicate any historic precedent.

6.11 St Mary Magdalene, Mariners Drive, Stoke Bishop - 19/00946/F

QA recused himself for this item.

The Panel support this application.

As well as the improvements in accessibility and sustainability the extension to the church meeting rooms would offer the conservation benefits of improving the connecting link between the church and the meeting rooms.

The extension picks up the architectural language of the Gothic revival church but more attention could be paid to details such as the gablets and porch which reference the listed building.

7 Any Other Business:

None

8 Future Meetings:

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