

MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL
HELD AT CITY HALL ON
TUESDAY 19th FEBRUARY 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
Julie Laming	Neighbourhood Planning Network
Roger Leech	Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological 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
Bruce Clark	Bristol City Council
David Martyn	Bristol City Council

1. **Apologies for absence:** Margaret Cartledge, Izaak Hudson, Andrew Kenyon and Stephen Morris
2. **Declarations of Interest:** Richard Pedlar for Redcliffe Wharf and Richmond Hill.
3. **Minutes of previous meeting:**
No amendments.
4. **Matters arising:**
The Local List has been updated and adopted. It now contains 29 new C20th buildings.
5. **Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:**

18/06624/F Casa Mia, Bramble Lane, Sneyd Park

The Panel considered this proposal to be over development with four large houses, situated very close together. This would have an adverse impact on the character of this part of the Conservation Area and the open green character of the Gorge. Despite the range of

building styles and materials within the vicinity of this site, the finishes and materials of any approved scheme must be of a high quality.

Windmill Hill & Malago Community Planning Group

It is understood that WHaM is seeking to register as a Neighbourhood Forum with the intention to develop a Neighbourhood Plan. There is a desire to seek allocation of parts of Windmill Hill as a Conservation Area and secure some form of listing or protection for Windmill City Farm's eco building.

Shirehampton Conservation Area

The Shirehampton Conservation Area has been extended and must be checked via Know Your Place as this is not covered in the Enhancement Statement. It is not clear if the extension to the Conservation Area is shown on the Local Plan map. It can be found on Pin Point, which is the backbone to Know Your Place. This includes more of the planning policy information. Access is via 'Bristol Pin Point'.

6. Planning and Listed Building Applications:

6.1 19/00067/LA 6 Upper York Street

The Panel is neutral.

The Panel considers this to be an improvement on the earlier pre application submission, with the latest scheme addressing a number of issues that were raised.

The Panel welcomed the phasing of the development, with the listed building scheduled to be developed first. However, there are concerns that the Maltings building (Lakota) is being left to the last phase, where there is considerable risk of further deterioration that could result in the loss of the building. A condition needs to be attached to a decision notice that controls the phasing of works and ensures that the works to the listed and retained buildings are undertaken by certain specified trigger points.

The retention of the boundary wall and railings should be conditioned to ensure that these are retained. The street setts must be protected during construction and any damage caused to these should be repaired with appropriate materials following completion of the development. The internal cast iron columns inside the Maltings must be protected and retained. These can be secured through conditions.

The Panel was concerned that contrary to clear evidence that this was originally a maltings the heritage statement questioned the evidence.

It is noted that the Maltings is a locally listed building, which does to some extent limit the level of statutory protection afforded to this building. However, the continuous roof form over the Maltings and the new building was not acceptable as this did not distinguish between the old and new buildings and resulted in a loss of historic and architectural integrity. There is little information contained within the Heritage Statement on the form of the roof of the Maltings building. This needs to be further investigated.

6.2 18/06660/LA Redcliffe Wharf, Redcliffe Way

RP recused himself for this item.

The Panel objects to this application.

Building B continues to be too dominant and assertive. The decorative arch remains an eye catching conceit. There has been an insufficient archaeological evaluation undertaken. This is an area rich in history and the archaeological approach needs to embrace a more detailed evaluation over the wider site area.

The proposal seeks to demolish and rebuild the oldest structures on the site (Building D). Although these are in a very dilapidated condition this is not supported. These buildings must be retained and sympathetically restored.

The proposed moorings are inappropriate in terms of their use, scale and design in this location. The intrinsic character of the City Docks is industrial in nature. The proposed moorings act more like a residential marina, and would occupy far too much open water, which would adversely degrade the character of this part of the City Docks and would fail to present a suitable scale of reference to the Bascule Bridge.

The former Quaker Burial Ground is a local Historic Park and Garden. This would be adversely affected by the overbearing nature and proximity of the new buildings. The relationship between these two elements need to be reconsidered.

6.3 **18/05805/LA The Pineapple, 37 St George's Road**

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel welcomes this application and also the recent Grade II listing of The Pineapple. However, the design of the newly constructed building adjacent to The Pineapple is currently neither a quality pastiche design nor a quality contemporary design. In any event this needs further refinement as it should be as simple as possible in order not to detract from the Edwardian facade of The Pineapple. To achieve this it would be more appropriate to have only two windows per floor which should be simple casement, rather than sash, windows and without stone lintels. There is some concern over the loss of external pub memorabilia and the possible loss of the working gas light. This must be clarified further.

6.4 **18/06600/LA High Street Dental Clinic, 44 High Street, City Centre**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel considers the heritage assessment to be wholly inadequate and this application cannot be determined on the basis of the current package of information. A more thorough assessment needs to be undertaken before a decision can be made as there is a very poor understanding of the existing internal configuration and the architectural significance of the building. Based on the paucity of information provided it is considered that the proposed elements of demolition would significantly harm the building.

There are clearly going to be changes to the building's external signage and the opportunity should be taken to remove the vinyl banner on the front.

6.5 **19/00231/LA 16 Richmond Hill, Clifton**

RP recused himself for this item.

The Panel supports this application.

6.6 **19/00272/LA 62 Queens Road, Clifton**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel considers the heritage assessment submitted with this application to be wholly inadequate. There is a very poor understanding of the internal configuration and architectural significance of the building and as such this application cannot be determined on the basis of the current package of information. A more thorough assessment needs to be undertaken before a decision can be made.

6.7 **19/00249/LA 6 Worcester Terrace**

The Panel is neutral.

The Panel does not object to the principle of development, however, this is a Grade II* listed building and there is insufficient information submitted to support this application. As a result there is a poor understanding of the existing internal configuration and architectural significance of the building and the impact of the proposed works. This application cannot currently be determined on the basis of the current package of information. A more thorough assessment needs to be undertaken before a decision can be made.

6.8 **18/06730/F Flat 1, 7 Eaton Crescent, Clifton**

The Panel objects to this application.

The proposed rear extension involves a large loss of fabric from the heritage asset and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. This would set a precedent for future development of this nature for the rest of the Crescent. Moreover, the extension would limit scope for access for future maintenance of the exterior of the building.

6.9 **19/00192/LA 5 Exeter Buildings, Redland**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel is appalled at both the proposals and the quality of this application submission. There is no proper heritage assessment. There is no assessment of the significance of the heritage asset. The proposal includes the removal of the basement front chimney piece and part of the chimney breast, the removal of original cupboards and the rear sash window. There is no consideration of the practicality of the removal of all the load bearing walls in the basement. There is no justification for the loss of original historic fabric shown in the basement.

6.10 **19/00311/F 1a Colston Yard, City Centre**

The Panel objects to this application.

The gabled south-east elevation is very prominent above the arcaded retaining wall to Johnny Ball Lane and the change from four windows to seven windows would have an adverse effect on the building and the character of the Conservation Area. The internal plans must be reconsidered to retain the existing windows. The proposed window to the second floor room is out of of scale with the gable and must also be reconsidered.

7 **Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

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