

# MINUTES

OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL  
HELD AT CITY HALL ON  
TUESDAY 15<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 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
David Martyn	Bristol City Council
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
Margaret Cartledge	Observer

1. **Apologies for absence:** Izaak Hudson, Andrew Kenyon & Stephen Morris
2. **Declarations of Interest:** QA declared an interest in Arnos Vale and 87-89 Park Street. RP declared an interest in The Old Halt and FR declared an interest in 98 Hotwells Road.
3. **Minutes of previous meeting:**  
Correction required to the date of the October meeting.
4. **Matters arising:**  
DM to provide a Planning Appeal Inspector's decision on the ability to refer to the impact on the character and appearance of a conservation area regarding views of new development from a privately owned area.
5. **Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:**  
  
None

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

6.1 **18/06325/LA 7a Richmond Hill Avenue**

The Panel was neutral.

The Panel acknowledges the reduction in the proposed range of materials but there is a concern with the proposed first floor accommodation. The relationship of the additional development at first floor level creates a very tight and uncomfortable relationship with the immediately adjacent listed building that could adversely affect its setting. The roof over bedroom 2 must be hipped as indicated on the elevations.

6.2 **18/06642/LA 87-89 Park Street**

The Panel supports this application.

Whilst the Panel supports the principal of the proposal, the bin storage area is not considered to be sufficient in size. This needs to be reviewed and amended before the application is determined.

6.3 **18/6601/F 10 Woodland Road and 1-8 Priory Road**

The Panel objects to this application.

The loss of the rear gardens is not supported. The increasing use of back gardens to accommodate additional teaching space adversely affects the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and undermines the character of large Villas set within gardens. The proximity of the proposed buildings to adjacent buildings adversely affects the setting of and relationship between existing heritage assets.

There are no compensatory conservation enhancements associated with this scheme in relation to boundary treatments and signage. The University must take this opportunity to repair and where necessary upgrade the front boundary treatments of the Villas on Priory Road, including replacing missing or damaged gate piers. This should form part of this application. Should this application be approved a condition controlling any new additional signage should be considered within this application.

There is a mistake in the Arboricultural report that incorrectly calculates the tree replacement compensation requirement. This must be rectified. It was felt that the landscape plans were deliberately confusing showing tarmac surfacing in a light green colour.

This proposal does not provide sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm that it will cause to designated heritage assets and therefore does not accord with relevant Local Plan heritage policies and the requirements of the NPPF (2018).

**6.4 18/06614/F 98 Hotwell Road**

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel welcomes this design. Consideration must be given to the colour of the mortar and the relationship between the proposed red brick and dark mortar.

**6.5 18/06202/LA Shepherds Hall, 71 Old Market Street**

The Panel objects to this application.

Insufficient information, notably with the absence of a historic buildings survey, has been submitted with this application, which makes it extremely difficult to assess what original fabric remains in situ and the acceptability of the scope of proposed works to the front section of the site (no. 71 Old Market Street). , known from the recent English Heritage study of Bristol Town Houses to contain a plan, ceiling beams, fitted spice cupboard and doorway to a pentice linking the house to a former detached kitchen, all of the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In addition to this the importance of the cultural history of the building's historic use over a significant period of time as a Friendly Society must be further assessed and taken into account as part of the heritage assessment.

The Panel was informed that the Shepherds Hall is classed as a Grade II listed curtilage building, in which case a full heritage statement is required, with a full fabric audit for the entire site. The sub-division of the Shepherd's Hall into bedrooms destroys any appreciation of the space and roof structure.

It is noted that a previous retrospective listed building application for works to the entire site was withdrawn prior to a refusal. It would appear from the submitted plans that these unauthorised works have taken place. This must be investigated further before any decision can be made with regards to the current applications.

This proposal does not provide sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm that it will cause to a designated heritage asset and therefore does not accord with relevant Local Plan heritage policies and the requirements of the NPPF (2018).

**6.6 18/06296/LA 16 Portland Square**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel is aware that 16 Portland Square had been rebuilt and no historic fabric remained, however, the proposed new building to the rear immediately adjoining the small former hall is too over-bearing and too large for its back street location. In its current form it creates an awkward and imposing relationship with the adjacent hall and must be reduced by at least one storey.

It is considered that this proposal does not provide sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm that it will cause to designated heritage assets and therefore does not accord with relevant Local Plan heritage policies and the requirements of the NPPF (2018).

6.7 **18/06460/F 127 Richmond Road, Montpelier**

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel welcomes this high quality design. However, the rubble stone front elevation was not considered to be entirely successful and is contextually inappropriate within its context. The rendered flank wall is weak in terms of its relationship with the front rubble stone wall, which in its current form appears as ‘wallpaper’. This element of the building’s design needs to be refined.

6.8 **18/06450/F Jury’s Bristol Hotel, Prince Street**

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel considers this building in its current form to be worthy of local listing.

The infilling at ground floor level between the V shaped pilotti and the extension out onto the pavement was regretted as this undermines the quality and integrity of the facade of the building. The extension does not relate to the building’s V shaped pilotti, its original design aesthetic nor does it respond to the later glazed addition. To add a further architectural form to the building’s overall architectural design weakens the integrity of the original design and is inappropriate.

The proposed extensions appear to be built on the public highway, which is unacceptable.

The proposed waste and recycling area on Assembly Rooms Lane merely encloses the existing area used for bin storage. This is already inadequate and large bins are permanently left on the pavement. Whilst the rationale for enclosing this area is understood it serves to undermine the open nature of the building’s ground floor colonnade. This would also adversely affect the integrity of the building’s overall design aesthetic.

The proposal as a whole does not enhance the character and appearance of this part of the City Docks conservation area. As such this proposal does not provide sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm that it will cause to designated heritage assets and therefore does not accord with relevant Local Plan heritage policies and the requirements of the NPPF (2018).

6.9 **18/06709/F 60-66 East Street, Bedminster**

The Panel supports this application.

However, there are a number of areas that need to be further refined. The articulation of the design of the front elevation onto East Street needs further refinement in terms of the positioning and depth of the windows and a better expression of the verticality of the elevation to more comfortably sit within East Street.

There is insufficient amenity space and landscape associated with the number of proposed units. The landscape design needs to be of better quality and the area covered by landscape and amenity space needs to be increased. The landscape design of the route through Essex Street needs improvement.

6.10 **18/06604/LA Swiss Cottage, Ironmould Lane**

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel commends the quality of the works being undertaken and welcomes the proposed restoration of the curved verandah.

6.11 **18/06487/LA 4 Cooks Folly Road, Sneyd Park**

The Panel has concerns about this application.

The Panel commends the quality of the historic assessment of this building. However the bathroom clad in brick slips and supported on slender steel posts appears perverse and at odds with the character of the existing building. The ground floor extension would also be detrimental to the original building.

6.12 **18/06691/LA The Old Halt, Downleaze, Sneyd Park**

The Panel supports this application.

The amendments to the previous proposals were noted and the mainly glazed structure was considered to address the previous concerns.

6.13 **18/06654/LA The Spielman Centre, Arnos Vale Cemetery, Bath Road**

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel acknowledges the aspiration and the argument lodged to justify the proposal to increase the seating area available for cafe use during inclement weather by building a pergola on the existing terrace. It would not be better to put a pergola somewhere else. Greater success of the cafe would support the existing use of Charles Underwood's grade II\* listed Nonconformist Chapel and, in turn, nurture Arno's Vale Cemetery and animate its Arcadian landscape.

Whereas the design of the glass pavilion had been informed by the proportions and rhythms of the chapel, the proposed pergola would have a more pragmatic form – its northerly supporting legs being set on the existing boundary wall of the terrace, whose location happens to be determined by the extent of the undercroft. The proposed informality and transparency of the pergola could fairly claim to be subservient to both chapel and pavilion, although it was felt that the eye-catching white paint of the existing boundary walls of the terrace should be toned down by painting them a more subdued colour.

7 **Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

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

