

DRAFT MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL
HELD AT CITY HALL ON
TUESDAY 19th MARCH 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
Tony Mason	Montpelier Conservation Group
Stephen Morris	Redland and Cotham Amenities Society
Richard Pedlar	Society of Bristol Architects
Frances Russell	Avon Gardens Trust
David Martyn	Bristol City Council

- 1 Apologies for absence:** Margaret Cartledge, Izaak Hudson, Julie Laming, Jeremy Newick, Steve Wickham
- 2 Declarations of Interest:**
QA for Classic House, Shirehampton Hall and 24 Zetland Road
- 3 Minutes of previous meeting:**
No amendments.
- 4. Matters arising:**
None
- 5. Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:**

18/02334/LA Former Bristol General Hospital, Guinea Street

The Panel objected to this application.

The Panel noted that the dome as built is considerably different to that which was approved, with discrepancies including: the cladding material, the windows and the overall shape. The proposed minor modifications were not sufficient to remedy this.

The Panel concurred with the comments from Historic England that the works were an inauthentic and inaccurate restoration which did not preserve or enhance the listed building and the Conservation Area.

The dome must be reconstructed in accordance with the approved design.

6. Planning and Listed Building Applications:

6.1 2 – 4 Clifton Down Road – 19/00682/F

The Panel objected to this application.

The proposals were far too bulky and massive on this prominent site. The previous public open space was lost and the building filled the entire site to Clifton Down Road and Kings Road apart from a narrow strip at the front for the cafe. The building did not refer in any way to the building lines created by Mortimer House and Boyce's Buildings.

The extensive plant space on the top floor in effect created a 4 storey building. The cladding with metal louvres was completely unacceptable as this would be clearly visible from a distance and would adversely affect the skyline and the Conservation Area. The building would have a particularly adverse effect on the setting of the Grade II* listed Mortimer House. The bulk of the building would severely overshadow Kings Road and Boyce's Avenue.

The unrelenting grid of the facade with enormous areas of glazing is not environmentally sustainable and does not have the level of detail and the hierarchy which is a characteristic of this Conservation Area.

6.2 6 Oakfield Place – 19/00316/LA

The Panel objected to this application.

The proposals involve the loss of too much historic fabric. Most of the rear wall at lower ground floor level would be removed for the extension and the french doors at upper ground floor level would involve further loss. The unusual curved partition at second floor level and the divided window must be retained.

The single storey extension was not appropriate. The terrace on top would cause unacceptable overlooking to both neighbours and also through the skylight to the living room of the flat below.

The proposed replacement window to the front of the lower ground floor was not acceptable and must be reconsidered.

6.3 Classic House, Stokes Croft – 19/00565/F

QA recused himself for this item.

The Panel objected to this application.

Although the building is just outside the boundary of the Conservation Area, its curved facade defines this part of the streetscape and is prominent in views from within the Conservation Area. The Stokes Croft facade of the proposed two storey extension does not reflect either the form or the character of the existing building, and should respond to its curved facade and the strong rhythm of its windows. The complexity of the roof form was questioned.

The street trees on Stokes Croft must be protected during construction works.

6.4 Black Swan, Stapleton Road - 19/00164/LA

The Panel objected to this application.

For a listed building this application was not acceptable as it did not contain an audit of fabric or an assessment of the significance of the building and the impact of the proposed works.

The existing buildings consist of one larger structure, a longer narrow building to one side and an unusually shaped building to the other side. All of these elements would be lost in the proposals and this must be justified.

6.5 Shirehampton Hall – 19/00851/LA

QA recused himself for this item

The Panel supported this application.

The panel commended the full Heritage Statement and the detailed Condition Report. The proposed works would not only restore the fabric of the listed building but update its facilities to secure its future as a successful community building.

The roof of this building makes a significant contribution to its character and significance. If the entire roof is to be re-slatted this work must replicate the original roof. Particularly important aspects are colour, profile (including eaves sprockets)

and slate size (including diminishing courses). Similarly all new rough cast render must match the original.

The extensive array of PV panels on the rear roof slope would be harmful to the appearance of the building and the siting of the PV panels on the flat roofs at the rear should be considered.

6.6 37 – 39 & 41 Corn Street - 19/00845/LA

The Panel supported this application.

The Panel commended the level of detail in the application and the understanding of the listed building.

A condition should be attached that any surviving historic fabric must be recorded.

6.7 24 Zetland Road – 18/05864/F

QA recused himself for this item.

The Panel objected to this application.

The creation of a total of 5 flats in this semi-detached house would be significant overdevelopment. In particular the proposed basement flats would be of very poor quality. The front flat would be single aspect only with any view blocked by the retaining wall and parked cars. The rear flat would only have a restricted view into a heavily shaded courtyard. The basement should be converted into a single flat.

The new window to the front basement bedroom must be the same width as the window above. The window to bedroom 1 at first floor level should be reinstated as a timber sash window. All windows must be of painted timber.

The substantial changes to the roof structure with the removal of critical elements must be structurally justified.

The loss of the front boundary wall was not acceptable as this was an important part of the character of the Conservation Area.

8 Any Other Business

There was no other business.

9 Future Meetings:

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