

PLANNING CONSULTATION

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Conservation - Jo Manning

Application(s) reference: 21/00395/FUL

Proposed : Proposed installation of 19 PAS 68 hostile vehicle mitigation bollards to the frontage of 5-7 Wood Street and associated extension to footway

At : 5-7 , Wood Street, Stratford-Upon-Avon, CV37 6JA

For : Mr Richard Burbidge George Pragnell Ltd

Parish : Stratford-upon-Avon TOWN COUNCIL

UPRN : 100071361913

O.S. Grid Reference : E: 420107 N: 254971

The case officer dealing with this application is Amy Flute - Tel: 01789 260761.

REPLY:

SUMMARY

Objection – Further to the previous objections to 18/01489/FUL and 19/00892/FUL the latest application includes additional proposals that increases the impact and, therefore, harm to the setting of the listed buildings, the grouping with other listed building and the character and appearance of the streetscene.

ASSESSMENT:

EXISTING:

- Pavement to front of No's 5, 6 and 7 Wood Street.
- No's 5/6 is a Grade II listed former townhouse, used as The Unicorn Inn between 1630-1775 and now shop with offices above. Although previously divided into two separate units they were combined in the 1990's to form larger jeweller's shop with approved internal and external alterations. Timber frame c.1595 (rebuilt after a fire) with later alterations and top storey and refronted in brick in 1815 (shopfronts late C20th).
- No.7 is a former townhouse, now shop/dwelling and recently combined with No's 5&6 to form part of the Pragnell's business. C1760 although possibly earlier origins. 2-storeys plus attic of painted brick and Georgian style. C20th shopfront to front.

BACKGROUND TO PROPOSAL:

- As previously commented under the previous applications for mitigation bollards (18/01489/FUL and 19/00892/FUL), security and terrorism concerns are increasing both publicly and commercially. Measures to protect against such incidents are, therefore,

- becoming increasingly desirable and I sympathise with the business, especially as I was in Wood St at the time of the 2008 robbery.
- There are examples of bollards, of varying ages and types, within the streetscene of the Town and in connection with historic properties and sites. These tend to be fewer in number, with greater separation distance, of more traditional design or material or simple and contemporary in a designed public open space context.
 - I previously raised objection as below:
 - *I consider that the amount and concentration of the bollards to be particularly dominant at the front of the listed buildings and within the historic streetscene and adds significant visual clutter. I appreciate that the bollards will to some extent be camouflaged against the shopfront (both being black in finish) however this is only when viewed directly opposite the listed buildings.*
 - *For these reasons I consider that the bollards will cause some harm to the setting of the listed building and does not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. This harm is judged to be at the lower end of 'less than substantial' and should be weighed against any public benefits.*
 - The latest application proposes widening the narrow pavement, increasing the number of PAS 68 bollards from 18 to 19 together with the addition of a reflective band to 17 of the bollards.
 - There is a marginal increase in the distance of the bollards from the front of the buildings, however this is not considered to significantly alter impact upon the listed buildings, although it may increase it slightly within the streetscene looking up or down the street.
 - The increase in number and the addition of the reflective band, as is their very purpose, will increase the impact and visibility of the bollards, the bands especially in low light levels and at night. This in turn increases the impact upon the setting of the adjacent listed buildings, neighbouring listed buildings and the streetscene and public perception of place.
 - Whilst the proposals are reversible in the future I still consider the level to be within the 'less than substantial' categorisation of the NPPF and Core Strategy, however, the harm is increased by the additional/amended proposals. The harm will need to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposals and it should be demonstrated that potentially less harmful measures are not possible.

Jo Manning
Conservation Officer