

From: Stephen Heath
Sent: 03 May 2017 23:21
To: Young, Tony
Cc: Bloomsbury Association
Subject: APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT 2017/1450/L

Tony,

Our original comments still stand because we see no rational basis for changing them for a few millimetres lesser dimension.

For the past two days I have attended an appeal (non planning) in the High Court during which a considerable amount of time was devoted by learned Counsel to interpretation of the word "*alternative*". It leads me to conclude that it is not reasonable to reach any sound conclusions on the basis of whether an alternative proposal that is slightly smaller is better. This is an entirely subjective opinion and, in a way, the elegance and craftsmanship evident in the proposed sign detracts from what, under listed building legislation, should be a more rational judgement. My subjective opinion carries no more weight than does yours.

I would be inclined to consider the proliferation of other signs around the Square and ask, if this proposal was for a sign in brass or plastic, would the Officer view of appropriateness of the dimensions of the proposal be any different. I would then ask whether the applicant's design and material choice is such that it could be argued that it enhances the building more than might be expected with a more conventional sign. I would also ask, is it a sign or a commemorative plaque and does it really matter? I think it does and fitness for purpose is an issue unless the applicant wishes to put forward the suggestion that this is a work of art, in which case our view may be very different.

Regards,

Stephen Heath
On behalf of the Bloomsbury Association