

APP/14/01063 and /01147 (LBC)
The Ship Inn, Langstone Road, Havant PO9 1RD

This is a prominently sited listed building facing onto the harbour and Langstone Road. I have visited the site and also taken note of the representations made by the Langstone Residents Association.

The gable facing Langstone Road is the most visible on the approach and contains the main signage at present. The present gold/.bronze lettering is a fairly basic solution. The proposals present something a little more original and distinctive. I do not feel the basic concept should necessarily be dismissed out of hand, but feel a more limited and restrained approach is required.

Detailed Proposals

1. There is no significant change to the current colour scheme requiring comment. In my view it is appropriate..

Signs

2. Signs B, C, D & E are very similar to what currently exists and are uncontentious.
3. Floodlights. Sign A. Note current floodlights are to be retained. No problem with what is on the building. I believe the intention is to replace the lights on the post supporting the hanging sign by the downlighter. If this were the case it has may support being a more satisfactory crisper design solution. Certainly there is no need to retain the bulky uplighters and their removal confirmed.
4. Sign G. Signwritten sign situated at ground floor on main gable and harbour return. No objection. This is relatively restrained and uses a traditional form of signwriting. Taken in its broader context it would be difficult to argue that it harms the building's architectural character or visual amenities, which are the relevant criteria. It is designed to be read on pedestrian approach rather from the road. It would be straightforward to sign write the Langstone Road elevation which is smooth render. More challenging, but not impossible the rubble face of the Harbour return. It would be relevant to check the Agent has not overlooked this when developing the proposals.
5. Sign H. Signwriting the main gable in place of the individual lettering is in my view a reasonable proposition in principle. Where the current proposals fall down, is the content is too fussy and complex. If the sign writing is confined to the gable only, and the pictorial ship is omitted, which serves no purpose: it is in my view reasonable. The upper sign writing on the harbour frontage needs to be omitted. It is merely repetitive, serves no useful purpose (the gable being the principal signpost) and merely adds to visual clutter. Additionally, the walling on this elevation varies between brick (at the upper level) and roughcast rubble. A sign straddling the two would look awkward and out of place.

6. Sign I. This replaces a current sign on this location. It is viewable above the vehicles and intended (presumably) to identify special offers/events. In my opinion it would be difficult to argue this compromises the building's special architectural interest or visual amenities, which are the key planning tests.
7. Sign J. Hanging sign. Whatever the historical accuracy (or otherwise) of the intended sign, it is a very poor in comparison to the present pictorial sign. I think the Agent may have got carried away in trying to present a single consistent image – to be applied to the sign and building.. There is no need, and no good reason to use the pictorial images on the building itself. This frees things up and allows for a good quality pictorial sign which has meaning. The replacement pictorial hanging sign is not acceptable. Advise, refurbishment of the existing, or alternative_of equal visual meaning and pictorial quality.

John Townsend
Conservation Consultant

14/11/14

UPDATE 04/12/14

Support application in revised form as set out on drawing (21715pl01 Issue 2 attached to email dated 03/12/14