

A/25/98996 & L/25/98998 – Ham Farm Harvester, Twyford Road, Eastleigh, SO50 4LF.

Context.

The site lies to the east of Twyford Road, between it and the River Itchen to the rear on the northern entrance to the town, in a residential area. The restaurant building lies to the rear of the site on the east boundary with the large car park in front to the northern end with the old listed farmhouse in the south-west quadrant, end on to the road.

This building is separate to that at the rear and is built of painted brick-work and partly brick-nogged timber frame under a thatched roof and is the pub element of the whole site.

The Proposal.

This application is for both revised and additional signage at this site, involving four elements; No. 1 is a refresh of the existing 'lollipop' sign to the left of the site entrance; No. 3, a refreshed pictorial sign on the existing gibbet fixed to the front wall of the listed building and No.4 new lettering to the newly glazed gable entrance to the rear of the side elevation of the listed building. None of the above present any problem, so there is no objection to No's 1, 3 or 4.

Sign No. 2 however is a considerable problem. This is a new sign some 1735mm x 1060mm (aprox. 6' x 3'6"), the bottom standing 1400mm (4'8") above the ground level to the right hand side of the site entrance and therefore in front of the listed building, largely blanking it out to travellers approaching from the north. This will have a seriously harmful effect on the setting of this heritage asset. Objection to the position of this sign.

One appreciates the need to bring attention to the offer within the buildings but the proposed position of this sign not only reduces the quality of the setting of the listed building but will largely block out the attractiveness of the venue to prospective new customers entering the area and therefore be counter productive. A sign of this nature needs to be either set down at hedge level (board itself is after all about the same height as the hedge) or positioned much further north along the front boundary.

Conclusion.

Signs 1,3 and 4 are no problem but the height, size and position of sign No 2 as proposed is not acceptable, so holding objection.

Tim J S Dyer, B.Sc.,Dip.Arch.(Birm), Grad.Dip.Conservation(AA), RIBA.

Built Heritage Consultant.