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This thesis examines current historic preservation and conservation efforts for Bath, England’s only complete UNESCO World Heritage city, where urban and commercial development remain a controversial threat to its status. This is best represented by the opposing views of the Bath Preservation Trust and the Bath & North East Somerset Council. While the Trust stands as a supporter of saving Georgian Bath, the Council continues to sacrifice precious greenbelt areas and historic buildings for the purpose of attracting tourists and prospective residents.

Both organizations are extensively examined in order to better comprehend Bath’s future. Although no definite answer can be reached at this point in time, besides establishing balance between old and new architecture, examining social and political issues in this city demonstrates that there is a serious need for legal intervention to prevent further destruction to a past way of life so that the modern world can emerge. Areas explored include the conserved Roman Baths, the recent developments of SouthGate and the Western Riverside Development, the conserved Beckford’s Tower and the demolished Gasholder.
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An Aerial Introduction to Bath:

Historic preservation plays a key role in defining a nation’s legacy as exemplified by its past triumphs. With the increasing presence of economic and social issues affecting future generations, problems concerning historic preservation nonetheless erupt for buildings and the valuable history they offer both a city and its people. One such immediate case confronting historic preservation and conservation issues is the legendary city of Bath. Situated "in the South West of England and less than 2 hours from London," as illustrated in Figure 1, Bath has been a UNESCO World Heritage site since December 1987 and is currently celebrating its 25th anniversary as such a prestigious city.¹

UNESCO, or United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization, is responsible for identifying international sites that contribute to the enrichment of global cultural heritage. They chose to include the city of Bath as a World Heritage Site because of “the way its grand neo-classical crescents, terrace, and squares spread out around its hills and within a green valley combine harmoniously, integrating architecture,

urban design, and landscape to create deliberately a beautiful city."² This was accomplished through the ingenious 18th century vision that English architects, Beau Nash, Ralph Allen, John Wood the Elder and John Wood the Younger, had for Bath. These great men borrowed the Italian Palladian style of "many individual buildings with a common frontage made to give the effect of a grand building" in order to suit the luxurious style of the upper class.³ This gave birth to Georgian Bath, a city where a rich taste in architecture is represented in many of its grand buildings, including the Circus and Royal Crescent, which still stand today.

In modern times, Bath is fast-becoming a growing center for tourism because of the success of its architects. Such touristic endeavors advertise and praise Bath’s status as being "the only complete city in the UK afforded World Heritage Status," although recent controversial development in Bath affects the city’s ability to maintain its status in the 21st century.⁴ Marketing promoting the city continues, nonetheless, right down to online availability of Bath architecture in tantalizing chocolate confection replicas.

Although Bath remains a growing and attractive city with a unique architectural history, increasing threats of development endanger the city’s future. Bath first began as a Roman bath and later became a Georgian city when "in the 18th century, under George III, it developed into an elegant town with neoclassical Palladian buildings, which blend harmoniously with the Roman baths," and therefore offers England a

unified glimpse of classical Rome.\(^5\) This same cohesion of East and West exists today for Bath’s newest visitors. Presently, 176,000 people live in Bath, as per March 2011 Census and Population statistics, and this creates even more problems for conservation efforts and historic preservation.\(^6\) As more and more people travel to Bath, the precious Georgian buildings face more and more threats from the wear and tear daily life presents. This can best be attributed to the great level of tourism available in Bath, such as bathing in the lavish, historical Roman spas or visiting the famous home of 18\(^{th}\) century literary genius, Jane Austen, which are continually highlighted in the British media. These pressing social issues further complicate preservation matters.

Measures for new developments and the destruction of the greenbelt and buildings in the surrounding areas are continually proposed in city plans, as outlined by the Bath & North East Somerset Council.\(^7\) Although the Council is primarily responsible for the operation of both cities of Bath and Somerset, their conflict of interest remains apparent. It may be that Bath’s history will be sacrificed solely for the promised increase of much desired housing developments, business districts, and new roads to better suit the immediate needs of the city’s many inhabitants while also bringing in tempting revenue sources to appease this local government.

While all these development proposals have been rejected, and continue to be rejected by the Bath Preservation Trust, early urban development issues in the 1970s and 1980s, as well as current controversial issues in 2007 and 2009, unfortunately

---

allowed great destruction to befall Bath in an attempt to modernize England. Such urbanization additionally remains a constant threat that is not likely to disappear in coming years, but rather increase. These problems even extend into current restoration and renovation concerns for Bath’s historic Georgian architecture. The Bath Preservation Trust campaigns harder and harder to protect the safety of Bath. The Trust is more attentive and critical of designs made in the later 21st century as these changes will impact upon and destroy Bath’s historical significance for future generations.

Earlier developments, however, now remain permanent unsightly fixtures in Bath. These include the installation of a bus stop at the historic Churchill House site and the box-like shopping center of SouthGate in City Centre, located at the very entrance of Bath. While these supposed improvements are horrible reminders of development’s cruelty to nature, they also function as reminders of the necessary options available to Bath. Public protestation efforts as well as the creation of much needed UK laws can stop future developments. These measures can help protect a huge portion of England’s cultural heritage from being lost forever. Since the Trust’s very foundation "in 1934 to safeguard the historic city of Bath," it continues to carry out its mission statement to ensure development does not threaten either Bath or its special right, and privilege, to be listed as a World Heritage Site. The Western Riverside stands as the latest development threat in Bath. Completion of this development will jeopardize the city’s World Heritage Status if adequate steps are not taken early on in order to limit the amount of building and respective building heights in this already densely-populated and sensitive section.

Proposals do, of course, exist to combat the continual problems facing Bath. These problems include, but are not limited to, population growth, tourism, traffic and pollution, a changing climate, specifically increased pollution levels, and a low-wage economy that will make city revisions and building additions necessary for life in a real world.\footnote{“Future for Bath & North East Somerset,” accessed August 5, 2012, \url{http://www.web.archive.org/web/2007.}} Since Bath has such a rich and diverse history, the Bath Preservation Trust’s active involvement in historic preservation and conservation, as well as the government’s creation of and implementation of laws, remain critical to guarantee the city’s survival for England’s cultural heritage as reflected in this unique and only surviving full World Heritage City, despite developers’ insistence for economic change in the name of promoting the city’s growth.

**Bath’s Cultural and Architectural History:**

Bath is best remembered for its architectural wonders and history, all of which are aggressively advertised on tourism websites in the hopes of raising revenue and attracting more droves of people to this popular country. England even boasts that Bath contains “some of the finest architectural sights in Europe such as the Royal Crescent, the Circus, and Pulteney Bridge alongside a diverse collection of museums and attractions including the Roman Baths, Jane Austen Centre and Thermae Bath Spa,” all of which remind foreign visitors of the appeal of traveling to a prestigious World Heritage city such as Bath where every “architectural” building offers a one of a kind experience, as illustrated in Figure 2.\footnote{“Visit Bath,” accessed February 10, 2012, \url{http://www.visitbath.co.uk/travel-and maps}; see page 6.} Not only does Bath present itself as a cultural wonderland, in this respect, but it also offers a magnificent architectural feast. Each of these above
referenced sites contributes towards the promotion of Bath as a glorified spa town in relation to its ability to generate revenue for the Council.

**Fracking the Baths:**

**Conservation Problems, Solutions, and Issues**

One of the most attractive aspects of Bath is its famous and archaic Roman Baths. These baths are said to possess special healing properties first noticed by the Romans. They commemorated the mysticism of this site when they "built a temple there around 50 AD. The temple was dedicated to Sul, a Celtic god and Minerva, the Roman goddess of healing. [...] They also built a public bath, which was supplied by the hot springs" naturally occurring in Bath and the source of modern controversy with respect to conservation issues.\(^\text{12}\) Excavations for the Baths “stretch back over 200 years to the efforts of 18th century antiquarians. It is, however, the excavations of 1978-1983, directed by Peter Davenport and Barry Cunliffe, that have given us the most detailed

---


account of the site” as found on Bath tourist websites, such as Visit Bath. These websites advertise the baths’ history in order to educate and entice visitors to come see old Roman Bath not only for the waters’ healing properties, but also to buy, shop, and spend in a prestigious World Heritage City. Today the baths are open to the public as a museum and are owned by the Bath and North East Somerset Council. According to Andrew Selkirk, Editor in Chief and Founder of Current Archaeology, Britain’s best-selling archaeology journal, after Barry Cunliffe’s excavations, the Roman Baths were converted into a museum, as they are “one of the foremost heritage sites in England and clearly one of the most profitable” in terms of the revenue they bring the Council.

One of their main attractions includes the central Great Bath, which offers visitors the chance to experience a hot spa in the same fashion as the ancient Romans. Bath’s Hot Bath additionally is a historically significant building because of its status as “a Grade II listed building within the City,” which increases the chances and importance of successful conservation efforts made to update this bath so it will continue to reflect its historic as well as modern function.

The history of the Roman Baths directly relates to tourism and development. Bath itself was “built at least 8,000 years B.C. but probably the place was too mysterious, with steam emerging from a hot, lushly vegetated swampy area for any settlement to take place here,” but the actual City of Bath was founded much later in

---

“863 BC” by Prince Bladud after his leprosy was cured in the springs. To this effect, “in AD 43 the Romans started the development of ‘Aquae Sulis’ as a sanctuary of rest and relaxation,” which is now a tradition passed down through the ages and upheld by modern tourism. This preliminary development of Aquae Sulis “attracted visitors across Britain and Europe, foreshadowing Bath’s status as a premier tourism destination,” which lasted from the 17th century and into the 18th century, at the time of the appearance of Georgian architecture. A pivotal point in the transition from development to cultural heritage occurred from 1688-1703. It was at this time that “Princess/Queen Anne visited Bath to take the waters and the frequency of her visits led to even greater aristocratic patronage. These visits set in motion a period of development in which Bath became ‘the premier resort of frivolity and fashion,’ and led to the great rebuilding of the city to produce the 18th century layout and architecture of today’s UNESCO World Heritage Site.”

The spirit of this spa culture resulted in the construction of an architectural style that directly corresponded to the city’s relaxing nature and fit the needs of Bath’s guests. The baths were even redesigned by Georgian architect John Wood the Younger and although city planning “required the destruction of several existing streets & houses, and much archaeological evidence,” the beginning of Georgian Bath was set in

---

The Roman Baths are only part of the reason for Bath’s inclusion as a UNESCO’s World Heritage Site.

The Roman Baths have their own solvable conservation issue, unlike the more prominent issue of developers' constant threats for the rest of Bath. In the 1980s and 1990s, conservation efforts proved successful enough for preserving the baths so they would continue to reflect the presence of Roman history in the Western world. However, the new economic threat of fracking developed in 2011. The controversy here sparked the immediate attention of both the Bath & North East Somerset Council and the Department of Energy and Climate Change. In comparison to the buildings featured throughout Bath’s Georgian city, these issues were immediately reviewed to prevent great destruction, perhaps because of the museum’s association with revenue sources.

Initial restoration efforts for the baths addressed the climate and level of work required so the site would continue to be publically accessible to its tourists. On this note, "the Baths presented a uniquely challenging environment, due to humidity levels and the resulting continuous movement of moisture and salts through the stone." This involved a great level of precision and care for specialists dealing with such an unstable environment in an effort to prevent further damage from befalling such a historically important site. These cleaning efforts, of course, were not in vain. The Bath City Council is currently "delighted to observe that mortar repairs mixes used on the stone floors of the baths have remained sound, even after 25 years of wear and tear by visitors," which points to the high-level of skills and expertise needed in order to conduct these

---

Guidelines involving such precise care can, and should, be considered for the successful implementation of preservation in Bath’s architecture as well.

Restoration of this nature may last for twenty-five more years, provided current repairs adhere to the same quality of standards for maintenance. This calls attention to the daily dangers World Heritage sites face. Because of their respectable reputation, people visit these sites more often than less famous monuments to experience the best of history. This places these special buildings at considerable risk, making them in constant need of protection and legal care. The Bath Preservation Trust expressed their concern for the future of historic buildings in their February 2011 guide, *Warmer Bath*, published exclusively for the city. Here they revealed “the preservation of the built environment of Bath and the creation of a sustainable future for the city need not be in conflict. There are many ways of improving the fabric and use of traditional buildings in Bath without radically changing their appearance or their historic fabric.” The Roman Baths represent the perfected execution of this philosophy as the conservation used for this site is still in acceptable condition. Neither the “appearance” nor “traditional buildings” of the Romans Baths faced substantial harm during such conservation efforts. This raises questions into determining a reason as to why the remainder of Bath’s buildings cannot effectively be saved from the problems modernity poses for the city. Of course, this fact essentially depends on the right level of implemented legality and national support mandatory to ensure their survival.

The issue of fracking, in relation to the removal of natural gas, became a

---

significant controversy for Bath in both October and November of 2011. At this time, intrusive underground activity affected the Roman Baths hot springs. Not only did these activities threaten the site, but they also involved other environmental concerns. As recorded in Bath’s own newspaper, *Bath Chronicle*, such underground hydraulic fracking resulted in the presence of earth tremors, which would weaken buildings’ foundations and endanger their stability at ground level. Although “green groups claim the process damages the environment, [the] Bath and North East Somerset Council is worried that it could be used [in] a way that could damage the city’s world-famous hot springs.”24 This problem also gained the attention of the Department of Energy and Climate Control and they promised to investigate the dangers that the situation posed. Oddly enough, further comments on the part of the Department were unavailable through media contacts. The onset of underground tremors is a most serious environmental hazard affecting not only the future of the baths but the entire country and warrants immediate address.

**Environmental Hazards: Fracking Bath**

It was further suggested that this initial proposal for fracking could cause other natural hazards, beyond simple earth tremors. In this respect, “a new license granted to Eden Energy and UK Methane Ltd to begin test drilling in the area could cause contamination to the natural hot springs which feed the nearby Roman Baths,” and would thereby bring contamination much closer to England’s native population, inclusive of the masses of unsuspecting travelers.25 The negative effects of fracking, however,

---

continue to mount. In a recent July 2012 posting for the Bath Chronicle, Karen Boutland expressed her own concerns over the latest drilling licenses involving the Council and their unexpected approval of the Cuadrilla gas company. On this note, "in Bath, there are already fissures in the rock through which the precious bath hot springs flow. The Mendip shale area for fracking includes the bedrock for Bath. There is no reason why this could not be affected and this water could degenerate into a brown oily mess."26 The risk presented here not only affects drinking water, but also threatens the very hot springs which attract tourists to Bath in the first place. Combined with the presence of chemicals and the toxic promise of pollution in the form of carbon dioxide, more harm will come than good to the environment and its people if the Council knowingly approves of fracking in this region despite the dangers associated with this activity.

Although Boutland additionally wishes for Bath to become a "frack-free zone," the extraction of gas fulfills a monetary goal in the form of meeting increasing energy needs in a city seeking to satisfy its own problems with energy. This essentially means that fracking will not come to a halt, regardless of how much citizens like Boutland complain and warn about the compound dangers associated with this issue. Coincidentally, Cuadrilla has also appeared in the June 2012 edition of The Guardian for their controversial involvement with fracking in another area of England, the Blackpool region. Fracking conducted at that site created two earthquakes which, in turn, damaged a well and was felt locally by residents. Further drilling stopped in order to prevent the possible leakage of methane, a lethal and flammable gas that also "is a potent greenhouse gas" which can negatively increase global warming once released.

into the atmosphere.\textsuperscript{27} However, the Royal Academy of Engineering and the Royal Society simply overlooked the dangers of this environmental hazard. They only provided that "the UK's current regulatory systems were sufficient for shale gas fracking if they were adequately enforced, but [c]loser monitoring of shale gas exploration sites should be put in place, in order to ensure their safety."\textsuperscript{28} The fact that fracking is not a stable activity means that deadly gases can spill onto the land and this should be taken into heavy consideration before future work continues. With the spillage onto soil, the cycle begins of widespread contamination through wind and water sources. It is not enough to suggest a "closer monitoring" of this type of "exploration". Realistic limitations need to be enforced in potentially unsafe areas where cultural heritage faces damage.

For a historically important area like Bath, hiring a company with a known-reputation for causing harm should raise much more than just initial concern for the Council. Perhaps next time, more than just gas will spill. It is surprising that the Bath Preservation Trust has not released any statements about their environmental anxieties, but this fact may be attributed to their primary focus on saving buildings, not the environment. Whether or not fracking does continue in Bath, although the former is a more feasible possibility than the latter, the public must be aware of the potential impact such environmental issues play for society. Their awareness may prevent substantive harm in such a widely-visited spot where old buildings like the Baths may not be able to survive both this internal and manmade disturbance.

Perhaps the Roman Baths receive so much media attention not only for their primary role in attracting thousands of tourists and the controversial issue of fracking, but also because of their special royal treatment. Since 1591, the Baths have been under the Bath & North East Somerset Council’s protection. It is even noted on Bath’s main tourist website, Visit Bath, that Queen Elizabeth I initiated this change. She made the town responsible for preservation of the baths by transferring the issue of legality directly to the local level, as represented in the Council.\textsuperscript{29} Although the Council still possesses this important authority, they seem to foolishly misuse their power in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. Their continual approval of developments, despite the Trust’s insistence against such irreversible damages, is not a wise choice for protected areas of Bath, yet this remains an ongoing issue of great alarm. Even though cultural heritage and preservation remained a main priority early on in England’s history, during the late 16\textsuperscript{th} century, well before Georgian architecture entered the scene, the future of such preservation seemed uncertain as well.

**Bath’s Attractive, Uncontroversial, Attractions:**

Contrary to the high level of unresolved controversy surrounding the Roman Baths, not all of Bath’s tourist attractions involve controversial issues. Three such places include the Jane Austen Centre, the Thermae Bath Spa and Sally Lunn’s. Much like the Roman Baths, these areas serve as a massive source of revenue for the city as they are three of the many other major centers wildly advertised on Bath’s tourist maps as entertaining centers worthy of visiting.

The Jane Austen Centre offers a cultural and literary educational experience for England’s travelers. The Centre is currently "located at 40 Gay Street and tells the story

of Jane's Bath experience—the effect that living here had on her and her writing," which occurs in some of her most notable novels, namely *Persuasion*, *Pride and Prejudice*, and *Northanger Abbey*.30 The Centre functions as a walk-in museum in which viewers are afforded the opportunity to relive 18th century fashion, dining, and entertainment just as Austen lived. Additionally, the Centre offers its visitors walking tours of Georgian Bath, an annual Jane Austen Festival in September, and in this respect, functions similarly to that of other tourist websites for Bath, such as Visit Bath and Bath Tourism & Travel. Here the main goal again lies in attracting new faces to the city and increasing an expansion in both revenue and population. The Centre furthermore includes a massive gift shop, which features a wide array of merchandise associated moreso with the cheap profit of tourism than with Austen’s works and Bath. These include collectible jewelry, stationary, journals, mugs, costumes, dresses, and hats.31

Despite the Centre’s deliberate drive to tie commercialism with the past, Austen’s legacy nonetheless remains significant for Bath. According to Peter Borsay, Jane Austen is essentially responsible for preserving the memory of Georgian architecture because “her novels made Bath ‘literary,’ transforming it into a fictional and mythic landscape” which is currently worthy of praise and remembering with respect to present preservation efforts in order to keep the city alive.32 Although Austen only lived in Bath for a short five-year period, her impact on the literary world is unending. Her works stand as classics and the Centre attests to her influence on the Georgian world.

The Thermae Bath Spa is another tourist attraction in Bath for its visitors, which

recently opened its doors in August 2006. Here travelers have the chance to "enjoy Britain's only natural thermal waters as the Celts and Romans did over 2,000 years ago" in a modern setting, featuring a state of the art facility that includes “a roof-top pool of hot water” for a rejuvenating bath. Like the Jane Austen Centre, the Thermae Bath Spa promotes commercialism through its extensive offerings of spa packages. These specials are varied and include “watsu, aromatherapy massage, Hot Stones therapy” and its latest weekend special Twilight Package. Such advertisements focus on personal relaxation with an added emphasis on exotic treatment set in a prestigious location. Britain's Heritage Cities website similarly composes a rather elaborate advertisement for the Thermae Bath Spa in which they juxtapose the cultural significance of the baths with the commercialism now directly linked to the spa. Accordingly, "the historical parts of the spa, Roman, medieval, Georgian and Victorian - have been refurbished and returned to life. But there's also an astonishing new 21st century spa complex that offers a full range of treatments, complementary therapies and steam rooms, not to mention the opportunity to bathe in a spectacular rooftop thermal pool open to the skies." In this light, the modern world now features an assortment of new spas and hotels just like the Thermae Bath Spa, which further adhere to Bath’s original purpose in the 18th century: that is, as a luxurious and entertaining spa town built exclusively for the elite and their frivolous lifestyles.

Similarly to the Thermae Bath Spa, Sally Lunn’s stands not only as major tourist attraction in Bath, but also as a historic landmark. As noted on Sally Lunn’s official

website, and in the true spirit of successful advertisement, travelers to England “can’t visit Bath without experiencing Sally Lunn’s.” It is here that the famous Bath bun was born in Bath and visitors now can enjoy genuine British food at affordable prices. Sally Lunn’s website posts daily menus which not only explain meal choices, but also provide an elaborate historic overview of the eatery and its significance in Bath’s history. Sally Lunn’s currently includes a culinary museum, similarly to the Jane Austen Centre, dedicated to the life of Huguenot Sally Lunn. As creator of the Bath bun, Lunn created “a very popular delicacy in Georgian England as its special taste and lightness allowed it be enjoyed with either sweet or savoury accompaniments” ranging from butter to smoked salmon. The museum, much like any other building associated with commercialism in the heart of Bath, sells the Bath bun so its visitors can “take home a Sally Lunn bun” and hopefully return for another delicious visit. Interestingly enough, entry to the museum is free so long as “all guests take refreshment” as they partake in the true Bath experience.

Another important characteristic of Sally Lunn’s rests in the historically significant contribution the building makes to the city in terms of architecture. The eatery itself is centered in “one of the oldest houses in Bath,” equating its preservation to that of a prestigious Grade I and II Listed building. On this note, “the present house you largely see was erected around 1622 and built upon earlier houses. Here you will see evidence of early Medieval & Roman dwellings on this site and the oven it is believed Sally Lunn

used back in 1680.\textsuperscript{42} Sally Lunn’s diverse history is a vital factor for the tourism associated with the house. Much like the very founding of the city of Bath, Sally Lunn’s may, in time, be in need of conservation and preservation attention to keep the establishment in good working condition for the purpose of attracting people to this intriguing spot.

These tourist hot spots provide only a brief glimpse into the way of life, which was old Bath as found in its new location within the modern world. Although these sites are not areas of cultural controversy, their futures in Bath seem rather secure because of their abilities to promote economic growth for the Council. In the case of Georgian architecture, however, preservation and conservation issues nonetheless continue to exist.

Stepping Out of Baroque and Into Georgian:

18th Century Architecture in Bath

In addition to a wide scope of cultural history, Bath's architectural history is comprised of impressive Georgian buildings that complement the city's meticulous layout. Although the playful Baroque style first existed in Bath, the Georgian became an easy replacement simply because of its dual practicality. Architectural sources note that the "Georgian [style] succeeded the English Baroque of Sir Christopher Wren, Sir John Vanbrugh and Nicholas Hawksmoor, [but] unlike the Baroque style that it had replaced, which was generally almost solely in the context of palaces and churches, Georgian had wide currency in the upper and middle classes, making it a more versatile architectural style" that fit perfectly in the urban design of this growing English city. The city's traditional homes, built on the ruins of the ancient Romans, now came to exist in conjunction with the respectable image that Georgian architecture offered this resort town comprised mostly of the elite and tourists. Georgian architecture could now relate to the style and preferences of both the upper class and the middle class.

A significant feature within the layout of Bath is Georgian architecture's ability to adapt to its surroundings. This occurs when classical architecture directly responds to nature. Such a well-balanced combination of buildings and gardens establishes the ideal city, as Figure 3 demonstrates. On this note,

"[t]he individual Georgian buildings reflect the profound influence of Palladio, and their collective scale, style, and the organisation of the spaces between buildings epitomises the success of

---

44 See page 26.
architects such as John Woods, Robert Adam, Thomas Baldwin, and John Palmer, in transposing Palladio’s ideas to the scale of a complete city, situated in a hollow in the hills and built to a picturesque landscape aestheticism creating a strong garden city feel, more akin to the 19th century garden cities than the 17th century Renaissance cities."

It is in places such as Renaissance Italy where the close relationship shared between nature and architecture originated. This classic building idea eventually transferred to both England and France and became a valuable attribute in the architecture of these Western countries. This change enabled the entire city to be built in one particular architectural style, as opposed to the incorporation of a variety of different styles lacking unity and holding no relationship to the influences of their Italian predecessor.

The transformation of Bath into a Georgian architectural city further depended upon 18th century social perceptions that traveled into 20th and 21st century philosophy. Because of the city’s association with the spa as a health reviving facility, Peter Borsay outlines the image and myth of Bath as a developing city which maintained a unified link to its classically influenced heritage. Specifically, in the years following World War II, “Georgian Bath was projected as an inspiring example of town planning, albeit of a less formal, specifically English type." Although the later Victorian generation turned toward conservative architecture in building design, in rejection of the former style, Georgian architecture nonetheless left a lasting impression on the city’s future inhabitants who

---

saw preservation as a key element for remembering the architects who gave the city’s
it ultimate life force.

Through the exclusive use of Georgian architecture, Bath’s architects unified the
city by allowing nature to correspond perfectly with the social presence of urbanization.
Such close attention to city space and landscape then became an essential tool in
connecting the city with its individual buildings. The evident popularity of Georgian
architecture in Britain also spread to its American colonies, through the practice of
mercantilism. However, no other city or town in England ever saw the construction of an
entire city built in one complete architectural style. This precious unity makes
preservation in Bath an important factor to consider for its architectural history. In fact,
UNESCO added Bath to its World Heritage List in 1987 as a “cultural site” because of
this unique combination of historical elements and cultural diversity. Such elements are
explained in great detail on UNESCO’s official criteria listing, and include the following
diverse qualifications:

“Roman remains – the Roman Baths
and Temple thermal establishment; 18th
century architecture – neo-classical
public buildings and set-piece-
developments such as terraces,
crescents, squares and the Circus by
Palladian-inspired Bath architects; 18th
century town planning – its innovative
and cohesive ‘garden city’ concept,
harmonized with its green landscape;
[and] social setting- its role as a
destination for pilgrimage and the
social aspirations of the fashionable
spa culture that created the Georgian
city.”

http://www.unesco.org/world_heritage.
Developers pose a serious threat to Bath with the lasting impact their profit-driven plans will ultimately have if careful attention and efforts are not made to prevent future destruction. This in-depth description suggests the scope of Bath’s historical significance and further fulfills UNESCO’s definition of a World Heritage Site. The city additionally adds “outstanding universal value to the whole of humanity” through its universally preserved living past found in a city where the Roman past and Georgian heritage have not been forgotten but continue to exist in the present day.48 Development will negatively impact upon Bath’s ability to remain a “universal” site for all “humanity” as much of the city’s original cultural fabric will essentially be lost through the transformation of both building and nature.

The Prince of Wales succinctly addressed the social problem development poses for the city of Bath and its architecture. In his January 31st 2008 speech, given at the New Buildings in Old Places Conference in St. John’s Palace, London, he stated that “we may not only be destroying our heritage, but killing the goose that lays the golden egg for we will destroy what makes our cities and towns so attractive to tourists.”49 In other words, if developers, with the Council’s approval, are successful in completing erasing Bath’s heritage, the effects will be catastrophic for all parties involved. Tourism will decline and adversely affect commercialism, which is the ultimate driving force behind the prominence of development. Historic buildings will once more be sacrificed for modernity’s emergence. Perhaps the Council does not realize that their efforts

towards satisfying their modern needs only serves to jeopardize the highly-respected accomplishments of the past.

Like the Prince of Wales’ sentiments, Bruce G. Trigger quotes archaeologist Gordon Childe and his nationalistic views of how cultural traditions correspond to specific social settings. Childe’s vision suggests balance and directly applies to the situation about development and preservation affecting the city of Bath. Childe here offers that “no cultural system will survive for long if there is not a reasonable congruence between the imaginary and the real worlds. Ideas are tested by their observed utility and their ability to serve human needs and desires.”50 In order for Bath to survive into the 21st century, according to Childe’s model, there must exist “a reasonable congruence between the imaginary” 18th century Georgian architecture and the past world it encompassed “and the real world” England has transformed into, in which tourism relates to modern needs. These buildings must serve “human needs and desires” to avoid being either destroyed or altered beyond recognition. This suggests that because Bath is a specific English town, its survival ultimately affects British national identity, despite UNESCO’s universal vision of Bath and its standing as a World Heritage City. In order to avoid the loss of Bath and its impact on English cultural heritage, the city must “reshape human behavior” so it will respect the past and its influence on modern culture.51

Bath remains a cultural hotspot because its buildings have successfully withstood

---


the test of time. During World War II, Germany’s blitz bombings severely devastated the city. Both lives and architecture were lost as “more than 19,000 buildings were destroyed or damaged and over 400 people killed, many of them women and children.”虽然那场悲剧的痛苦仍然强烈地存在于历史学家和致力于保存历史记忆的人们心中，但现代历史似乎已经忘记了这场悲剧。这座城市已经被彻底改造，因此“当今的巴斯几乎没有任何迹象显示其在最近历史中的破坏性时期——它看起来是一个优雅和完好的乔治亚式城市”，其中的人类历史的悲伤已经取代了旅游和广告的快乐前景。虽然这场战争中被破坏的建筑要么部分被修复，要么完全被拆除，但乔治亚式的建筑风格仍然顽强地存在，尽管它面临大量破坏的威胁。现代建筑显然缺乏乔治亚式巴斯所提供的创造性风味。它从来都不是一个简单的替代品，尤其是在巴斯的建筑风格统一的背景下。UNESCO赞扬巴斯在体现其显著性和声明其非凡的普遍价值方面所取得的成就。巴斯成功的城市规划体现在自然的实用应用上。例如，巴斯的综合建筑和城市设计，它的视觉一致性及其美丽，都是建筑师和规划师的才能和创造力的见证，这是18世纪和19世纪的遗产。虽然这场战争中被破坏的建筑要么部分被修复，要么完全被拆除，但乔治亚式的建筑风格仍然顽强地存在，尽管它面临大量破坏的威胁。现代建筑显然缺乏乔治亚式巴斯所提供的创造性风味。它从来都不是一个简单的替代品，尤其是在巴斯的建筑风格统一的背景下。UNESCO赞扬巴斯在体现其显著性和声明其非凡的普遍价值方面所取得的成就。巴斯成功的城市规划体现在自然的实用应用上。例如，巴斯的综合建筑和城市设计，它的视觉一致性及其美丽，都是建筑师和规划师的才能和创造力的见证，这是18世纪和19世纪的遗产。联合国教科文组织赞扬巴斯在实现其显著性和声明其非凡的普遍价值所取得的成就。巴斯成功的城市规划体现在自然的实用应用上。例如，巴斯的综合建筑和城市设计，它的视觉一致性及其美丽，都是建筑师和规划师的才能和创造力的见证，这是18世纪和19世纪的遗产。

Modern architecture, unfortunately, lacks the creative flavor Georgian Bath offers. It can never be an easy replacement, especially in Bath’s architecturally unified setting. UNESCO praises Bath for this accomplishment in criteria i of its Significance and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Here Bath’s successful execution of urban planning is portrayed in terms of its practical application to nature. Criteria i details

“Bath’s quality of architecture and urban design, its visual homogeneity and its beauty [which] is largely testament to the skill and creativity of the architects and visionaries of the 18th and 19th centuries.

who applied and developed Palladianism in response to the specific opportunities offered by the spa town and its physical environment and natural resources.\textsuperscript{54}

Such an idea promotes a custom made city wherein originality thrives. Bath’s architects ingeniously applied Palladian ideals of “urban design” to basic English architectural elements. This was accomplished by specifically linking the promising spa culture of Bath to its architectural beauty. 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century tourists accepted this festive celebration of classical architecture transposed to the English countryside as part of the Bath experience. 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} century travelers then adopted this same prestigious attitude, which developers have capitalized on. The desire to shop and stay in a high class World Heritage Site has therefore allowed them to increase their financial gains.

Although tourists come to shop and relax in the comforts provided by modern living, they also come to relive the “creative” avenues illustrated by the past. This holds true because the present world can never be an exact replica of the past, no matter how much the modern world really strives to recreate the past. This is the same energetic spirit that keeps Bath from succumbing to conformist notions in modern architectural practices. Unfortunately, such pragmatic thinking did not exist earlier in the city’s history when Bath required optimal protection for its immediate safeguarding.

Figure 3: An Aerial View of Georgian Bath, Focusing on the Royal Crescent
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The Destruction of a Style: Modernization Hits Bath

The first major wave of development struck Bath in the early 1970s and 1980s, prior to its listing as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. However, initial development problems arose much earlier in the city’s history. From 1967-1968, the infamous Sack of Bath critically injured the city. This deliberate act of devastation introduced “an unprecedented toll of needless destruction and replacement with poor quality modern buildings,” which spurred a national scandal and eventually led to the Trust’s immediate involvement in legal matters to save the city from further destruction, as was correctly predicted. The issue then, as with modern issues, focused upon the demolition of historic buildings in order to pave the way for commercialism and new housing sites, without regard for, or even, respect for Georgian architecture’s exceptional characteristics.

According to a primary publication in response to the highly-debated issue of preservation versus change in 1978, Larry R. Ford discusses the social problems development offers in this sensitive city where control is also a special issue. Ford reveals that “Bath has the least capacity for change. About half of the city is in a conservation area, and it is completely surrounded by a greenbelt. Roughly two-thirds of the city is subject to special control. It is also the city where controversial change has come both suddenly and massively.” Although Bath was not, and still does not, remain equipped to meet the imposing demands of the modern world, developers essentially forced their vision of the future on the city, without regard for the amount of “change”

they would inflict upon the sensitive nature of the site. The attitude of developers, as well as the Council’s, back in the 1970s and 1980s, as found in this report, represents a continuing attitude with respect to the later 2007 and 2009 incidents. Even if Bath physically remains unable to change without further altering the social fabric of its buildings, developers still believe that change in the form of demolition and modern construction, not preservation of Georgian architecture, is the only pragmatic way to save the city.

Borsay additionally addresses the hardships facing preservation efforts in a distinctive city like Bath. He specifically deals with the disunity of law and supposed protection that limits survival. In this respect, Bath’s

“protected fabric within the conservation area acquired a corporate inviolability which not only guaranteed its survival but also severely restricted the scope for new building in a competitive style. This was so not only because restrictions on modification and demolition limited the space for new construction, but also because the area surrounding an old building was now protected, creating an exclusive zone which proscribed any new structure likely to detract from the historic form in situ.”

New construction is seriously compromised because of restrictions, which apply not only to buildings themselves, but to the actual areas surrounding these buildings. This act supposedly creates a historic safety net meant to limit the imposition of modern construction in order to retain Bath’s historic significance. However, the Council
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continually overlooks legal matters as they simply chose to bypass protection. Development promises improvement for Bath, and in their eyes, preservation cripples progress.

The main issue confronting Bath then, and surprisingly, still now, centers on successfully handling a crisis in population expansion. Presently, there is an interest in addressing the legal issue of handling historic construction. However, the city remains incredibly limited insofar as what legal measures can or cannot be taken to allow for the intrusion of urbanization. Preservation efforts interfere with the need for these new buildings meant to aid Bath’s developing and prosperous economy, but without preservation, the city once more falls at the mercy of developers.

Hello SouthGate, Goodbye Bath:

The years 2007 and 2009 involved major preservation problems for Bath in the 21st century, profoundly paralleling the insidious actions of the 1970s and 1980s. At this time, the city’s respected status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site was seriously threatened. In April 2007, builders erected Chapman Taylor Architects’ grandiose design of a new shopping center called SouthGate in Bath. The goal of this plan was to increase commercialism and satisfy residential demands. This was mostly satisfied through the additional construction of The Residence, a large-scale apartment complex featuring an “860 space car park” located adjacent to the new bus station, complete with “landscaped gardens,” built to ironically commemorate the memory of Georgian Bath.59 The Council’s poorly-planned decision unfortunately cost the city its grandeur. This resulted from the disastrous clash this “faux Georgian pre-fab facades” in architecture

inflicted upon the old Georgian style. The historic Churchill House was even demolished so a new bus station could be created with the ultimate goal of easing traffic flow into Bath. This idea, of course, erupted from the increase in population expected at this location through the creation of a mall, where a heavy population would naturally occur.

SouthGate currently is a prosperous shopping paradise found right in the center of the city where the old Churchill House once stood, as noted in Figure 4. According to its designers, Chapman Taylor Architects, SouthGate was specifically designed to echo the traditional use of Georgian architecture while also avoiding outside interference from UNESCO’s criteria for Bath to remain a World Heritage city. New architecture promised to adhere to basic principles of construction in an effort to recreate the traditional architecture featured in Georgian architecture without appearing to be in direct violation of historic ideals. Chapman Taylor defended the construction of this modern development in terms of its visual complement to the overall traditional view of Bath. Here,

“a key design principle was to ensure that the new development naturally complements and blends with the existing urban fabric, thereby remaining sensitive to Bath’s World Heritage status. Chapman Taylor employed specific design techniques to recreate traditional vernacular Georgian style, scale and detailing – the new buildings are mainly three storeys in height, some with added roof storeys; mostly of stone construction and stone-finished

61 See page 35.
rendered elevations and slate roofs.”

Despite Taylor’s elaborate explanation in support of SouthGate’s design as a recreated Georgian building, this development negatively impacted upon the future of Bath’s historic landscape. The demolition of the old Churchill House, oddly enough, allowed for “the exact same building [to be put] in its place in a style that imitates this mock-Georgian since [S]outhGate [s]eems to be consciously imitating Churchill House’s ‘municipal Georgian’ [as] it appears to be a 20th Century combo of Bath’s Georgian Palladian and Baroque Revival.” The historically rich public building of the Churchill House was Council voted for demolition to pave the way for SouthGate’s construction. Such a decision allowed SouthGate to mirror and mock the Churchill House through its deliberately modernized form. The only difference with these two buildings lies in the very fact that the Churchill House filled no useful purpose for the Council and SouthGate does. Although petitions were distributed with the ultimate goal of saving the Churchill House, no tangible results ever materialized. This suggests internal problems occurring within the actual English legal system that prevent the people from having power to install change in the name of saving a city that desperately needs to be saved if not for its own survival, but for its rightful legacy to posterity.

Contradictory information appears on SouthGate’s website regarding its role in promoting historic significance. SouthGate ultimately boasts of the contributions it affords the World Heritage City rather than the negative image it establishes for Bath’s
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cultural history. Here this “modern shopping destination [features] classic Georgian-style open streets and public spaces [as this center is] home to over 60 stylish shops full of the latest fashion, gadgets, and places to eat,” such as Apple, Build A Bear, Calvin Klein and Fabulous Designer Jewelry, all of which further attest to the massive influence of modernity and its lasting effect on a grand historic city with a diverse cultural reputation. Although SouthGate believes their architecture has achieved a newfound “classic Georgian-style” of architecture, the actual building cannot begin to compare to 18th century classical architecture. The style simply lacks spirit and heart.

SouthGate’s 60 new shops are specifically designed to satisfy modern taste in clothing and electronics, thereby seriously detracting from Bath’s original design as a luxurious spa town and playful resort. Instead, this mall has become nothing less than a generic brand of entertainment, whose existence only satisfies the demands of the Council and England’s consumers. Stephen Bayley, news reporter for The Observer, expressed his rather grim view of the damage SouthGate has inflicted upon Bath’s cultural significance. Bayley interprets SouthGate as being nothing less than “a Sodom and Gomorrah of shopping, […] a ridiculous conceit, because Bath already has far too much grasping, shrill retail,” yet perhaps the inclusion of 60 stores is simply not enough for the Council. In future years, SouthGate may expand beyond a mere 60 stores and include more than just expensive shopping and luxury housing.

Surprisingly enough, the Bath Preservation Trust recently rejected a planning application for one of SouthGate’s stores. Although Fabulous wished to display a “1no
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internally-illuminated projecting sign,” the Trust based its rejection on the fact that SouthGate does not conform to the subtle style featured in Georgian architecture.\(^6\) In this respect, the Trust’s objection revealed that “the style and character of the new Southgate shopping centre can tolerate a more unconventional design approach compared to the rest of Bath, [so] we will continue to object to illuminated signs within the City of Bath and in the World Heritage Site” as these items visually destroy the historic flavor of the city through modernization efforts which include illuminated advertisement signs.\(^7\) Much like the rest of SouthGate, this acrylic sign employs “a poor quality of materials,” signifying the modern world’s use of cheap materials in the name of cutting costs in order to increase profit.\(^8\) Perhaps more rejections of this nature will arise on the Trust’s website as these decisions suggest that someone, or more accurately, some organization, is actually watching over Bath and willing to protect the city should more developments of this intrusive nature appear.

The Bath Heritage Watchdog also supports the Trust's open rejection to the incorporation of modern lighting throughout the heart of Georgian Bath, not just Fabulous and other stores within SouthGate. As another preservation group dedicated to saving Bath, the Watchdog remains highly-critical of plans centered on altering the city. Such instances of change will cause more harm than good. The Watchdog, much like the Trust, hopes to limit the growth of unnecessary change. With respect to the issue of modern lighting, the Watchdog voiced their discontent over this proposed


alteration. Their general complaint focused on both previous and current improper decisions regarding the installation of lighting. In this light, the Watchdog is

“positive that all of the choices made so far for SouthGate are wrong, so we want to be assured that these will never, ever be considered to be pilots for anywhere else in the city. And because the lights installed do not appear among the approved lighting in the planning papers, we look forward to these being removed eventually and replaced by something that does comply with the city’s design values.”

The Watchdog believes that every decision made so far in SouthGate is “wrong” and new decisions will also follow this “wrong” pattern of design. They wish for inappropriate lights of this nature to be “removed” at some point in the near future and be “replaced” with better lights that closely adhere to Bath’s status as a historically significant city. Hopefully, such a wise decision will be followed in order to improve SouthGate. A more appropriate decision would have been to never install SouthGate.

Although the Watchdog is right to say that designs made in “neo-Georgian” SouthGate are “wrong,” their radical and activist attitude positively supports preservation efforts. Here is a group that wishes to keep the old Bath alive while outside forces wish to tear it down. This matter is no longer just about lights, but about reestablishing Bath’s dignity as a city that has survived history throughout the ages. Their desire to “remove” the new installation of lights typically found in “cafetieres bound with iron hoops” shows that this visual design is anything less than “appropriate” for
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Bath’s buildings. Hopefully, the Watchdog, in collaboration with the Trust, will be able to enact a better level of change that will ensure Bath’s ability to remain a World Heritage City for another twenty-five years, or longer. This may be possible, provided that no new developments arise in the near future to complicate this situation.

Figure 4: View of SouthGate Bath from Beechen Cliffs
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The Western Riverside Development: Bath’s Second SouthGate

In addition to the horrendous construction of SouthGate in 2007, the Western Riverside residential housing project was also proposed at this same time, as illustrated in Figure 5. Its completion would complicate Bath’s shaky future. Unfortunately, initial construction details were deliberately vague and misleading. The British newspaper, The Guardian, provided a rather elaborate description for the housing center in 2007. They accordingly described the housing plan as being

"the size of 19 football pitches that will boast 2,200 flat. At the heart of the scheme, set on the site of a derelict gasworks, is a grid of new streets lined with blocks of nine-storey flats, of a kind you might find anywhere from Berlin to Beijing. The regimented layout and the stiff drab design of the buildings are in stark contrast to the lifting ebb and flow of the rest of the city. As a sweetener, the developers, Crest Nicholson, have offered Bath an 'ecology park' - a public place with grass, trees, flowers, insects and birds," which would essentially amount to the application of a band-aid strip to a major wound.\(^72\)

This projected modernization of Bath will further cost the city its rich past as it continues to present crippling preservation issues. Once a historic city permits the entry of developers, they prove difficult to control due to the naturally - conflicting agendas of both parties. The former finds itself in the position of keeper of the past while the latter is fully aware that this line of thinking curtails profit potential and will be inclined to engage in undermining tactics. In a city as large and as significant as Bath, anticipated damage

masquerading as change of this kind is an unacceptable step in a decidedly wrong direction. The city stands to lose its authenticity and unique character, as with the example of boxy, modern structures that clash with existing, grand-scale architecture built “big enough to accommodate the aristocracy and their entourage.”

A much bigger problem facing the Western Riverside development, still a debated issue for preservationists and angered residents, however, concerns complexities pertaining to government involvement. According to Caroline Kay, chief executive of the Bath Preservation Trust, in 2009, “the unresolved problem here is that developments are meant to be addressed by national government, but the Department for Culture Media and Sport, and the Department for Homes and Communities, insist these are issues of purely local interest,” again supporting the Council’s involvement as a main protector for the city. From this description, it would seem that the national government is much too large and busy to deal with minor details such as preserving a city, even if the city is one of great historic interest, when the smaller local government should, by law, hold this responsibility. It is realistic that the Council will approve of housing and related commercialism, as prospectively represented in the Western Riverside, regardless of the permanent damage to Georgian Bath, when it becomes apparent that these issues relating to financial health and population control are too great a challenge for the rest of the city.

This was, of course, just the beginning of trouble for Bath’s Western Riverside.

Since 2007, more social and political issues regarding the Western Riverside

development have risen and are more pressing than the unchanging existence of SouthGate. These complications pose a considerable threat to Bath’s future as this development has the potential to become Bath’s second SouthGate. This matter will be discussed in further detail in relationship to UNESCO’s most recent area of concern for the city’s safety.

![Figure 5: Western Riverside Development In Progress](http://www.flickr.com/)

Figure 5: Western Riverside Development In Progress
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Bath in Danger: UNESCO’s Legal Right to Intervene

Following the development fiasco of SouthGate and the beginning of the Western Riverside Development in 2007, the year 2009 saw Bath’s status revisited and renewed, but this reversal of status was not implemented without warning. UNESCO reminded the Trust that their purpose "is not to stop all development, nor to attempt to pickle our cities in heritage aspic, but to make us stop, think and try to build the best we can." While UNESCO recognizes the social importance of creating new developments to address rising issues of modernity, they do not look kindly upon cities that foolishly risk their priceless World Heritage Status standing solely for the sake of economic prosperity.

UNESCO reserves the ability to take away a site’s status if it is no longer applicable. This was the case for both Oman’s Oryx sanctuary and Dresden. In the first case, a conservation area allowed its unique wildlife to disappear. In the second, a Baroque city permitted the destruction of its own architecture to accommodate the construction of a motorway bridge, all within a short two-year period, as discussed in the Bath Heritage Watchdog’s SouthGate News. If Bath were to follow in their footsteps, it too stands to suffer a great, possibly irretrievable, loss. Suburbanization would spoil the special relationship shared by the natural world and that of the man-made realm, as regards architecture, in Bath. This definitely makes progress more difficult for the Trust, as well as England, because serious monitoring becomes necessary, as through the implementation of stricter guidelines for commercial and housing development.

Bath has drawn considerable attention to itself through the near loss of its status, as evidenced in media commentary. As noted in *The Guardian*, "UNESCO will be watching to see if the city can strike the right balance between its heritage, its need for housing and the modern lust for shopping." UNESCO is, of course, both correct and wise in outlining this need for “balance” as it is the success of such cohesion which can result in the city’s stabilization. Bath remains in need of preservation to protect its “heritage,” but the modern world has concerns of its own which, while conflicting, should not be overlooked. Nor should the city itself be sacrificed because the push for modernity can be overpowering. Ironically, the Trust now appears to have become rejection happy, as evidenced later in their many comments on proposals, as presented on their website, perhaps with the realization that the cost of development was a price that they could ill-afford to pay and that they do, in fact, have the potential to obstruct historical repetition.

Ford perfectly summarizes the type of balance Bath must strive for so it can retain its status as a historic albeit modern city. He asserts that “cultural attitudes toward change are important. If a city seeks to keep its entire heritage intact (as, say, a replica of the cosmos), change is impossible and obsolescence is inevitable. On the other hand, if a city erases its past too quickly it may lose touch with its heritage and become chaotic, ambiguous, and ‘placeless.’” A city cannot remain in a suspended state, where nothing changes because such an act ultimately obstructs progress. However, when a city rejects all its history and opts for absolute modernity as a means of
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supporting progress, this decision eventually detracts from the legacy of its founders.

So, in the case of Bath, the optimal solution is one in which historically significant buildings are preserved and the growth of modernity is encouraged on a moderate scale. This will allow Bath to develop modernly without losing both its history and right to remain a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Like Ford, Bran Graham suggests that heritage management must prove sustainable for future generations. This is illustrated in his suggestion that Heritage management, in this respect, illustrate Graham’s suggestion that “sustainability requires that contemporary development must address the demands of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own requirements.”79 In order for Georgian Bath to survive in 21st century England, organizations such as the Bath Preservation Trust and Heritage Watchdog must continue to suppress development, so it does not impede with the existence of future generations who live and work in Bath. The city can remain a UNESCO World Heritage as long as the needs of the past and future are balanced while heritage and tourism are promoted and used, not abused for the sake of Council based frivolous needs.

**Learn to Help Bath: Education For Preservation**

The Bath Preservation Trust offers a pragmatic solution to this problem in support of Ford's analysis. In a February 2009 article entitled "World Heritage for the Nation: Identifying, Protecting, and Promoting Our World Heritage," the Trust suggests that the management of such special cities needs to "require local authorities to take

---

World Heritage Sites into account when determining planning applications."\(^{80}\) This essentially means that planning decisions need to include significant sites before developers even enter the scene. The site should first be analyzed as well as notations made and careful consideration taken of potentially damaging changes. Then planning can arise around the area. While such an idea may work, the battle here continues with the Council, the "local authority" representing Bath and their desire to destroy rather than preserve in the name of promoting economic growth. Council-made decisions will affect the impact of sustainable planning decisions installed to benefit the city.

Therefore a more viable solution towards combating the issue of achieving balance revolves around education. The Trust strongly encourages the implementation of a World Heritage Education program within the National Curriculum. They believe that "educating school children is a good first step towards reaching the wider community" as a viable means of achieving future success.\(^{81}\) Children's active interest in learning about their own cultural past will help them see themselves as future leaders capable of instigating change. Their enthusiasm about saving their cultural heritage will hopefully inspire both their parents and other members of the community to become politically motivated activists towards preserving precious World Heritage cities, in accordance with UNESCO guidelines. Since education plays a key role in shaping future leaders, passing on valuable knowledge of this nature serves as an excellent first step towards the ultimate goal of fighting to save Bath from the continual possibility of its


destruction. This responds to Bran Graham’s belief in the use of heritage as a tool as “heritage is a knowledge, a cultural product and a political resource” that strengthens nationalism and fosters a sense of identity for a community and its individuals.82 The real concern here is the scope this educational program will cover and its ability to successfully be incorporated into the national level so it can positively affect the local level. It is possible that the Council may mismanage educational goals and gear them towards the creation of a more consumerist society because this is their natural preference. The Trust will then need to take charge to avoid such a horrible fate and shape its own educational plans for Bath.

Perhaps the Trust will be more successful in fighting back through its own educational plans meant to save Georgian architecture. To date, the Trust has established workshops for World Heritage Day. Such events allow the history of Bath to come to life for youngsters and their parents as both groups are educated about the buildings they encounter on a daily basis and the master architects responsible for their creations. This type of informal education enables Bath to showcase its achievements in a museum-type atmosphere wherein the community is empowered with the gift of knowledge to stop and think about the dangers developers present for their city and home. Maybe legal action will then follow these initial steps. The only difference in the Trust’s museum is that there are no signs of commercialism, which places greater emphasis on education rather than profit-driven goals.

**Rules and Regulations: Listing Legality**

Regarding developments in Bath, restrictions that now apply affect listed
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buildings and must be considered prior to the execution of proposed plans. In accordance with the Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, "no person shall execute or cause to be executed any works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, unless the works are authorized." In this instance, authorization continues to remain mandatory for new development. Without approval of this governmental consent, any present or future work is considered illegal, and thus in direct violation of UNESCO's specific guidelines. Essentially, no development can occur without prior governmental knowledge. This makes unchecked decisions for changing Bath much harder to avoid.

This Act was further revised in March 2010 with an inclusion allowing for proposed developmental changes for the enhancement of Bath without causing substantial harm to the city's buildings. Section 1 now maintains that for all those listed buildings of special architectural and historic interest,

"the planning system is designed to regulate the development and use of land in the public's interest. The designation of historic sites enables the planning system to protect them, through the complementary system of listed building consent and conservation area control, coupled with controls over scheduled monument consent."  

These new legal changes allow land to be altered and used for "public interest"
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under the condition that no harm befalls the site’s original intention. If this is the case, the destruction expected to occur in a unique Georgian city like Bath, in order to allow for the creation of modern housing and office buildings, is considered to be legal under UK law, especially since such changes are executed in the name of public interest. Surprisingly enough, there have been no new changes added to this Act in either 2011 or 2012. This lack of evidence suggests that either the document has already been sufficiently altered to meet the changing times or the English legal system holds no power over the Council and their decisions could simply be ignored if the issue of money presents itself once more.

Buildings and Grades: History Preserved

The history of Bath is told through its buildings and this makes preservation for these buildings necessary for Bath’s remembrance as a culturally significant site. The different classifications of historic importance afforded to its over 5,000 buildings, attesting to the glory of Georgian architecture existing from 1700 -1780, affect the level of future reconstruction or additions. The Manchester City Council defines such listed buildings as being of "architectural or historic interest [and] are classified in grades to show their relative importance."\(^8^5\) Bath currently contains 663 Grade I listed buildings that fall into this category because they are "buildings of exceptional interest" while Grade II buildings are significant on a lesser scale of historic “interest.”\(^8^6\) In addition to the various classifications afforded to the historic buildings, Bath’s buildings are also important because of their cohesive incorporation of Bath stone. It is for this reason that Bath "has more government-protected buildings per capita than any town in England.

The entire city, built of the creamy warm-tone limestone called ‘Bath stone,’ beams in its cover-girl complexion,” which contributes to the city’s extraordinary appearance as a city of outstanding beauty both in architectural design and natural landscape.87

More specifically, most of Bath’s traditional Georgian townhouses feature Bath stone. These such townhouses “are typically constructed from rubble stone, faced with honey coloured Bath ashlar on the primary frontage or street elevation [and] rear facades are rubble stone, many of which were originally rendered with lime stucco to resemble ashlar,” exemplifying the idea that material and construction specifics work together for a reason and cannot be altered at whim without an adverse affect.88

Specifics regarding traditional building material and their proper handling are taken into account when considering permissible reconstruction and repairs for historic homes. Homeowners now have concrete guidelines to follow, which take preservation responsibilities out of the hands of local government and place them directly into the hands of the people of Bath. This action sends the message that saving the city is practical, doable and personal.

Although Bath is undeniably a historically-rich city, it is not without problems directly-attributable to the effects of tourism. It is noted that, "[t]he popularity of this beautiful city does have its disadvantages for there are constant threats to the city’s 6,400 listed buildings, unsympathetic urban intrusions and an increasing threat of development in the city’s green belt," of which dilemmas will predictably become

exacerbated in coming years. Accordingly, with Bath already being under the national
government’s protection, complications in the struggle to keep developers at bay will
arise and require revised and added legal regulation.

Unfortunately, although the government claims to protect its buildings by creating
laws and revising older laws to meet changing social trends and to satisfy public policy,
there is only so much they can realistically accomplish in order to safeguard this portion
of the country’s history. Ironically, where government action ends, local government
takes over, as represented by the Bath & North East Somerset Council. As the Council
was clearly guilty of allowing wide-scale damage to occur in 2007 and 2009, they must
continue to remain suspect, particularly where good judgment is required. While urban
development enables economic development and benefits a small and thriving
community like Bath, progress means one thing for the Council and quite another for the
city. Sacrifices to even minute portions of Bath, though decided upon and legal, are
irreversible. Avenues for the realization of increased revenues, however, can be varied,
flexible, and impermanent – making the better choice clear for the city.

Cleaning Bath Stone: New Preservation Efforts Without Damage

Issues of maintaining the city have most recently been addressed in 2010 when
the Council, oddly enough, in conjunction with the Bath Preservation Trust, published a
guide, “The Cleaning of Bath Stone,” for the successful cleaning of Bath stone as found
in most, if not all, historic homes. This guide seeks to prevent a great level of damage
from affecting the stone while also cleaning the surface, similarly to earlier restoration
efforts effectively made at the Roman Baths. As a soft mellow limestone, Bath stone

often falls victim to limestone decay, which occurs "greatest along heavily trafficked roads" as a result of a chemical reaction from the presence of car and atmospheric pollution.\(^90\) When Bath stone decays, as in the case of the Roman Baths, it “turns black, and so the first task of the conservation was to clean all the blackened stone and restore its honey colour, using both traditional methods and also a new laser technique.”\(^91\) These threats are not likely to disappear in recent times as the issue of overpopulation escalates.

In order for cleaning efforts not to harm Bath stone, specialists first conduct pre-surveys before correct methods and techniques are selected. Inappropriate methods include "dry air abrasive, high pressure or continuous water spraying and acids" as the application of too much pressure can permanently damage the surface and create an expensive problem in need of future solution.\(^92\) The guide states that the best cleaning method for such stone is "water washing" as this technique poses little damage for old buildings in Bath.\(^93\) Licensed professionals, of course, must carry out such cleaning as inexperienced workers would cause more damage than reparation. Of considerable interest in a case study like this is the fact that a listed building in need of cleaning for either restoration or repair efforts must first receive the Council’s listed building consent, 

not the Trust’s.94 This suggests that the Council possesses more power over Bath than the Trust, even though the Trust is an active participant in the saving of the city. Ultimately, Bath and its buildings are Council-owned, leaving cleaning decisions in their hands as well as the publication of cleaning guides. The necessity of these conservation efforts enables a new and improved Bath to emerge for future generations without more of the same destruction to historical buildings.

**Beckford's Tower: Saving One of Bath's Historical Masterpieces**

Beckford's Tower remains a fine example of a Grade I listed building whose future was previously in jeopardy had the Bath Preservation Trust not become engaged in saving the building. Restoration efforts for the Tower began in 1995 and 1997 and continued well into 2001 and 2002, prior to the controversial emergence of both SouthGate and the Western Riverside Development. Despite such high-level of work, the Tower still remains at considerable risk as its history could be lost without the future execution of extensive repairs. Built in 1827 by Henry Edmund Goodridge for one of Bath’s most prized residents, William Beckford, this "120 foot neo-classical Tower, which enjoys uninterrupted views of the countryside, was constructed as a study retreat and to house Beckford's precious collection of art and rare books."95 The Tower now functions in modern-day Bath as a museum dedicated to Beckford’s life and works. Beckford, very much like Austen, remains an important literary figure for Bath. Although he is best remembered for his mystical Oriental tale entitled *Vathek*, which does not specifically deal with Georgian architecture, *Vathek* essentially made Beckford a literary
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sensation among the elite.

Since 1993, ownership for the Tower belonged to the Bath Preservation Trust as sold to them through the owners of Beckford's Tower Trust, Leslie and Elizabeth Hilliard.96 The Hillards transferal of ownership reflects British traditions of heritage in relationship to national identity. According to David Lowenthal, Professor of Geography at the University College London and author of *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, “ancestral estates have themselves become national. In the 1930s and 1940s scores of hard-up country-house owners ceded family estates to the National Trust in return for continued tenancy and a promise of loving care.”97 The Tower currently functions as the site of many lectures and events for preserving Beckford's memory in addition to the Trust's many conservation and preservation events. This remains a relevant issue because the Tower’s restoration would not have been possible without the Trust’s involvement. By holding events in the Tower itself, the Trust publicly promotes their successful campaigns in historic preservation. This enables the Trust to showcase themselves as an organization actively involved in keeping buildings in danger out of danger.

The Tower itself continues to remain an architectural wonder in terms of its design. It houses "rich carpets, luxurious curtains, and coffered ceilings paneled in oak and enriched with scarlet, crimson, purple and gold," as well as a 154-step spiral staircase which leads to a most glorious view of the city, making the building one of
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Bath’s finest treasures for tourists and residents alike. As with many other traditional homes situated within the city, building materials used for the Tower’s reconstruction adhere to the original flavor of Bath architecture, such as the incorporation of Bath stone ashlar. This decision satisfies the Trust’s continual desire for original material usage in building repairs and restoration efforts.

Initial restoration for Beckford’s Tower occurred in 1995 with the ultimate goal of saving the tower from falling into a state of disrepair. At this time, "the Lantern was under serious structural threat. The internal wooden structure was severely decayed and the ironwork was suffering from corrosion after years of damage," which would create an unstable future for the Tower. Following completion of this necessary work, two years later, in 1997, additional repairs occurred so the building could be better stabilized. These repairs were made possible through the volunteer efforts of the Heritage Lottery Fund and public support. Fundraising of this nature allowed for "the total reconstruction of the Tower's ornate lantern and the redecoration of the sumptuous Belvedere and Tower staircase." Such repairs allowed the Tower to continue to stand until the beginning of the 20th century, when further repairs were deemed necessary.

By the time 2001 and 2002 arrived, additional repairs were needed to ensure the Tower could still survive and fulfill its newfound function as a museum dedicated to preserving Beckford’s life and works. This time, completed restoration efforts were recognized and commended through the Tower’s awarding of the prestigious award for
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Building of the Year in Restoration. Such memorable, as well as successful, restoration efforts suggest the historical importance not only of Beckford the man, but of Beckford’s building. Complete renovation herein enables the splendor of 18th century Georgian Bath to be relived for future generations. Of course, further restoration and conservation efforts are still required in order to maintain the Tower as it faces the daily challenges of surviving in the busy modern city Bath has become where survival constantly remains key to preservation.

**Changes for Beckford’s Tower: Development Threatens The View**

A current concern for development surrounding Beckford’s Tower affects the proposed development of the Ensleigh MOD brownfield site. The Council here has proposed a new housing development, which the Trust has critically commented on. In an official statement made to the Bath & North East Somerset Council on July 11th, 2012, Adrian Tinniswood, trustee of the Tower, expressed concern for the problem developments pose for areas directly located around the Tower. On this note, any building change targeting the area must be

"relatively low-rise, high quality and respect the treeline. [Since] the MOD site goes to the brow of the hill and the edge of the Bath skyline[,] [a]ny building beyond that would spill over the 'edge' of the bowl, be highly visible from a number of approaches, and seriously compromise many of the long views of the Tower, as well as seemingly urbanising its eastern aspect, which is currently open countryside."
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The main problem concerning this proposed change is the fact that the threat of
development is brought much closer to the relationship of Georgian architecture and
nature. Such an idea will serve to “urbanize” a formerly neglected area and infringe
upon the view Bath’s “skyline” offers England. Other concerns include the
environmental impact as well as the issue of increasing building heights in a sensitive
area where buildings are not deemed appropriate.

In environmental terms, this MOD site functions as a brownfield. By definition, a
brownfield is eligible for redevelopment. Since this land qualifies as “a piece of industrial
or commercial property that is abandoned or underused and often environmentally
contaminated, especially one considered as a potential site for redevelopment,”
development is highly encouraged so as to not invade other protected greenfield
areas.\textsuperscript{104} Such useful means of redevelopment will promote progress in the city
because otherwise potentially “contaminated” land will be left in an “abandoned” state
without much of a realistic future. By encouraging the development of such land,
unwanted landscape is being recycled rather than simply being disregarded. While such
an idea seems wise, the unfortunate choice to develop a brownfield adjacent to a
historic landmark offers yet another example of the Council’s poor decision in city
planning.

Building heights are a sensitive issue in a case like this for not only will they
disrupt the skyline, but also disturb the original cohesion existing between buildings and
nature as envisioned by Bath’s creators. The Tower itself remains famous for its
stunning aerial of Bath, which attracts tourists to the city. Erecting exceptionally tall

buildings of a business nature in this area will ultimately infringe upon the splendor of
the view. The current threat of these buildings presents the future threat of complete
urbanization that will forever alter the area situated around Beckford's Tower to the point
that the Tower's special relationship with nature will be sacrificed as well. In addition,
the project expects to bring in more inhabitants to satisfy the immediate need of
housing, which will only serve as an increased threat to the current status of this old
structure. This action may then require additional restoration for Beckford's Tower in
order to prevent future damage from befalling the Tower as it must now deal with the
threat of a new housing development and the problems associated with modern
construction, namely increased population and traffic pollution.

More Housing in Bath: Developments Invade the Greenfield

In addition to the controversy existing on the brownfield area situated around
Beckford’s Tower, another housing development issue has arisen affecting Bath’s
greenfield. A recent statement made to the Council, as posted on the Bath Preservation
Trust's website, also dated July 11, 2012, explained the Trust's initial shock in learning
about the idea of introducing a housing development on a supposedly protected
greenfield. Accordingly, the Trust stated that

"we do not believe there is a mandate from the Core Strategy to open this
wider green field area up for housing. As well as the principle of avoiding
building on green-field land, those playing fields [of the Kingswood and
Royal High] would need to be replaced, at least to some degree eroding the
openness of the Green Belt and the rural quality of the AONB, as well as
quite possibly encroaching on the setting of the historic battlefield site"
represented in these playing fields.\textsuperscript{105}

Both Greenfields and the protected Greenbelt are areas not targeted for development as brownfields satisfy this initial need. A greenfield is accordingly defined as being “an area of agricultural or forest land, or some undeveloped site earmarked for commercial development or industrial projects” in the near future once brownfields have been developed to their full potential.\textsuperscript{106} This same logic held true in the case of the Western Riverside, a former brownfield turned expansive development. However, historically significant greenbelts, which will be discussed in greater detail later, need not suffer from the impact of development as they are responsible for enriching the historic fabric of a respected city like Bath. However, for the Kingswood and Royal High playing fields, disrupting the greenfield will “erode the openness of the Green Belt,” thus complicating the historic and sensitive nature of this development.

When given a choice, and only after the recycling of the brownfield, a greenfield should be selected for optimal “commercial development.” This “agricultural or forest land” is not a significant factor to consider in Bath’s fight to maintain its World Heritage status. The Greenbelt naturally fulfills this aspect of UNESCO’s selective criteria. A probable solution towards sustaining balance between the greenfield and Greenbelt would be to find and develop land situated on the outskirts of congested Bath that does not satisfy UNESCO’s definition of a protected area of natural beauty once both the brownfield and greenfield no longer remain open options for development. Large-scale housing developments do not specifically need to be located in a popular city already

struggling to combat preservation and conservation issues. A nearby less populated city, such as Bristol and Somerset, already under Council control, could easily be developed to meet Bath’s growing needs of population expansion. This would keep Bath out of danger from being put on UNESCO’s World Heritage in Danger List.

The conflict with the Trust’s sentiment, as reflected in this primary document, lies in the fact that the Council is actually violating its own published Core Strategy. The Core Strategy fully supports development of the brownfield, not the greenfield. Since this decision is "not supported by [the Council's] own strategy and policy framework." new insight into the level of corruption found in this local government entity now occurs. The Council essentially changes its mind at whim with regard to developments entering Bath without first giving any comments for their actions. Their own website never even releases information related to primary sources, such as the Core Strategy planning policy, for use in further investigation. Even though the Trust acknowledges the discrepancy in information available to both themselves and the public, they are limited insofar as the range of legal actions they can pursue because the essence of their document rests on their demands for changes made to the area before any deals are struck with developers. If no written documents exist for the Trust's consultation, then the Council buys itself freedom for any underhanded decisions they choose to make that will satisfy their demands for improving Bath by allowing developers to have control over building master plans. The Trust nonetheless outlines very pragmatic solutions towards compromising the use of the land found in this greenfield area, which should be considered by any governmental entity other than the

Council.

The Trust essentially acts as overseer of the Council's actions. They henceforth seek "to strengthen, and make more specific reference to, the landscape constraints which will need to be respected in order to adhere to the Council's own development policies; and [t]o interrogate much more accurately the number of dwellings and other developments that can be fitted onto the brownfield site given these constraints" with the hope of avoiding another SouthGate fiasco. In demanding "specific" data from the Council, the Trust will strengthen its possible control over the rise of development in the future. Although the Council has not commented on this project and no further information besides these two already mentioned documents are posted on the Bath Preservation Trust's website for public consultation, time still exists for change either in the name of saving or further destroying Bath's brownfield and possibly, greenfield.

**The Greenbelt: Conserving Bath’s Natural Beauty**

In addition to architectural wonders elevating Bath to the status of the eighth wonder of the world equivalent, the struggle for survival and fighting the cultural heritage threat facing the city in the 21st century continues. This threat extends into the Greenbelt, an area of exquisite beauty that enhances the city and differs from the greenfield in terms of UNESCO criteria, as previously examined. Greenbelts, in this respect, function as “a buffer between towns, and town and countryside” as their existence glorifies the city’s layout in terms of natural beauty. The Greenbelt, in this respect, remains a major contributor towards supporting the delicate balance of nature
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specifically tied to agriculture, in a similar fashion to Bath's buildings perfectly corresponding with nature.

Saving the Greenbelt is a main concern for the Trust because of the physical contribution this land makes to the history and culture of Bath. Most of the city consists of this Greenbelt, making its survival imperative for its consideration as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. While "[t]wo-thirds of the area's 570 sq km (220 sq miles) is green belt, combining great natural beauty with some of the most significant historical treasures found anywhere in Europe," this Greenbelt nonetheless remains a controversial area existing with respect to the Trust's ongoing fight with developers.\textsuperscript{110} This is a highlight of the recent 2009 controversy in Bath concerning the Greenbelt conservation area of Bath Meadows.

**Conservation in the Greenbelt: Elimination or Preservation?**

The issue of conservation for Bath Meadows sparked great controversy as regards its proposed elimination as a solution in dealing with population growth. The Bath & North East Somerset Council "approved plans to turn meadows on the outskirts of the historic city into a park and ride car park for 1,400 cars."\textsuperscript{111} While this plan could conceivably alleviate traffic congestion along with decreasing accompanying pollution, residents voiced complaints about the proposal. Since "more than 500 people have written objecting to the scheme [because it] will ruin the meadows to the east of the city and become an eyesore visible from miles away," their resentment over this and other

such unnecessary changes confirms the Trust’s objection and position on this matter.\textsuperscript{112} In an official UNESCO document reevaluating Bath’s World Heritage Status, Caroline Kay, Chief Executive of the Bath Preservation Trust, claimed that "Bath is at risk from losing part of the Green Belt to a Park and Ride on the East of the City over water meadows, and an urban extension to the South West, each of which threaten to ‘suburbanise’ the essential rural hinterland which surrounds the Georgian City” in total disregard of the landscape’s visual balance which is the pride of the region.\textsuperscript{113} As expected, Bath Meadows is joined by other portions of Bath on the endangered list when it comes to developers’ intentions.

In July 2011, less than two years after the previous controversy erupted, the Trust was back fighting the Council to save the Greenbelt from becoming a developers’ paradise. Apparently, a new policy "effectively removes the national target for recycling brownfield land and allows local communities to support building on the green belt” in an attempt to provide easier solutions for housing and job problems arising in Bath.\textsuperscript{114} The Trust adamantly objects to this use of the Greenbelt because of the fact that it will have a deleterious effect upon the historic environment of the city, although the Council feels that this plan for substitution of “the green belt” for the “recycling [of] the brownfield” is an optimal means of protecting the environment. However, this is not the case.

Environmentalists argue against mismanaging the Greenbelt because of its significance in terms of natural protection which combats atmospheric pollution caused by...
by urban development. On this note, the “[g]reen belt land is important for our wider environment, providing us with trees and the undeveloped land which reduce the effect of the heat generated by big cities.”¹¹⁵ For a major city like Bath, keeping the Greenbelt remains vital not only to the environment’s survival, but also for the survival of historic homes which need to uphold low heating costs in order to avoid suffering from maintenance damages and associated tax increases.

Loss of the Greenbelt is a significant loss not only for Bath, but for all of England in terms of the country’s cultural roots. Once this destruction happens by means of developments, “we lose land that has its own identity and plays its own role in England’s heritage.”¹¹⁶ The Trust’s fight fortunately was not for naught. This same issue currently affects the Greenbelt surrounding Beckford’s Tower and as the latest conservation area in the Trust’s continuing fight against the Council, remains an unresolved controversy. Hopefully, a feasible solution will be reached for the Greenbelt so Bath can strike an appropriate means of balance for its architecture and nature.

Much earlier, in October 2011, the government revoked previous building plans with the goal of protecting the Greenbelt in mind. According to Local Government Minister Bob Neill, revoking proposed plans is the only realistic way for

"this government [to] pu[t] an end to unpopular, undemocratic Regional Plans, which imposed the development on communities and threatened the countryside. [...] We are putting planning powers into the hands of local

people to take charge of local housing challenges in a way that makes sense for them while protecting the local countryside and green spaces they value."\(^{117}\)

This allows the residents of a multi-cultural center, like Bath, to decide how and when development will occur and for what purpose, without inflicting further harm on their community. Seeing one part of the struggle won means more of Bath can be saved from frivolous development. All that is needed is the combined effort of people dedicated to stopping useless action disguised as progress in the name of preserving their home and culture. If all this could already be achieved for the Greenbelt, as was the case for the Roman Baths, then the rest of Georgian Bath stands a good fighting chance. After all, once an authentic portion of the city is removed, any effort to remedy such mistakes can be deemed to be little more than an apology in the form of a reproduction.

The idea of community involvement to strengthen government support has proved quite successful in recent news. A recent press release for March 27, 2012 press release details new legal changes made to an existing National Planning Policy Planning Framework which now stresses the significant role the community plays in saving their city. In addition, the community of Bath, much like the Trust, demands "clear local policies" which will explicitly state the purpose and goal of such policies enacted at the local government level. The Greenbelt, oddly enough, remains one of the areas of current government concern as this portion of Bath along with "AONB

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty] protection reinforce the planning protection of the landscape around City of Bath World Heritage Site.”

Perhaps government involvement centered on protecting the city’s landscape will also help save buildings because of their close proximity to nature.

If Bath were to lose its Greenbelt at any point in the future, its buildings and status as a World Heritage Site would also be jeopardized. Without its buildings existing around nature, Bath would just be a city like any other found in the modern world. This potential threat places greater emphasis on preserving the Greenbelt because its preservation may also preserve Bath’s architecture. Hopefully, both the Greenbelt and Georgian Bath will one day have a safe and legal future where development will not impact upon their existence.

Facing Bath’s West: Revisiting the Western Riverside Development

The growth of Bath’s Western Riverside development has become one of the more recent areas of conservation concerns as much of old Bath is now at risk with the details of this proposed change. Beginning from the initial phase of development in 2007, and proceeding from 2009 until most recently in 2012, housing growth in the development has increased significantly. In April 2009, the Riverside development had planning permission for construction yet building was not completed. On June 22, 2010, the Council approved planning application for the first phase. However, in 2011, additional alarming information became available. News reports dating from July 2011 revealed that "developer Crest Nicholson [and his company] Regeneration start[ed] creating the road network and laying foundation for the first 800 of the 2,000 planned
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homes of Bath's Riverside development between the Lower and Upper Bristol Roads” and in December 2011, about 48 homes had already been finished allowing for the first wave of incoming residents.\footnote{Madison Oakley Estate Agents in Bath, July 2011, accessed September 15, 2012, http://www.madisonoakley.wordpress.com.} This situation was simultaneously interesting and ridiculous.


Basically, Crest Nicholson attempts to appear the hero for increasing housing capacity on a scale to overwhelm the city and superficially honor the long-gone manufacturer with a street name, while doing nothing at all about conservation or needed jobs.

Additionally, although the Bath Preservation Trust advertised the Western Riverside on their website, they failed to mention the completion of the development. Their last reported entry for such news dates to 2007, when original construction plans were discussed and the initial danger of disturbing Bath was announced. However, 2009 news reveals that, in accordance with UNESCO Committee plans, the Bath Preservation Trust stated that “in relation to architectural commissioning, we agree that in order to succeed in Bath, any contemporary design must be of the highest quality” so
as to not clash with the already existing buildings located there. Oddly enough, this information was released at the same time that SouthGate was installed which could not be more visually offensive to the image of Bath, both in structural design and function. This may just be one of UNESCO’s revised plans to prevent further architectural damage from affecting Georgian Bath as these new buildings of the Western Riverside development now “must be of the highest quality,” as were their predecessors. This allows for the idea of continuity while allowing room for monitored change in a city to avoid stagnation.

Although a considerable degree of original buildings in Bath are listed as Grade I buildings and require conservation attention, they continue to be advertised for sale on the Madison Oakley Estate Agents’ website, in addition to the Western Riverside’s latest modern homes and apartments. Historic buildings do hold great appeal for prospective homeowners. The introduction of modern housing may suit the needs of some people who seek the comforts of modern living, but others may seek historic buildings to satisfy their housing needs. So while it seems a poor fit to place historic structures regularly on the real estate market for ownership by the general public, the idea has merit as they will thus be maintained through occupation. Guarantees are built in, with repair proposals, which require the Trust’s approval to comply with their established guidelines for preserving homes. Surprisingly, new houses featured in the Western Riverside have yet to be included on the Madison Oakley Estate Agents’ website for sale. This may suggest that some of these latest additions have not yet been constructed as the

Western Riverside is still in its early phases of development. As full construction has not been completed, the Trust remains a critical player in assuring that development does not interfere with Bath’s ability to remain a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

The Bath Preservation Trust has been successful in reducing the heights of buildings for the Western Riverside development as such intrusive building design would seriously compromise Bath’s west. In 2008, the Trust "claimed victory in achieving the reduction in height to six storeys" as opposed to the developer’s long-awaited for nine storeys, but this problem has not stopped. The Trust herein expects to receive "further applications for taller riverside blocks" which will again need to be contested as building in the development progresses. On January 30, 2008, the subject of which government entity is ultimately responsible for changes made to Bath was decided.

The result did not hold much promise for the fate of Bath. At this time, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government declared “the Secretary of State's general approach is not to interfere with the jurisdiction of local planning authorities unless it is necessary to do so.” Here the national government essentially relinquishes governmental control to the "local government," which is again represented by the Council. This puts the immediate issue of decisions regarding completion of the Western Riverside back in the hands of the Council. Their actions will impact upon the historic significance of Bath and determine whether or not legal action on UNESCO’s behalf will once more be required to keep the city in line. Since belonging to UNESCO’s
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World Heritage status “recognizes the City as belonging to an exclusive collection of global sites which surpass local or national importance and are part of the shared heritage of mankind,” UNESCO plays a critical role in ensuring Bath’s survival for all humanity.  Protection no longer applies strictly to the “local” and “national” level, but rather applies to a universal property that all “mankind” is responsible for. Hopefully, UNESCO will continue to be successful in preventing Bath from falling.

This decision from the Secretary of State to "not call in the Western Riverside planning application" did not sit well with the Trust. They voiced their general discontent over the opinion, stating that "all the important issues raised by opponents of the scheme will not now be dealt with in a formal public enquiry" wherein the local community would also be allowed to express their discomfort with the projected development and offer suggestions to keep the development from becoming a permanent eyesore in Bath. The Trust ultimately objected because in addition to affecting Bath's UNESCO World Heritage Status, the decision not to call in the application was of great "national and international, not merely local significance." One governmental level cannot be involved in a politically important issue that so seriously merits the attention of all three levels of government. Each level must be allowed to voice their own concerns so that there will be enough time for the debate of possible choices before final decisions can be rendered that will affect the “national, international and local” levels.

In addition to the Bath Preservation Trust’s continual fight against the Western Riverside, the Bath Heritage Watchdog stands as another preservation group dedicated to saving Bath from further destruction. Their main complaint against wide-scale development deals with the city’s ability to remain a World Heritage site when more change than continuity is actually occurring. At the time of the planning application’s initial acceptance, even the Watchdog voiced their discontent with the developer’s lack of respect for the city’s status. This was evidenced in the application’s limited reference to Bath as a World Heritage Site. Much like UNESCO’s views, the Watchdog’s argument revolves around the fact that “World Heritage Sites belong to all the peoples of the world, irrespective of the territory on which they are located. So the peoples of the world, as represented by the World Heritage Committee, and not Bath’s residents and council, should be the arbiters of what is acceptable.”

From this view, protecting Bath does not merely concern England or the Council, but rather the world. Therefore, responsibility for preserving and maintaining the city falls not at the local level, but at the international level. Decisions made should now be created at the international level before they are enforced at the local level.

The Watchdog also provided critical comments on the new limitation of building heights in the Western Riverside, which Nicholson has been able to avoid. Although in 2010, “the newly adopted Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Developments [set] a limit on the number of storeys, not the number of visible storeys. All the buildings quoted as 6 storeys in the application [have] an underground car park [which means] 7 storeys,” thereby proving that since 2008, the original decision for 6 storeys has again
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been altered to meet Nicholson’s demands, not the city’s needs.¹³⁰ Adding an extra
storey only compounds the visual problem because now the scenery is severely
compromised since building stories in modern architecture do not conform to old stories
found in Georgian Bath. This is just another way in which Bath’s current status of “safe”
changes to “in danger.” Should more sudden changes to development plans occur,
Bath’s fate will further be endangered.

On the other hand, developer Crest Nicholson and his Regeneration Company
creates a false sense of support for historic preservation on his website, much like
SouthGate. Accordingly, Nicholson’s statement for the much desired change in the
Western Riverside revolves around the respected use of the brownfield in terms of
advancing development. Nicholson is responsible for improving "the western corridor, a
former industrial site which has been left derelict for more than 25 years, [that] has
undergone an extensive transformation since the beginning of 2011."¹³¹ Nicholson
essentially praises himself for his intrusions into a World Heritage site where an
abandoned area is in the process of becoming an active center for solving housing
problems and adding commercial areas of interest to increase the city’s value.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, the Watchdog refutes Nicholson’s claim.
They state that since this area was “derelict” for a long period of time, “UNESCO has
always taken the view that undeveloped land is no bar to World Heritage status but
once development starts, what is being built has to fit in with the Outstanding Universal

¹³⁰ “Western Riverside News.” Bath Heritage Watchdog, accessed May 2, 2012,
¹³¹ Planning Applications by Crest Nicholson for the Development of Bath Western
Riverside (Western Quarter), official government letter issued January 30,
Nicholson’s development is ultimately to blame for the current danger affecting the city because before he entered the scene, the Western Riverside remained “undeveloped” and Bath’s status was not compromised with the presence of new urban development. Nicholson’s proposed change for Bath now must specifically comply with UNESCO guidelines as well as the Trust’s and Watchdog’s active fight against modernizing Bath to point of losing its heritage.

Nicholson further believes the purpose of this housing development will serve a practical function. This "creates sustainable new communities and delivers high quality housing which meets the needs of modern living" as the issue of population also affects the local government.  

While these statements may reflect a pragmatic vision of change for Bath, it seems unlikely that other seemingly insignificant places in Bath will be kept safe from developers if future demands in housing arise. The question now remains which historical buildings will be sacrificed next in the name of upholding progress. Even though Nicholson advertises that "we are passionate about this city and ensuring that the plans we put forward in years to come reflect the needs of the city as well as pre-empt the demands that will be placed upon it in the future," skepticism should still be placed on his proposed vision of Bath as this is anything but a “passionate” and realistic vision. Nicholson, much like the Council, primarily cares about how much of a profit he can gain through mass-producing homes with the added prestige of drawing residents into a historic World Heritage Site.
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Nicholson currently has received the Council’s approval for more than 2000 homes on the available 44 acres featured in the Western Riverside. In fact, the initial phase of development previously approved enabled the construction of 299 homes, running quite contrary to earlier housing information provided by Madison Oakley Estates. Perhaps such inconsistencies in advertisement allow Nicholson and the Council to find loopholes around government laws and policies. In addition to the creation of homes, other commercial features exist and are projected for inclusion in the Western Riverside Development. Such features include “two parks, a primary school, restaurants, other commercial uses plus health and cultural facilities” including a large-scale supermarket, all of which combine to create yet another SouthGate for Bath on an imposing scale.135

Another confusing aspect of the Western Riverside development is the false manner in which it is advertised. As of October 2012, in conjunction with an environmentally safe engineering agency, Buro Happold, the Western Riverside is listed “as one of the largest brownfield regeneration projects in the south west [comprised of] approximately 70 acres of land west of the city centre adjoining the river Avon.”136 This suggests that this new development “regenerates” the old brownfield so it can be redeveloped, as supported by local Council policy, and satisfy the diverse demand for “homes, leisure and work spaces for the city” even though much of this change will negatively damage the landscape in this extensive project nearing its 2016 completion.

date. As Nicholson personally selected Buro Happold to fulfill his planning and engineering needs in order to alter the brownfield so it becomes an environmentally safe region in terms of structures, roads and drainage, this shows that the Council no longer remains in charge of planning decisions. Nicholson now has the authority to decide Bath’s future, unless the Trust and Watchdog vehemently object and are successful in stopping an increase in unnecessary developments throughout the project’s growth.

Destroying Bath’s Last Gasometer:

Allowing Housing, Not History, in the Western Riverside

An unusual heritage saving plan has been created for Bath's last gasometer, a holder for gas in existence since the Victorian period. Oddly enough, this gasometer is located in the very heart of the Western Riverside and now stands in the way of Crest Nicholson's destructive development. However, the gasometer has a rich history all its own which makes preservation vital for its survival. According to John Dawson, "[h]is grandfather [Edgar] helped build a gasholder, which has already been taken down, in 1912. Edgar, who died in 1960, was badly injured during the construction work and lost his left arm." Dawson's fight to save this gasholder stems from his interest in keeping and "reus[ing] it [to] remind him of his grandfather's bravery," thereby preserving his family's participation in Bath's industrial history for posterity. This gasholder, unfortunately, remains one of two already destroyed gasholders, which were both

---

mandatory demolitions in order for the completion of the Western Riverside project.

However, the Bath Preservation Trust does not support Dawson's wish to save this gasometer. They believe this "was not one of the reasons Bath was a World Heritage Site" and thus has no future in Bath.\textsuperscript{140} Since the gasometer has not received any support from the Trust, "the Council said it would be discussing a timetable for demolition of the structure" in order to keep Bath as modern as possible.\textsuperscript{141} According to this same news article, the Western Riverside, once finalized, will now offer prospective buyers a full range of 3,500 houses, significantly differing from numbers previously reported in earlier articles. This serves as a confounding factor, increasing the expected number of housing as well as demonstrating the changes needed to accommodate the population growth in Bath. In addition, since the Council is in partnership with Nicholson, development will be executed as they see fit, even if that means the destruction of a timeless building which also survived the horrors of the 1942 Bath Blitz in World War II whereas other public buildings were not so fortunate.\textsuperscript{142} Unfortunately, as of August 2, 2012, it has been confirmed that the gasometer will be torn down so progress on the Western Riverside may continue as planned.\textsuperscript{143} Unlike the successful preservation efforts made to ensure a future for Beckford's Tower, the gasometer sadly has no future.

The gasometer additionally presents problems not only for construction in the Western Riverside, but also for the area itself. According to Caroline Kay, "structures

such as this are not appropriate for the river basin in Bath" and since the gasometer isn't a Grade I or Grade II Listed Building, the Western Riverside remains "a very important regeneration area for the city" that will not be left alone until regeneration is finished. Here the issue of regenerating land for modern uses involving housing and business support outweighs the need for historic preservation. Of further significance in this argument is the Trust's interest not to save the gasometer because this structure does not serve an important function. Reasons in favor of supporting the gasometer's destruction includes the fact that it "prevents Bath Western Riverside from further development, prevents the regeneration of the Bath Press site [and] is an environmental blot on the landscape," all of which are goals geared towards promoting the economic growth of Bath, not protecting the historic fabric the Trust is expected to save as initially indicated in their mission statement.

The Trust's involvement in supposedly safeguarding the Gasometer now becomes complicated. While the Trust seems to encourage the saving of the past, they appear very willing to reject a critical part of Bath's history solely for the purpose of destroying the Riverside to add apartments and meet the rising demand for housing needs. Perhaps historic preservation plays no match when pitted against sustaining the future as well as the monetary assets to be gained from a venture of this nature.

Prior to the final decision to demolish the gasometer, Mayor Bryan Chalker, a strong advocate of cultural heritage and preservation, voiced his opinion regarding a pragmatic method for saving the gasometer. On February 6, 2012, he suggested that

"we have this massive old gas holder which with imagination and with a bit of vision could be turned into a massive concert hall or a museum of Bath," which would allow the gasholder to be transformed into a functioning building rather than just a pile of rubble once placed in the developer's hands.146

Chalker's idea for this model derives from the successful example of Vienna's conversion of their gasholders into a thriving commercial resort. Here Vienna's 2001 "Gasometer Town [or] G-Town, as the locals call it, includes 70 shops, bars, restaurants, cafes, a multiplex cinema, events hall with seating for 4, 200 people, a daycare centre, 615 apartments, 230-bed student dormitory and 11,000 square meters of office space," thereby serving as a direct link between past, present and future needs, without the additional need for unalterable destruction of the past.147 Vienna has essentially accomplished what Bath has not been able to do. Although Vienna created a SouthGate equivalent without destroying their landscape, had Bath not become accustomed to the luxury offerings featured in SouthGate, perhaps the same idea would have been a feasible solution.

It is most unfortunate that Bath's gasholder will not be able to enjoy the same prosperity as Vienna's structure, but then again, that is the price to be paid in a city where change in the form of unsightly fixtures proves more valuable than securing its World Heritage Status. An easy alternative for Bath would be to stop progress on the Western Riverside and convert the gasometer into another G -Town. However, such a decision would drive Nicholson out of Bath, halt the Council's plans and save the

Western Riverside.

Interestingly enough, the future of the Western Riverside development ultimately determines Bath's ability to continue being listed as a complete UNESCO World Heritage City. Caroline Kay noted this discrepancy when she stated that future planning applications affecting the development will also affect the city. In this respect, "the preservation of Bath depends on its evolution, but that evolution must respect those qualities of Bath which have given its World Heritage status in the first place. We will continue to engage constructively with developers but Bath's special status needs to be understood." If final plans negatively impact upon Bath's precious architectural design, and are determined by UNESCO to infringe upon the city's status, protection for the city will stop and the tourism Bath currently possesses may also be severely affected. Therefore, it remains imperative that Crest Nicholson be watched like a hawk and future planning applications seriously be supervised to prevent the possibility of another much larger SouthGate from erupting, which is a probable likelihood at this phase of construction.

---

Keeping Bath: The Need for Preservation

The royal family of England additionally addressed the controversy of manmade destruction affecting Bath. The Prince of Wales offered his views on this social matter when he spoke of his general discontent in an address to his Foundation for the Built Environment. Here he pointed to the significance of the beauty of the past and the importance of preserving, instead of destroying, in order to allow for the entry of the modern world. He stated that "[f]or some unaccountable reason we seem to be determined to vandalise these few remaining sites which retain the kind of human scale and timeless character that so attract people to them and which increase in value as time goes by."\(^{149}\) While the issue of preservation remains a continuing problem for Bath, there still seems to be a general problem in obtaining adequate governmental protection for historically significant sites.

Caroline Kay expressed her own views on this troublesome aspect of development for both Bath and the Trust. She offered insightful information as to the legal plight of Bath at the hands of developers. This is evidenced by the fact that "[t]here is no explicit statutory protection for World Heritage sites in UK law, and while we hope that the proposed draft Bill for Heritage Protection will remedy this, Bath is currently still at the mercy of developers driven by commercial interests, a local authority which has not even produced detailed planning guidance on tall buildings and a London-centric media."\(^{150}\) Questions now arise as to who actually protects this important city, which will continually face such economic threats due to deficits in identifying new legality and

finding support for its enforcement. Amy Gazin-Schwartz describes the government’s questionable role in protecting historic properties as the management of significant sites primarily depends upon the ability to secure funding to promote their survival. Although,

“on October 31, 2001, the House of Lords in London debated a National Heritage bill that included provisions governing the trading functions of English Heritage, as well as underwater archaeology and the sharing of authority among heritage agencies. English Heritage is a quasi-governmental organization created in 1983 to oversee protection and management of historic buildings and archaeological sites in England. The problem of providing funds to preserve, conserve and interpret heritage sites, and to manage them as tourist attractions, is a major focus of discussion not only in governmental arenas, but among archaeologists and others with professional or personal interests in the sites.”

While British heritage does involve the government, it still heavily relies upon support from outside agencies, individuals and communities, as in the case of the Bath Preservation Trust and the Bath Heritage Watchdog. These players are responsible for ensuring the protection and management of the city’s historic buildings for prosperity because Bath cannot solely rely on a government that continues to debate the provisions for a National Heritage bill, which would, by law, cover, protect, conserve, and manage, these historically-significant sites. Since tourism allows Bath’s economy to prosper, the Council should seek to secure funds to rehabilitate buildings in need of

conservation, so that buildings, local businesses, hotels, and museums will continue to attract tourism. The funds gained from tourism would re-enter the economy and encourage Bath’s growth as a metropolis while also battling the city’s future needs for development, without endangering its UNESCO status.

As no new information has been released regarding the proposed Bill for Heritage Protection, Bath’s legal future continues to remain most unstable. If UNESCO World Heritage’s own mission includes "provid[ing] emergency assistance for World Heritage sites in immediate danger [and] encouraging participation of the local population in the preservation of their cultural and natural heritage," these statements reflect that not enough is actively being done to ensure Bath’s safety for future generations.\textsuperscript{152} Although legal matters take time, money and effort, developers appear to be enjoying freedom which can not readily be accounted for. Perhaps the notion of insufficient laws and related enforcement can be used to the advantage of residents in the struggle to preserve the city. This may suggest that Bath’s residents will ultimately be the ones responsible for ensuring the survival of their city.

**Buildings in Bath: Following the Law**

From a contrasting standpoint, current issues of legality are addressed in the 2012 Listed Buildings in England, as found in the House of Commons Library. This governmental document explains why and how buildings can be listed for historic preservation and outlines the true role of the British government in promoting this protection. A particularly interesting fact concerning this issue is that when "an

application for listed building consent [which is] required for changes to a listed building goes to the local planning authority [t]here is a right of appeal to the Secretary of State if an application is rejected.\textsuperscript{153} Any change made to a building must first be reported to the government. Appeals may be granted, if and when an application is rejected because there is not sufficient information available to determine a building’s historic status for governmental protection.

The British government additionally elaborates on their position in relationship to historic preservation. They maintain that "it is not illegal to undertake development without planning consent. However, it is a criminal offence to alter listed buildings without listed building consent," a point which the Bath Preservation Trust further stresses in their documentations.\textsuperscript{154} However, one crucial provision within this document is that all changes must be made available to the public, especially if such changes concern historically significant listed buildings. Other buildings, of non-historic interest, can and will be altered to fit the needs of developers because these structures do not present a threat to England’s history. Only changes to a listed building, attesting to the city’s historic importance, must first be taken up with the government to receive consent, or else these unauthorized changes are in direct violation of the law. Although the government serves a critical function in safeguarding, saving, and altering the city, it, like the Trust, has both rules and regulations that strictly govern its every move. The Trust is not as free with its preservation decisions as all people would like to believe. The changes they allow to occur address the needs of the modern world, which

continually pose challenges the government must solve in order to remain current.

**Stopping Development: New Laws for Bath**

The presence of developers in Bath not only threatens buildings and their inhabitants, but also English heritage and culture. However, these problems for Bath actually began much earlier in the city’s history. With the emergence of the Sack of Bath in the middle of the 20th century, "[t]he destruction of large parts of Georgian Bath in the 60s and 70s became a national scandal," and because of this previous destructive attitude, it is without much surprise that scandals still arise in modern times.¹⁵⁵ Most of these scandals revolve around developers who threaten to tear down parts of Georgian Bath and replace the old parts with new modern parts that bear no resemblance whatsoever to building design or land use designation of the region’s earlier periods.

Contrary to previous information provided by the Bath Preservation Trust, two laws actually do exist for the purpose of protecting heritage and preservation in Bath. Accordingly, "Heritage Preservation for the 21st Century stated the aim of compiling a unified register for all heritage assets-including listed buildings and scheduled monuments. The Draft Heritage Protection Bill, published in 2008, would have put in place a unified heritage protection system and remove the distinctions between different designations- listing, scheduling, and registering."¹⁵⁶ Despite these protections, problems persisted. Although Heritage Preservation for the 21st Century outlined a pragmatic approach towards meeting the modern day attention of preservation efforts for Bath, the Draft Heritage Protection Bill, which was proposed and welcomed, it "was

not followed by an actual Bill” and so protection could not be created because this was only a proposal and not a legally-binding bill.\textsuperscript{157}

This creates further complications for Bath. Although new bills and laws are proposed, they are not passed as bills because their written presence would threaten the continuing advertisement of Bath as a tourist’s haven and romantic getaway. This prevents new laws from actually being enforced as well and prevents the city from being adequately saved. The erection of modern buildings and construction of new roads fits the needs of growing tourism and receives the approval of the Bath & North East Somerset Council, as its original purpose is, and still remains, to protect the city.

\textit{The Penfold Review}, published in November 2011, further explains the government's involvement with developers and listed buildings in an effort to limit damage. Many rules restrict the real level of work that can be carried out in order that historically-significant buildings do not lose their status. Accordingly, "developers must apply for Listed Building Consent if they wish to undertake work that would impact on the special historic or architectural interest of a listed building."\textsuperscript{158} Without legal consent, work cannot begin. Consent even extends into conservation areas, such as the Greenbelt, where there is also a requirement for consent before work can commence.

Of great importance for Bath are the legal issues involving conservation and demolition. Here "Conservation Area Consent is currently required to demolish buildings in a conservation area. Demolition is normally to make way for a new development - which will require separate planning permission" and it is an issue which plagues Bath

into the modern day. Additionally, renovations can be made to buildings of historic value, provided that these renovations also adhere to government guidelines, not just those outlined in Bath’s local government documents, such as Warmer Bath. In this manner, changes made toward preserving traditional homes are supported. Also, "[L]isted buildings can be altered, extended and sometimes even demolished within government planning guidance," which sets new legal standards and helps prevent illegal activity from occurring in significant edifices.

**VAT Complication: 2012 Budget Plans Impact Bath:**

In addition to legal procedures affecting the conditions of buildings in Bath, financial issues have become a recent area of complaint. These new budget plans for Bath threaten both current and future repairs to be executed on historically-significant buildings. In a March 2012 financial publication, for Britain's *The Telegraph*, Chancellor George Osborne revealed that alterations made for listed buildings would increase from "a zero percent VAT rate [to] the standard rate of 20 per cent." Because of this VAT change, or a value added tax, projected alterations and repairs made will increase and thus, influence people's pragmatic views on the importance of saving their historic past from destruction.

This decision has caught the attention of other heritage groups beside the Bath Preservation Trust, such as The Heritage Alliance. Chairman of the Heritage Alliance, Lloyd Grossman, expressed his concern over this latest area of controversy. Grossman

---


revealed that "[t]he very real fear is that this will discourage people from making improvements to listed buildings. It may make the difference between them having a future and losing them altogether."\textsuperscript{162} This holds true in many respects. If people cannot afford to repair their homes because of this increase, the buildings may fall into a state of disrepair. The severity of this situation will ultimately affect a building's historic standing. In essence, history may repeat itself if wide-scale destruction in the form of neglect is encouraged to flourish. The VAT also affects heritage and museum management as "these sites and museums would see their maintenance costs increase forcing them to reallocate funds from other areas of their budgets" in order to deal with this expected tax increase.\textsuperscript{163}

Oddly enough, the Chancellor refused to reduce the VAT for repairs needed for historic buildings. This aspect of the VAT has caught the media's attention because the ultimate goal lies in increasing revenue for the city, not saving Bath's past. This suggests that the financial gains to be achieved outweigh the more serious matter at hand: the preservation of a nation's legacy. Although the Bath Preservation Trust desires a reduction of VAT, they have suggested that rates should instead be "set both at an equal and lower rate such as 5%" which they believe to be a more realistic goal.\textsuperscript{164}

Unfortunately, the finalization of budget plans in October 2012 allow for a more grounded understanding of the tax' ultimate impact on historic preservation. The VAT is currently not expected to decrease, so Bath must now deal with this confounding factor.

as well as problems in combating developers’ presence.

**London 2012 Olympics: Passing the Torch through Bath**

The Council's latest effort to attract an increase in hundreds of people to Bath includes their listing of Bath as one of few selected British cities welcoming the torch for the Summer 2012 Olympic games. On May 22\textsuperscript{nd}, the torch arrived in Bath before continuing its long journey onto London for the July 27\textsuperscript{th} opening ceremony. Prior to its arrival, the Council advertised their involvement in preparing the city for its visitors as part of the "Communities on Route" affair. The passing of the torch here marks "the highlight of a packed year of celebrations - with the Council planning both sporting and cultural events district-wide to suit every taste, along with challenges to inspire all during 2012."\textsuperscript{165}

People are encouraged to welcome the Olympic Flame to their street, celebrate the achievements of the inspirational Torchbearers as they carry the Flame in their community and share in the excitement the Olympic Torch Relay offers.\textsuperscript{166} While this event seeks to unite the community and invite newcomers into this historic city, the issue of preservation nonetheless appears. The introduction of hundreds, if not thousands, of more people in Bath, increases both population and pollution problems, which will now affect the buildings moreso, than if the city had not been advertised as an important stop on the way to London. Tourist websites do not list this concern as such a reaction would halt the highly-desirable revenue associated with people staying

\textsuperscript{165} "London 2012 Olympic Torch Relay Comes to Bath," accessed July 8, 2012, visitbath.co.uk/whats-on/london-2012-olympics.

\textsuperscript{166} "London 2012 Olympic Torch Relay Comes to Bath," accessed July 8, 2012, visitbath.co.uk/whats-on/london-2012-olympics.
in Bath until the conclusion of the games on August 25th.

Current director of the Council and former Olympian kayaker, David Lawrence, is now in charge of preparing Bath for the torch’s passing. The plan for the city "is to have all of Bath's shops and businesses decked out in Olympic bunting" with the ultimate goal of engaging the community in the fervor of celebration.\textsuperscript{167} This use of Olympic decoration extends down to historically significant places such as the Circus and the Royal Crescent, although details of the changes are not available on the Trust's website. Perhaps the additions to such buildings will not be as elaborate or as extensive as repairs, but it seems rather unusual that the Trust does not detail any objections to the decorations.

The excitement associated with the Olympics allows the Council to enjoy just about three months of extra revenue with people living in and traveling through Bath. However, the question now arises as to the revised budget plan the Council has outlined in preparation for the Olympics as online sources do not allow access to any of this information, which comes as no surprise. The reason for such secrecy may be because of their penny wise and pound foolishness decisions with regard to proper city planning.

Controversial Conservation and Preservation Areas in Bath:

Bath contains many critical conservation and preservation areas in danger of destruction other than developmental in nature. The majority of buildings in imminent danger are those located within City Centre, the congested heart of Bath’s commercialism and tourism activities. Although there are many examples of controversial concerns facing historic buildings located throughout Bath, this research focuses on a select few because of the quality of historic preservation occurring at these sites. These six outstanding historically-significant buildings remain examples of the Trust’s practical mission of safeguarding the past for the future, as outlined on their homepage. Such sites include Abbey Churchyard, Beauford Square, Circus House, Gammon Plant Hire/Rock Hall Lane, the Summerfield School Lime Grove Site, and the Royal Crescent. Here historic preservation plays a vital role in the ultimate survival of these buildings.\textsuperscript{168}

Abbey Churchyard:

Abbey Churchyard is located in Bath’s City Centre and requires roofing repairs. Such repairs will modernize the building and accommodate England’s travelers. The Trust supports this change as the churchyard comprises a significant area of Bath and is of a generous size. As an active religious center, Abbey Churchyard must be repaired so it can survive daily challenges the 21\textsuperscript{st} century imposes upon its existence. This improvement is sorely-needed in order to prevent water damage, which would seriously increase damage to both the interior and exterior of the building. The Trust considers

this building an enhancement for the overall layout of the city as such changes will "enhance the heritage value of the listed building, and improve the appearance of the property that in turn will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area."\(^{169}\) However, much planning will still be required before repairs can occur as the Trust demands the use of original materials, which is one of their main arguments against new construction.

**Controversial Christmas Lights in Beauford Square:**

Another controversial area in the City Centre of Bath was the most recent proposed display of Christmas lights for the 2011 holiday season. The Trust objected to this "installation of six anchors into the primary facade of 13 Beauford Square [because it would] necessitat[e] the drilling into the ashlar frontage of the building."\(^{170}\) The trust maintains that "Christmas lights mounted within the city centre have a commercial and wider social justification, which does not extend to this proposal. These fixings [are] used on a yearly basis to mount the City's Christmas display, minimising the intrusion upon the historic fabric of these buildings."\(^{171}\) The rejection to the original idea is based on very real consequences -- that this "could also lead to a cumulative impact if such installations are seen as permissible."\(^{172}\) They have instead suggested alternative schemes, such as projection mapping as this is an effective and completely non-invasive technique which is used across the world to transform buildings into dynamic

---


and illuminated canvasses.

This has, in fact, already been done in Bath Abbey, where impressive results are noted as such changes did not inflict permanent damage upon that building. And in the end, the Trust rejected this proposal because they felt these alterations "would harm the special character of this listed building, [and] neither preserve nor enhance the conservation area, and will fail to protect the special qualities of the World Heritage Site."\(^{173}\) In this way the Trust is adhering to legal advice previously outlined in UK documents to preserve the integrity of the city and prevent future harm from befalling Bath.

**Circus House:**

Circus House at Bennett Street in the City Centre of Bath is another controversial matter. This is a key Georgian building in need of serious renovations. Architect John Wood the Elder designed the Circus, hoping to recreate "the grandeur of Imperial Rome [and] brought from London the concept of spacious squares and imposing terraces [which] set a fashion in Bath that others would emulate across the growing Georgian city," and thereby honor the influence of Roman architecture in England.\(^{174}\) The Georgian style in the Circus is herein comprised of

"3 storeys and mansard, with 3 or 4 windows, divided into 3 blocks, all of the same size, but each with a different number of houses. [The building has] 3 distinct orders; Doric on the ground floor with triglyphs and metopes enriched and each differently carved, Ionic on the 1st floor and Corinthian on the 2nd floor."


[It presents an] impressive array of coupled columns (324 in all) with bands of ornament at upper and lower storeys and acorns crowning the parapet above each coupled order."175

This system of hierarchy elevates the building in style construction as its overall composition reflects the influence of the classical orders of architecture.

The Circus unites the rest of Bath through its inclusion of a garden to echo the close relationship of architecture to nature in 18th Century Georgian Bath. This visual paralleling of the Circus and the garden "brought the Circus into closer harmony with Queen Square on the one hand and the rus in urb of the Royal Crescent on the other," as exemplified by the delicate intimacy of the city's layout.176 Such a detailed design allows for established cohesion within the urban setting of other buildings of a similar historical stature.

Current restoration plans for the Circus center on the installation of a ventilation system in its decontamination room, which involves the use of a grille. The Trust, however, does not approve of this addition as work will be rather invasive and involve destruction to the historic fabric of the building. Although the Trust states their openness to suggested alternative solutions, no resolution has been reached as of yet.177

Gammon Plant Hire:

A proposal has been made to demolish properties at Gammon Plant Hire at Rock

Hall Lane in Combe Down, Bath, for housing replacement. Although the Trust does not support development in Bath, they do consider new developments as long as such revisions are not excessive or defy historic city flavor, a point UNESCO also highly stresses. After the SouthGate incident, the Trust expects all new Georgian architecture to flow with existing designs. Plans for houses are currently being discussed and if the plans satisfy the Trust’s demands, these properties will be eliminated. Again, there is to be the loss of structures belonging to Bath. One is caused to wonder how much of a pre-formulated agenda already exists at the time of evaluation for these properties, and whether grounds for their salvation are deliberately being withheld to accommodate these agendas and their intent.178

**Summerfield School Lime Grove Site:**

The Summerfield School Lime Grove Site is a major area of controversy existing in Bath without resolution. The Lime Grove School educates handicapped children and "is sited within the Bath Conservation Area and wider World Heritage Site," but the Bath & North East Somerset Council has made plans for its demolition to instead allow the erection of 18 new dwellings, an access road and parking.179

In the released July 21, 2011 report, the Council thought demolition would not be a problem. They attributed this to the nature of these buildings being "relatively low level and due to the nature of their surroundings, are reasonably well screened from the wider Conservation Area. Whilst these buildings are typical of school buildings constructed in the 1970s, they are of little architectural or historic interest and as such,

---

do not make a positive contribution to this part of the Conservation Area.”\textsuperscript{180} Their sentiments reveal their true goal of destroying a functioning school system in order to make way for more financially-promising constructions. Their arguments focus on the overall lack of historic contribution to Bath, but this can feasibly be argued in light of the fact that these structures have occupied these spaces for four decades – a more than ample period of time for them to have acquired historical value as part of a community without strong, direct architectural links.

The Trust, unlike the Council, feels that this area upsets the traditional historic landscape that is Bath and desires new housing. The Trust has rejected the Council's proposed development for a number of reasons. First, the site's layout contradicts the original "intimate" layout Bath offers and, thus, these new proposed buildings "lack form and quality that would enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area, or connect with the grain of the surrounding townscape."\textsuperscript{181} The Trust also believes there is too much of a variety of architectural design that interferes with the original character of Georgian architecture, something they learned from the mistake of SouthGate. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, "the development may have a detrimental impact upon the setting of the listed terraces and harm the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site," which is the Trust's main goal.\textsuperscript{182} There is also a problem with the use of materials. The Trust believes render, Bath stone ashlar, and Cotswold rubble stone for roofs run contrary to materials used in original Georgian architecture,

similarly to the issue of Abbey Churchyard.

Plans to demolish the school were additionally rejected not only for failing to meet conservation efforts, but also for problems they would cause for road safety. In a later August 15, 2011 report issued by Highway Officer Amanda Hall, road construction plans "for the construction of a new access road and parking areas were 'refused on highway grounds'" due to a lack of substantial information available, including "longitudinal sections for the access road," the lack of turning space available, and how much of an increase in foot traffic there would be. Therefore, Officer Hall advises amendments be added to the proposal for reconsideration. However, these may also be rejected by the Trust if they feel they will continue to interfere with the city's layout. While this plan had nothing to do with conservation, it instead proved that city plans can be rejected because they do not include a "safe operation of the highway." In this instance, the immediacy of safety concerns outweighed the desperate need for housing.

**No. 1 Royal Crescent:**

The No. 1 Royal Crescent is a fine example of successfully preserved Georgian architecture open to the public. John Wood the Younger, son of famous architect John Wood the Elder, built the Royal Crescent in 1767-1774. This building "is a magnificently restored Georgian town house that creates a vital picture of life in

---

Georgian Bath.\textsuperscript{186} It is also the present location of the Bath Preservation Headquarters. Because of its museum like atmosphere, which allows visitors to relive 18th century Bath, it attests to the Trust's message of saving the past and stopping modern-day development's threats. In addition, the Royal Crescent fulfills UNESCO criterion for selecting World Heritage sites because the building showcases "the 18th century move away from the inward-looking uniform street layouts of Renaissance cities that dominated through the 15th-17th centuries, towards the idea of planting buildings and cities in the landscape to achieve picturesque views and forms."\textsuperscript{187} Of considerable interest is the fact that this house was first restored in 1968. Restoration then incorporated "only materials available in the 18th century," which is something the Trust looks for with respect to current restoration plans for other Georgian buildings filing for repairs.\textsuperscript{188}

As of 2006, new restoration plans occurred for the building. The proposed goal was to unify the building with its separated service wing. This would establish a more accurate historic museum house for the public. Restoration work will also be executed on the kitchen, basement and servant's hall to return the Royal Crescent to its former glory. Such a task will accurately bring 18\textsuperscript{th} Century Georgian Bath back to life for 21\textsuperscript{st} Century visitors. Preservation goals which strive to successfully recreate a historical time period that no longer exists while accommodating the modern world without

inflicting more damage is the ultimate goal Bath should strive to achieve.  

Restoration efforts for the Royal Crescent even included the acceptance of charity donations, as this is one of the ways in which private organizations support the preservation of historically significant buildings. In December 2011, the Trust established the Big Give Christmas Challenge for donations going towards restoration. This charity resulted in the Trust earning more than 20,000 pounds, equal to $39,170.05 in American dollars, to be applied toward the finalization of work on the Royal Crescent. For a building of such significant historic importance, complete restoration of this nature demonstrates that with the right amount of volunteerism, charity, and time, the past can be reunited with the present for the future. One can only hope that the same message holds true for the remainder of Bath as it faces its own uncertain future.

In most recent news, the Royal Crescent became the center of special attention in June 2012. The nearby Royal Crescent Hotel and the Bath House Spa advertised the celebration of Her Majesty’s Diamond Jubilee. This hotel even paid respect to England’s prestigious ruler through the exclusive offering of promotional discounts for summer travelers. These accommodations included 50% discounts on rates for trips on June 4th and June 5th as well as complimentary full tea services. The purpose of such a royal treatment of course relates to the lively atmosphere Bath creates for its tourists. The hotel’s website additionally states that “this iconic hotel is far more than a remarkable collection of buildings and beautiful gardens. It offers the opportunity to experience a style of gracious living from the age when Bath was the very centre of the civilized

---

world.” Only in a glorious city of Bath can recent history preserve the memory of the queen and her accomplishments through commercial endeavors that share no relationship to the significance of historic preservation other than to encourage commercialism.

A Concluding Vision of Bath:

The current issue of meeting the demands of historic preservation while combating increasing social and economic threats is a real and present danger facing World Heritage cities, like England’s prestigious Bath. This threat will continue to exist for present and future generations as problems like pollution and economic needs continue to arise in this small, but growing city. Modernity is mainly concerned with solving these problems without destroying more of the city’s heritage. This is mostly evident in the case of the Roman Baths and the Greenbelt region. For Bath, development proves to be the most prominent threat that was allowed to occur early on in the 21st century because of the financial promises the city council would receive. While gain of this nature should never be the reason for sacrificing any portion of a completely preserved historic city, the fact remains that financial need ultimately dictates the city’s direction and future.

After UNESCO stepped in to revoke Bath’s right to be a World Heritage site, more laws came into existence as a result of the efforts of the Bath Preservation Trust to combat future attacks upon the city’s cultural and historic fabric. Accordingly, the Trust provides strict, formal guidelines for repairs and renovations to historic homes and buildings. The creation of laws and corresponding legal revisions evidence active political involvement in the safekeeping of Bath’s past. Even though modern, visually-offensive architecture, such as SouthGate and the recent controversial Western Riverside Development, now clash with the 18th Century Georgian buildings, much of the city remains intact. The city’s true hope in combating developers rests with the Trust, lawmakers, and future generations as believers in the need to save Bath as a
critical part of history and integral component of national identity for England.


“Bath Meadows Will Be Desecrated by Park and Ride Scheme on Greenbelt.”
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