

# CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA



Thursday 11 September 2008

at 6.00 p.m.

at

**Bryan Hanson House, Hanson Square, Hartlepool, TS24 7BT**

MEMBERS: CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond  
Councillor Rob Cook, Chair of Planning Committee  
Mrs Sheila Bruce, Hartlepool Civic Society  
Mrs Maureen Smith, Hartlepool Archaeological and Historical Society  
Mr Brian Walker, Greatham Parish Council  
Mrs Pat Andrews, Headland Parish Council  
Ms Julie Bone, Headland Residents Association  
Mr Lloyd Nichols, Seaton Carew Renewal Advisory Group  
Mr Richard Tinker, Victorian Society  
Mrs Andy Creed-Miles, Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings  
Mr Brian Watson, Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors  
Mr Andy Riley, Royal Institute of British Architects  
Ms Julia Patterson, Park Residents Association  
Mr Ian Moore, Princess Residents Association

1. *6:00 – 6:30 visit to Church Street Conservation Area (meet at Bryan Hanson House)*
2. Apologies for absence
3. Minutes of last meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2008
4. Matters arising
5. Church Street Conservation Area
6. Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee
7. Tunstall Court
8. Any other business

# CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

12<sup>th</sup> June 2008

### **Present:**

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond  
Mrs Sheila Bruce, Hartlepool Civic Society  
Mrs Maureen Smith, Hartlepool Archeological and Historical Society  
Mr Brian Walker, Greatham Parish Council  
Mr Richard Tinker, Victorian Society  
Mr Brian Watson, Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors  
Mrs Julia Patterson, Park Residents Association  
Stuart Green, Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development)  
Peter Graves, Conservation Officer  
Sarah Scarr, Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager  
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

### **1. Tour of Grange Conservation Area**

Prior to the commencement of the meeting Committee members went on a brief tour of the Grange Conservation area

### **2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Rob Cook.

### **3. Declarations of interest by members**

None

### **4. Minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2008**

Agreed

### **5. Matters Arising**

The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) advised that work on the railway station, which was effectively the first phase of the Transport Interchange had recently begun. The overall Interchange project was expected to be completed in approximately one year.

Hart Parish Council were considering the formation of a committee to

consider a village design statement for Hart. The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager would bring any further information back to the Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

## **6. Park Conservation Area Appraisal**

The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager gave a brief update on the ongoing Park Conservation Area Appraisal. The North of England Civic Trust had been commissioned in June 2007 to carry out the appraisal. Since that time a steering group of local representatives had been assembled to guide the process, including representatives of the Park Residents Association, Friends of Ward Jackson Park, Civic Society and Council representatives. A number of public consultation events had taken place, including two walks of the area, talks and a drop-in session. 21 questionnaires had been returned and more were available should members of the Committee wish to make comments. Members acknowledged the consultants imaginative approach to the consultation and their comprehensive assessment of the conservation area.

### **Recommendation**

That the report be noted

## **7. Conservation Grant Scheme**

The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager advised that a budget of £75,000 had been agreed by Council for the Conservation Grant Scheme for 2008/09, a £25,000 increase on 2007/08. A press release had been issued at the beginning of the financial year and articles in the Hartlepool Mail and Northern Echo had subsequently generated a high level of awareness and interest. So far £70,000 of the budget had been allocated leaving only £5,000 remaining.

### **Recommendations**

That the report be noted.

## **8. Town Centre Issues**

The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) updated the Committee on recent developments relating to the establishment of a Town Centre Steering Group and the preparation of a Central Area Investment Framework.

### **Town Centre Steering Group**

Hartlepool's town centre had seen substantial public and private sector investments in recent years. This work had been geared to the establishment of a viable and attractive central area and involved inputs from many different parties. To add structure and momentum the establishment of a Town Centre

Steering Group had been approved by Cabinet. The Steering Group would comprise three working groups in development, management and promotion. Representatives from the public, private and voluntary sectors would make up the Steering Group which would be responsible for providing a strategic overview to the working groups in terms of focus, direction and workstreams as well as facilitating operational links with partner organisations. The Steering Group would report to the Hartlepool Partnership through the Economic Forum sub-group.

### **Central Area Investment Framework**

After discussion with One NorthEast consultants Genecon had been appointed to develop an investment framework for the central area of Hartlepool. This would support efforts to secure regeneration funding and was a response to One NorthEast's increasing emphasis on prioritising resources towards strategic investment opportunities to generate private sector investment.

The investment framework would provide the strategic justification for investment in central Hartlepool and provide specific proposals which could form part of bids for funding. It would be required to build on current proposals and key investment opportunities (e.g. Hartlepool College of Further Education (HCFE), Middleton Grange Shopping Centre, the Transport Interchange) and address key problems (e.g. poor connectivity between the town centre, marina and Victoria Harbour and the unoccupied building at Jackson's Landing). Initial scoping work had highlighted a range of issues and potential schemes were currently being developed as a basis for the investment framework including the reconnection of Church Street, the integration of the new HCFE building and the improvement of strategic accessibility. Discussions were progressing with key owners and interested parties prior to consultation on detailed proposals. The Assistant Director advised that comments from members would be welcomed.

Members commented that there was a need for more co-ordination in town centre planning and investment. A number of issues were raised in particular the lack of free parking in the town centre, something which was provided by out-of-centre retail areas. The Assistant Director acknowledged there was competition but outlined the planning policy approach which aimed to safeguard the town centre as an accessible and viable shopping location.

Another focus of attention was the forthcoming redevelopment of the HCFE. The Assistant Director advised that there would be liaison between Council officers and the College to ensure integration with the surrounding area. There were currently no plans for the provision of student accommodation. Members requested that there be wide-ranging public consultation in order to give residents a sense of ownership.

### **Recommendation**

That the report be noted.

## **9. Any other business**

### **Tunstall Court**

Members were advised that the application prepared by the Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager to have Tunstall Court declared a listed building had been turned down. The Secretary of State, after consulting English Heritage, had decided that the building was not of sufficient special architectural or historic interest to merit listing. Although the building was of significant local interest it failed to meet the criteria in a national context. Members noted the position and requested an update on the development of the site. The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager reported that officers were still engaging in pre-application discussions with the developers regarding their proposals. Members suggested that the draft Civic Trust report on the Park Conservation Area Appraisal be provided to the developers. They asked that if an application was submitted before the next meeting of the Committee they be informed of the details by the Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager. She advised that they would be notified when the application became available on the Council's website.

### **Planning Working Group**

The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development) reported that the Planning Working Group, a sub-group of Planning Committee set up to consider matters relating to conservation and enforcement, had been reconvened for 2008/09 and would be meeting on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> June. Representation from the Conservation Area Advisory Committee would be welcomed and interested members were asked to contact the Democratic Services Officer.

### **Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

A public meeting to discuss the proposed Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee would take place on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2008. Nominations for membership from residents and businesses of the area were requested by 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008.

### **Briarfields**

Mrs Patterson commented on the recent planning permission to convert the main house on the Briarfields site into eight flats with the original exterior appearance to be retained. Alterations to the Lodge had also begun with plans to put a new house between the main house and Lodge in progress.

### **Greystones**

Members took the opportunity to examine proposed plans for the Greystones Estate.

## 9. Next meeting

Members were asked if they had any suggestions as to the venue for the next meeting of the Committee. Church Street was suggested as a possibility.

CHAIRMAN

**Subject: Church Street Conservation Area**

---

**1 Introduction**

- 1.1 There is a need to review the existing eight conservation areas across the Borough. Full appraisals have been carried out on the Headland and in the Park conservation area. This process takes time and as an interim measure visual assessments will be carried out in other conservation areas to ensure that a short description is available to define their character. The first of these was completed for Stranton and circulated to the committee in March of this year. The second area to be considered is Church Street.

**2 Background**

- 2.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 states that local planning authorities shall 'determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.' Once areas are designated it is then the 'duty of a local planning authority from time to time to review the past exercise of functions under this section and to determine whether any parts or any further parts of their area should be designated as conservation areas; and, if they so determine, they shall designate those parts accordingly.' The starting point in reviewing an existing conservation area is to carry out an appraisal.
- 2.2 Appraisals are a means of assessing the key factors contributing to the appearance and character of existing and potential conservation areas, local authorities are encouraged to undertake periodically conservation area appraisals. There is no formal requirement for the form and content of appraisals, or the methodology to be used, but typically appraisals cover such subjects as historical development of the area, archaeological significance, prevalent building materials, the character of open spaces, the quality and relationships of buildings and also of trees.
- 2.3 The local authority have committed to carrying out two conservation area appraisals a year. It is acknowledged that as an interim measure there is a need to carry out an assessment of the other existing conservation areas to review their boundaries and ensure that their character is clearly defined. In order to do this visual assessments will be carried out of these areas.
- 2.4 The visual assessments will be loosely based on the English Heritage document 'Guidance on conservation area appraisals'. It will include desk based work considering historic plans showing the development of the area, along with on site assessments of the current state of properties within the area.

### **3 Visual Assessment of Church Street Conservation Area**

- 3.1 A draft visual appraisal of Church Street Conservation Area is enclosed with these papers. This work is currently ongoing however it was felt appropriate to bring it to seek the views of this committee at an early stage.
- 3.2 The appraisal considers the historic development of the area including its rise and subsequent decline. The public investment in the area in the 1980's is outlined along with a description of the current state of the area.

### **4 Recommendation**

- 4.1 The committee comments on the visual assessment.



**Subject:           Headland       Conservation       Area       Advisory  
                          Committee**

---

**1       Introduction**

- 1.1    This report is intended as an update on the current position with the recently formed Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee

**2       Background**

- 2.1    Members will recall from previous meetings that the Portfolio Holder agreed to the formation of a conservation area advisory committee (CAAC) in the Headland Conservation Area. Such a committee responds to the suggestion in the Headland Conservation Area Appraisal that there was a need to develop a committee to involve the community in matters affecting the Headland as well as disseminating information back to the residents.

**3.       MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE**

- 3.1    Discussions with ward councillors and a representative of the parish council resulted in the formulation of an outline membership for the committee. The following members were agreed:
- Eight resident representatives (these include individuals living and working in the area)
  - One representative of the Parish Council
  - One ward member representative
  - Two representatives from local interest groups one of which would be the Headland History Group.
- 3.2    The format for the selection of resident representatives was based on that used for Resident Representatives on the Neighbourhood Forum Groups. All properties received a letter outlining the background to the CAAC and requesting resident representatives from both residents and businesses within the area. Residents were then required to complete a nomination form with their nomination endorsed by five other residents of the area. Six resident representative nominations were received.
- 3.3    A public meeting was held on the 1<sup>st</sup> July. The purpose of the meeting was to provide further information to residents on CAACs and agree the resident representatives. It was agreed that the six residents who put their names forward would sit on the committee and a further two representatives were agreed by those present on the evening completing the eight resident places available.
- 3.4    The Headland History Group has agreed to sit on the committee providing a place for one other group. Residents associations, interest groups and the churches in the area were contacted and asked to express an interest. Two groups (Friends of Croft Gardens and Friends of Beaconsfield Square)

indicated their interest in joining the committee. The initial nucleus of the committee at their first meeting to agreed that both groups should be able to join.

#### **4 STATUS**

- 4.1 At the first meeting Jules Brown of the North of England Civic Trust provided a short presentation on CAAC's. Information covered included the type of subjects other groups cover and the status of different committees. Examples of committees in other areas were provided.
- 4.2 The group requested further information on the status of the committee and the advantages and disadvantages of being a Council Committee. Further information on this subject was provided at the second meeting.
- 4.3 Given the background of the committee and the previous agreement to the formation of the group sanctioned by the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Liveability (i.e. the Mayor), his view was sought on the proposed options. He had no objections to the committee becoming independent and was happy for the committee to decode the route it wished to pursue.
- 4.4 Those present at the second meeting considered the above and decided that they would prefer to be independent rather than a Council committee as this has advantages such as the ability to consider bidding for funding.
- 4.5 It was proposed that the committee should be known as the 'Headland Conservation Area Advisory Group' (HCAAG) rather than committee to avoid any confusion that it may be a Council committee.

#### **5 REMIT**

- 5.1 The remit of the group has not been finalised. A draft remit has been circulated around the group however this is still under consideration. Initial discussions would suggest that it is likely to consider planning applications within the area, Council policies and guidance programmes, investment priorities and raising awareness of conservation locally.

#### **5 RELATIONSHIP WITH HARTLEPOOL CAAC**

- 5.1 This committee considers strategic policy issues across all eight conservation areas within Hartlepool. It is anticipated that there would be little conflict between this and the new HCAAG which would consider more detailed conservation issues, focused solely on the Headland Conservation Area. It is hoped that there will be a dialogue between the group and the committee when appropriate.

#### **6 RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 That the committee notes the report.

**Subject: Tunstall Court**

---

**1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Members of this committee have previously expressed an interest in the future of Tunstall Court. A full planning application has now been received and this report provides information on that proposal.

**2 Background**

- 2.1 The property was built between 1894 – 1895. It is not a listed building but is a significant property within the Park Conservation Area.
- 2.2 The area in which Tunstall Court was built, known as West Park, was part of a designed urban environment to accommodate families with wealth arising from the industrial success of Hartlepool. It was designed by the architect T. Lewis Banks and had extensive grounds including an ornamental lake.
- 2.3 The building and its grounds were the home of the Furness family during the later 19<sup>th</sup> century and early twentieth centuries and therefore the area has strong connections with the heyday of Hartlepool's industrial development. The building was acquired in 1948 by the Borough Council and used as an educational base until the mid 1980's after which it was a training centre. Over a number of years the original grounds have been subject to residential development. Since the Council disposed of the property and the remaining grounds it has been vacant for a number of years and the subject of vandalism.

**3 Proposed Development Scheme**

- 3.1 Applicants, Raven Audley Court, are seeking to create a 'Care Community for the Elderly' at Tunstall Court that would provide accommodation for over a hundred elderly or infirmed residents. The facilities would allow elderly people to lead independent lives in a secure environment.
- 3.2 The proposal consists of 84 apartments in a total of six buildings situated around the site. Tunstall Court would be retained at the centre of the development with extensions added to the rear. The larger rooms within the house would remain in tact and provide facilities such as residents dining room, lounge, bar and library. Further to this the extensions would provide a swimming pool and a number of apartments.
- 3.3 Two new 'gate houses' are proposed on Park Avenue with a new entrance to the site. Further to this two buildings known as the 'Woodland blocks' will be constructed on the south of the site to address The Parade. Finally a 'Northern Block' is proposed as a block of apartments in a style which reflects the character of Tunstall Court adjacent to the main house. It will be visually linked to Tunstall Court through a terrace which runs in front of the two buildings.

### **3 Consultation**

- 4.1 The application is currently out to consultation with the plans available on the Council website ([www.hartlepool.gov.uk](http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk)). It can be located on the site by going to the Planning Online page and searching on the application reference number H/2008/0480 or address 'Tunstall Court'.

### **5 Recommendation**

- 5.1 The committee comments on the application.

**CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

11<sup>th</sup> September, 2008



**Report of:** The Assistant Director (Planning and Economic Development)

**Subject:** CONSERVATION POLICY REVIEW

---

1. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 To seek the Committee's views on proposed planning policy guidelines for alterations to properties in conservation areas

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1 Committee members will be aware that the Planning Committee has been reviewing its policy guidelines for alterations to properties in conservation areas. The Committee considered the report attached as **Appendix 1** at its meeting on 3 September and agreed to consider Conservation Area residents, the Regeneration and Liveability Portfolio Holder, Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the emerging Headland Conservation Area Advisory Group on the draft guidelines.

3. **RECOMMENDATION**

3.1 The Committee's comments on the draft guidelines are requested.

**Report of: Assistant Director (Planning & Economic Development)**

**Subject: Conservation Policy Review**

---

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Members will recall the consideration of planning policy guidance for residential properties in conservation areas and listed buildings during 2006 – 7. A report has previously been brought to this Committee however it was noted that the proposed policy did not include reference to the use of modern materials in conservation areas therefore it the Committee requested that this guidance should be reconsidered.
- 1.2 The Planning Working Group has therefore been reconsidering this area of policy in recent months. In considering policy guidance the Working Group agreed that there should be no change to the policy guidance for listed buildings: works to such buildings of special interest should continue to use traditional design solutions and materials. The main focus of this review is therefore on unlisted properties in conservation areas. These fall into two categories outlined below:
1. Properties in conservation areas covered by an Article 4 Direction which controls changes including replacement windows.
  2. Other properties in conservation areas with the normal permitted development rights, which allow alterations such as window replacement without the need for planning permission.
- 1.3 Given the distinction between the controls and the requirement for planning permission due to Article 4 Directions the main consideration in this instance is the policy guidance relating to properties covered by an Article 4 Direction.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 In considering policy guidance this Committee specifically requested further investigation into the inclusion of reference to modern materials within any new guidance.
- 2.2 Officers have carried out research into the options available when using modern materials. In addition, a representative of the British Plastics Federation (BPF) was invited to Hartlepool to provide information to officers on the capability of UPVC.

### 3 Requirements for replacement windows

3.1 Discussions at Working Group Meetings have suggested that four criteria should be considered when looking at replacement windows. These are:

- Design
- Dimensions
- Detailing
- Opening mechanism

3.2 These criteria are felt to be the key details that, if achieved, will result in a window similar to a traditional solution. The rationale behind the use of the four criteria is examined in Appendix 1.

3.3 The criteria were proposed as part of the consultation processes on the Headland Conservation Area appraisal. The consultation was extensive with three rounds gauging residents' thoughts on the conservation area. It was clear from the first two consultation events that a major issue in the area was the use of UPVC. In the third round of consultation the majority of respondents (65%) agreed that, in the case of Article 4 properties, 'modern materials on these properties may be considered, but only where these materials are in keeping with the design, detailing, dimensions and the opening mechanism of the original window'. It is therefore suggested that any new policy on UPVC windows should be based on these criteria.

3.4 With regard to the introduction of a new policy to support the use of replacement windows within conservation areas, it is suggested that the planning policy endorsed by Planning Committee on the 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004 is amended in relation to unlisted buildings in conservation areas, subject to an Article 4 Direction. The proposed amendments are highlighted below.

B(i) Any planning application for replacement or alteration of traditional joinery items on the building on front, side or rear elevations which is not of a type appropriate to the age and character of the building (in terms of design and detailing) and the character and appearance of the conservation area should be denied consent. The use of traditional materials will be favoured, however the use of modern material will be accepted provided that the window is of design, dimensions, detailing and opening mechanism matching those of the original window.

(ii) Any planning application for replacement or alteration of non-traditional joinery items on the building on front, side or rear elevations which is not of a type appropriate to the age and

character of the building (in terms of design and detailing) and the character and appearance of the conservation area should be denied consent. The use of traditional materials will be favoured, however the use of modern material will be accepted provided that the window is of design, dimensions, detailing and opening mechanism matching those of a traditional window appropriate to the character of the property.

- 3.5 These amendments specifically refer to modern materials and the key design elements which should be met in a suitable replacement window.
- 3.6 Should Members feel that it is appropriate a list of companies which can manufacture UPVC sash windows could be compiled, however it should be noted that the Council could not recommend companies and a caveat would be placed on any list.

#### **4 Financial Assistance**

- 4.1 In discussions about UPVC sliding sash windows it was acknowledged that such windows can be more expensive than timber sliding sash windows and standard UPVC windows. The Working Group expressed a desire to explore any opportunities available to provide financial assistance to residents seeking use of the more expensive UPVC option.
- 4.2 Research has shown that the existing forms of conservation and housing grant offered by the Council have neither the eligibility criteria nor the spare capacity to be able to provide any significant support towards the use of UPVC sash windows. The potential for loan assistance has also been explored but there is no approved Council budget to establish a loan fund. Enquiries have also shown there to be no external funding streams which might be relevant to this issue. Looking ahead, it would be theoretically possible to raise such financial assistance towards UPVC windows as a potential priority item for consideration in the Council's 2009-10 budget process but there can obviously be no certainty that such an approach would be supported, in comparison with other pressures and priorities.

#### **5 Conclusion**

- 5.1 The amended policy outlined in full in Appendix 2 allows residents the opportunity to use modern materials in a way which will be sympathetic to the overall character and appearance of the relevant conservation area. Some Working Group members have expressed reservations about the affordability of such policy for householders and the investigations referred to above have indicated that it is highly unlikely that there can be any significant assistance available towards the use



of UPVC sash windows. Members' reservations may therefore remain but the Planning Committee is asked to consider the following points:

- a) The UPVC sash window is a product already available, indicating that there is a viable market for its use without any guarantee of grant assistance;
- b) The policy proposed is consistent with the outcome of the Headland Conservation Area appraisal, which involved three stages of public consultation;
- c) The proposed acceptance of UPVC sash windows provides for a visually acceptable solution coupled with double glazing, which is commonly perceived to be a valuable benefit to the householder;
- d) The underlying rationale for this proposed policy is established national and local policy for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas as areas of special architectural or historic interest. The planning system serves to establish a set of policies in the public interest, with the expectation that planning applicants will have regard to such policies in submitting applications. It is not uncommon for applicants to face additional costs in complying with approved planning policy, whether they be private developers, businesses or householders, and planning authorities should not modify their decision-making on applications by reference to applicants' financial circumstances. There is not a duty on planning authorities to provide financial assistance for applicants who may indicate that they are unable to comply with approved policy.

5.2 Whilst some members may retain their reservations about the proposed amended policy it is submitted that an alternative approach of allowing "standard" UPVC windows, not meeting the criteria of the proposed policy, runs the severe risk of substantial loss of character in areas which contribute significantly to Hartlepool's overall sense of identity.

5.3 It is suggested that before any revised guidance is adopted, a consultation exercise should be undertaken to seek the views of residents across the conservation areas (members may feel that the Headland could be omitted, given the conservation area appraisal consultation undertaken in 2007, in the interests of avoiding "conservation fatigue"). In addition the views of the relevant Portfolio Holder, the Conservation Area Advisory Committee and the recently established Headland Conservation Area Advisory Committee will be sought.

## **6 Recommendation**

6.1 That the Planning Committee agrees to the proposed revised policy guidelines being taken forward for consultation with residents.

## Appendix 1

### 1. Design

The design of UPVC windows available on the market varies greatly. It is essential that any replacement window replicates the main design elements of a sash window, namely the appropriate proportions of the two panes with a central meeting rail with the lower window set back.

### 2. Dimensions

Timber sash windows usually have a slim frame in comparison with double glazed UPVC windows. This slim frame should be achieved in a replacement window.

### 3. Detailing

In UPVC windows it is usually difficult to re-create the finer detailing found in timber sliding sash windows, in particular elements such as glazing bars. Such parts are often added as applied strips on to a standard UPVC window to attempt to create the desired appearance, but such details lack the profile of "true" glazing bars and often fail to match the traditional dimensions. Where appropriate, additions could include horns and glazing bars however the detailing should be carefully considered and only used where historically accurate.

### 4. Opening mechanisms

Windows which open outwards differ in appearance from sash windows which slide vertically. The push out opening mechanism usually results in a bulkier, flatter window and the appearance of the 'mock sash' is lost once the window is open. For this reason it is suggested that any replacement window should be a sliding sash window to replicate one of the most distinctive elements of the window it is replacing.

## Appendix 2

### Amended Planning policy endorsed by the Planning Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004.

#### A. Listed Buildings:

- (i) Any replacement or alterations of traditional joinery items which is not on an identical basis in terms of design, detailing and materials should be denied consent.
- (ii) Any replacement or alterations of previously altered joinery items which is not of a type appropriate to the age and character of the building (in terms of design, detailing and materials) should be denied consent.
- (iii) Within modern extensions, any replacement or alteration of joinery details which is not of a sympathetic character (in terms of scale, proportions, form and emphasis) should be denied consent.

#### B. Unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas, subject to an Article 4 Direction:

- (i) Any planning application for replacement or alteration of traditional joinery items on the building on front, side or rear elevations which is not of a type appropriate to the age and character of the building (in terms of design and detailing) and the character and appearance of the conservation area should be denied consent. The use of traditional materials will be favoured, however the use of modern material will be accepted provided that the window is of design, dimensions, detailing and opening mechanism matching those of the original window.
- (ii) Any planning application for replacement or alteration of non-traditional joinery items on the building on front, side or rear elevations which is not of a type appropriate to the age and character of the building (in terms of design and detailing) and the character and appearance of the conservation area should be denied consent. The use of traditional materials will be favoured, however the use of modern material will be accepted provided that the window is of design, dimensions, detailing and opening mechanism matching those of a traditional window appropriate to the character of the property.
- (iii) Within modern extensions, any planning application for replacement or alterations of joinery details, which is not of a sympathetic

character (in terms of scale, proportion, form and emphasis) should be denied consent.

C. Unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas, not subject to an Article 4 Direction:

Any planning application for alterations or extensions which are not of a type sympathetic to the age and character of the building (in terms of scale, proportion, form and emphasis) and the character and appearance of the conservation area should be denied consent.