

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA



Thursday 20 October 2011

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
David Bentham, Hutton Avenue Residents Association
Mrs Joan Carroll, Hartlepool Civic Society
Mrs Maureen Smith, Hartlepool Archaeological and Historical Society
Ms Julia Patterson, Park Residents Association
Mr Richard Tinker, Victorian Society
Mr Brian Walker, Greatham Parish Council
Ms Jo Lonsborough, Elwick Parish Council
John Cambridge, Hartlepool Headland Conservation Area Advisory Group

1. Apologies for absence
2. Minutes of last meeting held on 21 July 2011
3. Matters arising
4. Regeneration Proposals at Seaton Carew - *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*
5. Update on Locally Listed Buildings - *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*
6. Heritage at Risk Register in Hartlepool - *Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*
7. Any Other Business

CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

21 July 2011

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm at Bryan Hanson House, Hartlepool

Present: David Bentham, Hutton Avenue Residents Association
Joan Carroll, Hartlepool Civic Society
Maureen Smith, Hartlepool Archaeological and Historical Society
Julia Patterson, Park Residents Association
Richard Tinker, Victorian Society
Brian Walker, Greatham Parish Council
John Cambridge, Hartlepool Headland Conservation Area Advisory Group

Officers: Sarah Scarr, Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager
Peter Graves, Townscape Heritage Initiative Manager
Tony Dixon, Arboricultural Officer
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond, Councillor Rob Cook, Chair of Planning Committee, and Jo Lonsborough, Elwick Parish Council.

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2011

Confirmed.

3. Matters Arising

Dates of future meetings to be circulated to Committee Members.

Tunstall Court – the committee was advised that the planning application was still with the department, though the applicant had made some minor amendments to some of the details. Members commented that the application did appear to be taking some time.

4. Update on Locally Listed Buildings *(Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods)*

The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager updated the Committee on the progress in developing the local list of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant. Members of the public and interested parties such as Parish Councils and Residents Associations were invited to nominate buildings across Hartlepool that they thought were significant. The period of consultation

ran from November 2010 until the end of January 2011. Nominations were accepted via e-mail and in writing. Seventy-two nominations were received for buildings and land throughout Hartlepool.

These nominations had been placed on a draft list along with nominations that had been identified as part of the work carried out appraising the eight conservation areas. In addition surveys of the town were also carried out to cover buildings which were located outside conservation areas. Over 250 nominations were included on the draft list.

Officers have compiled a description for each nomination, examining background information, photographing the site where possible and plotting each site on a location plan. This information had been placed in a draft document and some very initial draft copies of this were available for the Committee to view.

Owners and occupiers of all properties on the list had been consulted on the nominations. Consultation was in the form of a letter with a closing date for comments of 22nd July. Once all of the comments have been received the draft list will be published for general comment.

The selection of buildings would be carried out by an independent panel agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Housing on 16th June. The panel would comprise individuals with specialist knowledge in the field of conservation, architecture and history. Conservation Officers from Middlesbrough and Stockton Councils had agreed to sit on the panel. At the last meeting of this committee it was agreed that Richard Tinker of the Victorian Society would represent the CAAC on the selection panel.

Advice was taken from Hartlepool Reference Library on individuals with good knowledge of local history. A number of local residents were approached and Steve Robbins had agreed to represent these interests on the panel. He has carried out research into Hartlepool and regularly leads guided walks in the town.

It was indicated that the first of the Panels was likely to be scheduled for late September. The list they would consider had been split into three sections, Buildings, Monuments and Other Structures, including open spaces. Once completed, the final list would be available through the council's website.

The committee questioned the information that was supplied with the nominations. The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager indicated that some information had come from those nominating the property and some from the property owners themselves, where they were different. It was as accurate as it could be but was unlikely in most cases to be the standard that English Heritage produced for listed homes, though that did vary depending on when properties were listed. Members suggested that a refresh of the listed buildings in the town was overdue and the Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager agreed though indicated that much of the information on the buildings was kept by English Heritage.

In relation to the local list, the Committee questioned that once it was published, could it be updated with additional information from the public. The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager commented that the list would have to be 'frozen in time' at some stage, though annual refreshes were being considered. The Townscape Heritage Initiative Manager commented that the potential for a 'Wikipedia' style ability to update the list was on the 'wish list' but at this time no promises could be made on how interactive the final list would be.

After discussing the list that was circulated at the meeting, the Committee congratulated the officers on the work undertaken in developing the locally listed buildings for Hartlepool.

Decision

That the progress made on compiling a list of locally significant buildings be noted.

5. Trees in Conservation Areas (*Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods*)

The Arboricultural Officer reported that at the last meeting of this committee Members queried the controls in place regarding the removal of trees in conservation areas. In his report, the Arboricultural Officer set out the regulations around Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and the controls applied to trees in conservation areas that were not subject to TPOs. The Town and Country Planning Act makes special provision for all trees over a certain size (75mm girth) located within conservation areas. This special provision is in recognition of the contribution trees can make to the character and appearance of such areas, and is in addition to TPO controls.

The report outlined the exemptions to the giving of prior notice for work on trees in conservation areas and the actions the authority could take in such instances. It was particularly highlighted that the authority could not refuse or approve notices with conditions. When a conservation area tree work notice was received, the authority simply had to decide whether the tree warranted a TPO or not, though special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The report went on to outline the penalties for non-compliance with the regulations, the council's approach to dealing with Conservation Area Tree Work Notices, and Trees in Parks, Public Open Spaces and Streets in Conservation Areas. The Arboricultural Officer also outlined the process undertaken by officers to assess trees prior to works being undertaken which utilised TEMPO, Tree Evaluation Method for Preservation Orders.

The Committee thanked the Arboricultural Officer for the detailed report which clarified a number of issues for Members. There was concern as to how anyone contravening the regulations applied to trees in conservation areas could be taken to court when sufficient evidence would be extremely hard to

attain. The Arboricultural Officer commented that photographic evidence, particularly of the tree being cut down would be needed in most cases but witness evidence may be sufficient; each case would be dealt with on its own merits. Also, ignorance was not a defence as was blaming a contractor working on the property owner's behalf.

The Committee discussed the protection of trees in conservation areas particularly when they added to the character of the area. It was acknowledged that council officers would only be able to do a certain amount and the onus largely lay on residents to be vigilant in protecting the trees in their area. The Committee expressed the concern that had been raised at the previous meeting in relation to the trees that were cut down in Ward Jackson Park by the council. The Arboricultural Officer acknowledged the comments and conceded that the council should be seen to applying the same measures on itself that it demanded of residents in relation to tree works, whether they related to trees with a TPO or those in a conservation area.

Decision

That the Arboricultural Officer be thanked for his informative report.

6. Any Other Items

A Member expressed concern at the state of some of the listed and/ important buildings in the town and in particular at the apparent lack of action by their owners to protect them. The Landscape Planning and Conservation Manager reported that the Council had a Derelict Buildings and Land Group established by the Mayor, which was attempting to address the worst problems, but there were no quick fixes. The Council did not currently have a list of local buildings at risk though a report was being prepared for consideration by the Portfolio Holder in September. While establishing a list would not fix any of the buildings, it would highlight to the public and particularly the owners, that the Council was monitoring the property and would take action to protect it should it be necessary. The officer indicated that a report would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee.

There were buildings around the town that had been rescued from decline, the Victoria Buildings being an exemplary example. However there were significant timescales involved; the Victoria Buildings scheme had taken ten years to reach the current situation. The council also needed to be wary that most of these buildings were in private ownership, so couldn't always publicise what action was being undertaken. Section 215 Notices requiring immediate remedial action were regularly considered and approved by the Planning Committee.

Decision

That the report be noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.30 p.m.

CHAIR

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: REGENERATION PROPOSALS AT SEATON CAREW

1. Introduction & Background

- 1.1 Seaton Carew has an important role to play in Hartlepool's overall visitor offer. The promenade, beach and businesses in Seaton Carew are not only important amenities for Seaton Carew residents but for Hartlepool as a whole. Continuing to draw in investment and improving the attractiveness of Seaton Carew to both visitors and residents remains a key regeneration priority. Although regeneration funding has been secured for Seaton Carew in the past, the prospect of securing sufficient public funding to support the future regeneration of Seaton in the short to medium term, in the current financial climate will be more difficult. In order therefore to achieve the aspirations that the Council and local residents have for Seaton Carew, alternative ways of delivering change needs to be explored and considered.
- 1.2 It is in recognition of the importance of Seaton Carew that various efforts have been made for a number of years to support, sustain and enhance Seaton Carew's popular assets. The Council has had success in attracting external regeneration funding to support investment in the public realm and business premises through grant schemes, as well as ensuring the upkeep and maintenance of the beach and lifeguard service.
- 1.3 Recent efforts to continue this investment in Seaton Carew have been less successful as the criteria associated with regeneration funding has become more restricted and funding less abundant generally. Other funding opportunities have also been explored including two unsuccessful bids submitted for Seachange funding. These bids were aimed at developing a comprehensive masterplan for the area and improving the physical environment.
- 1.4 In response to these failed funding bids, work has been done to develop a masterplan for The Front at Seaton Carew. A large proportion of the Seaton Carew Conservation Area is included. The plan covers the 'old fairground site' in the south, the Rocket House car park, the Longscar building and the remaining Council owned land up to the junction of Station Lane. The purpose of this plan is to bring together the regeneration aims of the Council in a concise way, which could be used to support any future funding bids. Extensive consultation exercises, carried out previously, have highlighted what the regeneration priorities are in Seaton Carew and these have been captured in this draft development plan for The Front. The intention is to include this document (including the other sites in Seaton Carew) as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) where it will be used as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This will mean that when the document has been fully consulted on and adopted, it will be used as part of

the planning policy framework and used in the consideration of future planning applications.

- 1.5 In addition to these efforts focused at improving the area at The Front, officers have also been involved in considering the potential development of other Council owned sites and how they could be used to develop new or improved community facilities or deliver services in a different way. The community facilities in Seaton Carew including the sports hall and youth centre and library building are all in need of substantial investment and are subject to ongoing costly maintenance programmes.
- 1.6 A suggested scheme to develop the Elizabeth Way site and land at Coronation Drive/Warrior Drive for residential use and utilise the value generated to re-provide a new combined community facility in Seaton Carew was consulted on, and the results of which were reported to Cabinet in January 2010. Cabinet noted the responses to that consultation and agreed that any marketing of the sites should wait until the conditions in the property market improved.
- 1.7 Since this consultation exercise was carried out, the proposed reductions in government funding and subsequent reductions in local government expenditure has re-focused the question of future community service provision across the whole town. In response to the reduction in departmental budgets to provide community facilities, there is expected to be a reduced service provision across many areas. Currently proposals preclude any reduction in the library service in Seaton Carew but the provision of future community facilities in Seaton Carew may depend in part on the ability to provide sustainable alternatives through realising value through existing sites and assets.

2. Current Priorities

- 2.1 There are a number of key aims for the regeneration of The Front which have been established through consultation in Seaton Carew. The priority regeneration objective for this area is the removal of the Longscar Building. This unused property dominates the key central commercial area and Conservation Area at The Front. It's current condition and the limited prospect of any development ideas coming forward from the current owners, makes the need to redevelop this site a priority. Its current condition not only detracts from the visitor experience but affects the trading environment for other businesses in Seaton Carew. Any suggested regeneration plan for this area will need to address the use, scale and nature of this property through working with the owners to acquire the building or utilising the Councils planning powers including Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) to acquire and redevelop the site. If the latter approach is required a comprehensive plan for the area will be required, that is proven to be deliverable.
- 2.2 The successful regeneration of this area of Seaton Carew will also need to address the coastal defence issues highlighted by the Hartlepool Coastal Strategy Study. Draft defence schemes have been designed for individual stretches of the coastline between Newburn Bridge and Teesmouth. Funding

has been recently secured and work started on the stretch of frontage between the Staincliffe Hotel and the ramp at Station Lane. These works are being funded through the Environment Agency and are currently on site

- 2.3 The sea defence between Station Lane and Seaton Dunes is subject to a project appraisal process during 2011, some Environment Agency funding is expected for this area to fund the required works. It is anticipated that contributions from the existing operators, other private sector operators, responsible for developing sites adjacent to the sea wall, and/or the Council may also be required to meet the remaining costs of these works
- 2.4 Given the reduced availability of external regeneration funding, and the limited cash resources the Council currently has, officers have been looking at alternative ways to deliver the schemes. If these priorities in Seaton Carew are to be delivered either in part or whole, they need to demonstrate that they can be self funded.
- 2.5 In order to achieve the greatest level of return and delivery of a scheme that meets all the regeneration requirements and benefits that are required for Seaton Carew then considering all of the sites (Coronation Drive/Warrior Drive, Elizabeth Way and the area at The Front) together has been considered prudent.

3. Deliverability

- 3.1 At this stage, officers have looked at the indicative costs of bringing forward the regeneration plans at The Front and enhancing the community facilities in Seaton Carew and estimated the likely value that some of the assets may have, in order to meet those costs.
- 3.2 Clearly if any part of the proposals for Seaton Carew can be delivered, the private sector will have an important role to play. Before any decisions are made regarding development or disposal of sites, Cabinet agreed to a process of market engagement to gauge the level of private sector interest.
- 3.3 The private sector have been asked for 'expressions of interest' in the sites. Developers were asked to submit ideas regarding how they could deliver the benefits that have been identified in Seaton Carew, through utilising the sites and assets currently in Council ownership.
- 3.4 This process identified interests from 8 developers 2 of which Cabinet have requested officers to explore further through interview and further submission of information. Submission of final information is expected on 17th October.
- 3.5 This will hopefully identify a preferred developer that the Council can work with to take forward the sites, following further public consultation.

5 Recommendation

- 5.1 Committee is requested to note the report.

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: UPDATE ON LOCALLY LISTED BUILDINGS

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report is to update the committee on the progress being made compiling a list of Locally Significant Buildings and the next stage of the process.

2. Background

- 2.1 A draft document of over 250 entries was compiled combining nominations from the public and buildings highlighted during work carried out by officers. The entry for each nomination included a photograph of the nomination, a location plan showing the site and a short description outlining the significance of the entry.
- 2.2 Statutorily listed buildings can be all sorts of structures including telephone boxes, walls and gates as well as what we all recognise as buildings. In addition there is also a statutory process which recognises parks and gardens. In considering locally listed buildings these definitions were used and therefore the list is not limited to buildings but includes other streetscape structures along with parks and landscapes.
- 2.3 All nominees were notified of the inclusion of their building on the list. They were invited to comment on the nomination should they wish. Subsequent to this the list was posted on the Councils website and members of the public were invited comment on the nominations.
- 2.4 An independent panel was established to select the final list. The panel included conservation officers from Middlesbrough and Stockton Councils, a member of this committee and a representative specialising in local history.

3. Update on Draft List

- 3.1 At the end of September the selection panel met on four occasions to assess the nominations. Prior to the meeting the panel received a copy of the local list document.
- 3.2 In assessing each nomination the panel were provided with the following information:
- Photographs showing the nomination.
 - A copy of the nomination form where available.
 - Any comments submitted by the owner, occupier or other interested parties.
 - Any available background information.

3.3 The nominations were assessed on the following criteria:

- **Design merit:** is it the work of a particular architect or designer of regional or local note? Does it have qualities of age, style or distinctive characteristics relative to the area? Does it have landmark quality? Is it characterful and time-honoured or locally-valued
- **Historic interest:** does it relate to an important aspect of local, social, economic, cultural, religious or political history; does it have an historic association with an important local feature?
- **Historic association:** does it have close associations with famous local people (must be well documented); does it relate closely to any statutorily protected structure or site?
- **Survival:** does it survive in a substantial and recognisable form; are historic features and layout still present; does it represent a significant element in the development of the area?
- **Layout:** is it part of a planned layout that has remained substantially intact e.g. a terrace or a square?
- **General:** does it provide an important visual amenity?

3.4 Each criterion was marked on a scale of one to five. Five was the highest score meaning the nomination fully met the requirements of the criterion. One was the lowest score and used where the criterion was not met. All nominations scoring 15 or over have been included on the local list.

4. Next steps

4.1 Where objections have been raised owners and occupiers will be contacted to notify them of their inclusion on the draft list and to ascertain if they wish to continue with their objections.

4.2 The final list will be presented to the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Housing for agreement on 18th November. Where objections remain, these will be presented to the Portfolio Holder for consideration. The Portfolio Holder will make the final decision on the list.

5 Recommendation

5.1 That the Committee notes the progress made on compiling a list of locally significant buildings.

Report of: Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods

Subject: HERITAGE AT RISK REGISTER FOR HARTLEPOOL

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Some local authorities have registers of Buildings at Risk in their area. These are documents which bring together a list of heritage assets at risk within a single local authority area. This report outlines Hartlepool Borough Council's proposals for a register of heritage at risk.

2. Background

- 2.1 Planning Policy Statement 5; Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5) encourages local authorities to monitor the impact of their planning policies and decisions on the historic environment. It notes that particular attention should be paid to 'the degree to which individual or groups of heritage assets are at risk of loss or decay, how they expect this will change over time, and how they propose to respond'.
- 2.2 This sentiment is also found in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework which suggests that 'Local planning authorities should set out a strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.'
- 2.3 English Heritage encourages local authorities to monitor heritage in their area and compile local registers of Heritage at Risk. This acts to bring together any existing information on Heritage at Risk in an area including information that is not freely available elsewhere. Hartlepool does not currently have such a register.
- 2.4 In their response to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report English Heritage expressed concern stating that, 'the full extent of the Borough's heritage assets is not known, in as much as there is not yet a list or register of Locally Important Heritage Assets for it. Nor is the full extent of the condition of those heritage assets known or the extent to which they might be at risk from harm to or loss of significance. This is because the condition of grade II listed buildings and locally important assets has not been assessed.' It further went on to suggest that this was a weakness which could result in 'a threat to the environmental quality and integrity of the Borough'.
- 2.5 The creation of a Heritage at Risk Register for Hartlepool would create a single information point for Heritage at Risk. It would enable those buildings at risk to be monitored on a more formal basis than that which currently exists and highlight the buildings locally which may assist in securing their future. In addition it would address the concerns raised by English Heritage and it is in line with the current and potential future policy requirements.

3. National Registers of Buildings at Risk

- 3.1 English Heritage initially began work considering buildings at risk in 1991 when an assessment was made of property in London and the first Buildings at Risk Register was published. This was followed in 1998 by a document covering buildings in England. The document focused on Grade I and II* buildings at risk.
- 3.2 The method used to assess properties has since been adapted to serve other types of heritage asset, from archaeological sites and conservation areas to registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields, and protected shipwrecks. The register does not, however, cover grade II listed buildings, significant buildings located in conservation areas or locally listed buildings.
- 3.3 SAVE Britain's Heritage have been campaigning for historic buildings since its formation in 1975. In 1989 it began compiling a register of Buildings at Risk. Buildings on this register are not included on the English Heritage Register. The register covers grade II listed buildings and significant buildings located in conservation areas. The aim of this list is to identify new owners able to repair properties and/or find a new use for them, which will secure the building's future. The list is published every year in a catalogue format and on the internet however there is a charge to access the information.
- 3.4 In Hartlepool one Scheduled Monument (Low Throston Deserted Medieval Village) is included on the English Heritage at Risk Register. There are no buildings or conservation areas on the list. There are twelve grade II listed buildings and properties in conservation areas on the SAVE Register.
- 3.5 All heritage assets featured on existing at risk registers, i.e. English Heritage and SAVE Registers, would be included on a Hartlepool register along with any other assets not featured elsewhere, for example locally significant buildings.

4. Criteria for inclusion on the Hartlepool Register

- 4.1 The condition of the heritage assets would be assessed from an external visual inspection. The condition is then used to calculate the level of risk. The same methodology used by English Heritage on the Heritage at Risk Register would be used. This methodology is outlined in Appendix 1.
- 4.2 Using the same methodology will enable the authority to evaluate its information against existing national records. This will allow an assessment to be made of any trends appearing locally which can be compared to national data.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 Owners of heritage assets on the register will be notified that their building has been included. There will be an opportunity for comments on inclusion on the list prior to the list being formalised.
- 5.2 The list will be taken to the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Housing, along with any responses to the consultation, for final agreement.

6. Publication of the Register

- 6.1 Once the list has been formalised it will be published on the Council's website.
- 6.2 It is proposed that the list is reviewed annually. The consultation process outlined above will be repeated to enable owners to provide any comments or new information that they have prior to the updating of the list.

7. Recommendation

- 7.1 That the Committee notes the processes outlined in the report to establish a Heritage at Risk Register for Hartlepool.

APPENDIX 1**Measuring Risk****Condition**

For buildings at risk, condition is graded as:

- Very bad (structural failure or signs of structural instability)
- Poor (building with deteriorating masonry, leaking roofs, usually accompanied by general deterioration of most elements of the building fabric)
- Fair (structurally sound but in need of minor repairs or showing signs of lack of general maintenance)
- Good (structurally sound and weather-tight)

For sites that cover areas (scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens and protected wreck sites) one overall condition category is recorded. The category may relate only to the part of the site or monument that is at risk and not the whole site:

- Extensive significant problems
- Generally unsatisfactory with major localised problems
- Generally satisfactory but with significant localised problems
- Generally satisfactory but with minor localised problems
- Optimal
- Unknown (used for scheduled monuments that are below-ground and where their condition cannot be established)

For conservation areas, condition is categorised as: 'very bad', 'poor', 'fair' and 'optimal'.

Occupancy

For buildings that can be occupied or have a use, the main vulnerability is vacancy, or under-use. Occupancy (or use) is noted as follows:

- Vacant
- Part occupied
- Occupied
- Unknown
- Not applicable

Vulnerability

Principally vulnerability is noted for scheduled monuments and may relate only to the part of the monument which is at risk, and include the following:

- Animal burrowing, arable ploughing, coastal erosion, collapse, deterioration – in need of management, scrub/tree growth, visitor erosion.

For registered parks and gardens, protected wreck sites and conservation areas, vulnerability is noted as high, medium or low.

Priority

For buildings at risk, the following priority categories are used as an indication of trend and as a means of prioritising action:

- A Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; no solution agreed.
- B Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; solution agreed but not yet implemented.
- C Slow decay; no solution agreed.
- D Slow decay; solution agreed but not yet implemented.
- E Under repair or in fair to good repair, but no user identified; or under threat of vacancy with no obvious new user (applicable only to buildings capable of beneficial use).
- F Repair scheme in progress and (where applicable) end use or user identified; functionally redundant buildings with new use agreed but not yet implemented.

Trend

Trend for scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields and protected wreck sites may relate only to the part of the site that is at risk and is categorised as:

- Declining
- Stable
- Improving
- Unknown.

For conservation areas trend is categorised as:

- Expected to deteriorate significantly
- Expected to deteriorate
- Deteriorating
- Unknown
- No significant change expected
- Expected to show some improvement.