

APPENDIX B: Matrix of Consultation Responses Received

Consultee	Comment	Response/Notes	Recommendation
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	No comments.	Noted.	No change.
Scottish Water	No comments.	Noted.	No change.
Historic Scotland	<p>Historic Scotland has considered these draft documents for our historic environment interests and whilst we are broadly content in this respect, we do have some detailed comments to offer.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7: General Principles: This sets out four general principles for assessing proposals in relation to windows and doors. The first three principles appear to be focussed on assessment of undesignated buildings in conservation areas; they are not appropriate as key criteria on which to assess alterations to listed buildings.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Noted. It should be noted that in relation to the General Principles the Development Management Section will require to determine the appropriate weight to be given to each application on a case by case basis. In relation to comments regarding the first and second general principles – the position of the windows/doors and any remaining original windows/doors, it is considered that the general policy and its detail contained within the SPG is sufficiently robust to deter unnecessary new replacements being undertaken; However, their relevance in the consideration of an application in relation to Listed Buildings allows officers to consider the importance of or the contribution that the existing window/door has on the character of</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>Policy for Listed Buildings: I note that the guidance provides separate policy for Category A and B listed buildings and Category C listed buildings. It also states that the policy for C listed buildings is different and less restrictive than that for category A or B. It is important to consider and understand the contribution of windows and/or doors to the character and interest of a building on a case by case basis, regardless of category. Often, the retention of original/historic windows and/or doors can be a key element of the special interest of a C listed building. Consequently, blanket application of a less restrictive approach will reduce the ability of the Supplementary Guidance to preserve features of special or historic interest.</p> <p>In practice, the detail of the policies is similar, which is welcome. I suggest that they could be combined into one single policy for all categories of listed building. Not only would this be of benefit in terms of clarity and conciseness, but would also ensure that</p>	<p>the building. It should be noted that in relation to Listed Buildings SPG states: <i>“In general the repair of components on a like for like basis is preferable to the replacement of a whole unit”</i>, also any application for replacement windows to a Listed Building require a Building Condition Survey to be undertaken.</p> <p>Noted. The SPG sets out the general policy position, but it is also noted that this is subject to consideration of all matters including consideration of the contribution that any window and/or door adds to the character and interest of a building. It should be noted that the replacement window policy as it relates to category ‘C’ Listed Buildings has not been subject to change as a result of this policy review and in that respect the policy wording as it relates to this category of Listed Building had remained unaltered from that included in the 2012 SPG. However, it is considered that in respect to this part of the policy, additional clarity could be added to the document in respect of paragraph 3.23, therefore an amendment to the wording is proposed. In respect to doors, it should be noted that the policy wording is the same for category ‘C’ Listed Buildings as it is for categories ‘A’ and ‘B’. However, it is also noted that in the</p>	<p>Amend SPG: Include additional text for clarity, paragraph 3.23 to read: <i>“The introduction of double glazing may be acceptable in the replacement windows in category ‘C’ Listed Buildings. In specific and justified circumstances it may be acceptable for replacement with uPVC. The replacement unit should have the same glazing pattern and method of opening. Where glazing bars or astragals are required these must be of the same proportion and design to match the original window. The</i></p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>decisions are based on an understanding of the contribution of existing windows/doors to the individual special character and interest each building.</p> <p>The policy for A and B listed buildings refers in error to Historic Scotland as ‘giving approval’ to applications relating to A listed buildings. For information, Historic Scotland (acting on behalf of Ministers) is currently a statutory consultee for works to A- and B-listed buildings, and presently has 28 days to comment on applications after the planning authority has notified it of intent to grant consent.</p> <p>From 1 October 2015 Historic Scotland’s functions in relation to listed building consent will transfer to a new body, Historic Environment Scotland. Historic Environment Scotland will be a statutory consultee for certain works to A- and B-listed buildings, and will be consulted prior to determination of the application by the planning authority.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.25: What consent is needed for Category A, B or C listed buildings? : The Supplementary Guidance rightly emphasises that the windows of a historic building form an important element in defining its character. It also recognises that maintenance and appropriate ‘like for like’ repair is the best means of safeguarding the</p>	<p>consideration of any application the Development Management Officer is required to consider the General Principles set out within the SPG.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>It is noted that Historic Scotland’s functions will transfer to a new body, Historic Environment Scotland.</p> <p>However, it is also noted from the “The Planning (Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2015” that Historic Environment Scotland will become a consultee on all applications in relation to category ‘A’ and ‘B’ Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>It is noted that no change in relation to “What consent is needed for Category ‘A’, ‘B’ or ‘C’ Listed Buildings?” has been proposed from the 2012 SPG on Replacement windows. It is also noted that it is for the local authority to determine what alterations require consent. In addition paragraph 3.2 states that:</p>	<p><i>use of stick-on astragals will not be permitted.”</i></p> <p>Amend SPG: Paragraph 3.13 to be reworded to refer to Historic Environment Scotland and note that Historic Environment Scotland will become a consultee on all applications relating to category ‘A’ and ‘B’ Listed Buildings.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>historic character and fabric of a window or door. It is important to remember that removal and replacement of historic windows/doors, regardless of the form of the replacement, can have an effect on the character of the building through the loss of original or historic fabric. Consequently, I welcome that the policies for listed buildings support this by emphasising a presumption in favour of like for like repair rather than replacement.</p> <p>However, Paragraph 3.25 advises that, where windows and doors are replaced 'like for like' listed building consent will not be required. As you will be aware, listed building consent is required for any works affecting the character of a listed building. In view of this, I encourage you to consider whether the exemption for 'like for like' replacements (which would allow for the removal of historic fabric without need for consent) is appropriate, given the potential for historic window/door fabric to make a contribution to the character of the building.</p>	<p><i>"It is always recommended that advice is sought from the Development Management section as early as possible and certainly before installing any new windows or doors where 'Like for Like' replacements are proposed"</i>.</p> <p>It is the view of the Council that were proposals are 'like for like' no consent is required as it is considered that the character and appearance of the property will not be altered. The SPG within section 3.4 also sets out the definition of 'like for like'. Furthermore it is noted that paragraph 3.33 of the Scottish Historic Environment Policy states:</p> <p><i>"Works of like-for-like repair or other works which do not affect a building's character, would not normally require listed building consent. Such works could include repointing a wall or altering part of a building which does not contribute to the overall special interest."</i></p> <p>Therefore it is not considered that change to this part of the SPG is necessary.</p>	
Ray Theedam Parry	<p>The contributor lives in a conservation area in Lauder and is saddened to watch the gradual removal of traditional timber sash and case windows with uPVC copies which look nothing like the original and don't even operate in the same way.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Replacement Window policy seeks to take a balanced approach, in that the policy element for listed buildings is stricter than that for properties within the Prime Frontage/Core Areas of Conservation Areas, and then within the remainder of Conservation Areas. For that reason, the Replacement Window policy does</p>	No change.

	<p>The contributor considers that the proposed guidance is encouraging but due to the high costs of renovating or replacing with timber sash and case then many residents just can't afford it - it's a shame that there isn't some sort of Historic Scotland grant scheme to help with the high costs to help to encourage home owners to retain or reinstate original windows and doors. Many properties in our street (The Row, Lauder) no longer have their original Windows or even sympathetic replacements and it's highly unlikely that anyone would be motivated to replace them with more original-looking versions unless there was some kind of financial assistance or at least direct personal encouragement.</p>	<p>support the introduction of uPVC windows in some locations, as well as allowing an alternative method of opening in other locations.</p> <p>Noted. However, the document acknowledges that both traditional timber and metal windows can be economically repaired and made more energy efficient avoiding the need for complete replacement whilst also retaining the historic character of a property and retaining embodied energy. In addition the document notes that many traditional windows have often lasted for over 100 years with regular maintenance. However, it is accepted that often there is a desire of some home owners to replace their windows with modern replacements and as noted above the Replacement Window Policy allows for that in certain circumstances. Nevertheless the document also notes in section 3.6 that repair of components on a "like for like" basis is preferable to the replacement of the whole unit as this will best maintain the character and historic fabric if the window. In relation to grants, it is noted that Historic Scotland does provide grants to assist in the conservation of Scotland's historic environment. However, decisions on grants are influenced by the extent to which projects deliver benefits for communities, promote</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

	<p>This piece of guidance is all well and good but so many people simply do not apply for planning permission as they know that there won't be any repercussions if they don't. A planning officer ought to visit conservation areas, as well as check Listed Buildings, every couple of years and check their records to see if planning has been sought if required and enforce it if not. The planning department should not rely on neighbours reporting suspected planning violations as this system is not effective as no-one wants to create bad feeling with those living close by.</p>	<p>quality, develop knowledge and skills and build capacity for local heritage management. In addition, it should be noted that Historic Scotland's grants are in high demand and so they are not always able to offer grant to every project.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Council has powers to enforce planning requirements. However, it should be noted that planning enforcement is a discretionary power. That means that even where there is a breach of planning control, the Council has to consider if it is in the public interest to take enforcement action. It should also be noted that the Council investigates every enforcement complaint received and will maintain the confidentiality of all correspondents, at least until a case is referred to the Procurator Fiscal or an appeal is lodged. In such cases it may be necessary to divulge details about complainants.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Mitchell Glazing</p>	<p>It appears that you are relaxing a little to be more in line with Edinburgh? I can't quite decide where we can install a "composite" door from this, however. I think you are saying this will be allowed in Conservation areas and Prime Frontages?</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is considered that the policy set out within the SPG meets the circumstances within the Scottish Borders. As well as now including doors, the reviewed SPG also provides greater clarity in respect to the determination of planning applications in terms of the General Principles set out in Section 3 of the SPG. In relation to doors within the Prime Frontages</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		<p>of Conservation Areas, the key is what the immediate context is and what is present there already. Based on that it may be possible to replace a door with a composite door which reflects the historic character of the property.</p> <p>However, it may be that in a particular case the property concerned and its neighbouring properties retain their original doors, in those areas then Para 3.30 would apply.</p> <p>Each application would be dealt with on a case by case basis, the key is that any changes reflect the requirement to enhance the conservation area.</p>	
Berwickshire Civic Society	<p>Berwickshire Civic Society would like to thank you for inviting their comments on the above Draft SPG. We value highly the contribution of historic windows and doors to the character and appearance of individual buildings or the streetscape. Repairs to original features are preferable but if this is not practicable, then like-for-like replacements should be sourced, paying close attention to detail such as fittings and mouldings.</p> <p>We are pleased that this Draft Supplementary Guidance has been issued but would point out that there is little point in publishing the final version of this document unless your recommendations are enforced. There have been many occasions when</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The SPG acknowledges that in almost all cases, repair of components on a “like for like” basis is preferable to replacement of a whole unit, as this will best maintain the character and historic fabric of the window or door.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council has powers to enforce planning requirements. However, it should be noted that planning enforcement is a discretionary power. That means that even where there is a breach of planning control, the Council has to</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	replacement windows and doors have been inserted in Listed Buildings and in Conservation Areas in the past without permission, and SBC has not required them to be replaced with appropriate designs as described in earlier versions of the SPG.	consider if it is in the public interest to take enforcement action. It should also be noted that the Council investigates every enforcement complaint received.	
Gavinton, Fogo and Polwarth Community Council	The Community Council has no comments on this draft SPG document.	Noted.	No change.
Updates	Section 4 re-titled "Design and Maintenance Considerations". Replacement Figure 23 It would be helpful to expand on application requirements – what does an applicant need to submit as part of the application. Paragraph 1.4 omits that the SPG also applies to flats outwith Conservation Areas. Paragraph 1.2	Noted section 4 also included maintenance as well as design considerations. Noted that previous drawing had dimensions missing. Revise section 3.11 and 3.12 and include additional appendices to in relation to application requirements. Correct omission. Remove the word "current" from paragraph.	Amend SPG: Re-title section 4 – "Design and Maintenance Considerations". Amend SPG: Replace drawing. Amend SPG: Amend text within Paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12 and include an additional appendix relating to application requirements. Amend SPG: Include text to state that the SPG also applies to flats outwith Conservation Areas. Amend SPG: First

			sentence to read " <i>The previous Replacement Window Guide was published by Scottish Borders Council in April 2012.</i> "
--	--	--	--