The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Anthony J Wharton BArch RIBA RIAS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T9501/F/16/3153736

Craws Nest, East Twice Brewed, Bardon Mill, Hexham, Northumberland NE47 7AL

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Ms Clare Watson against a listed building enforcement notice (LBEN) issued by The Northumberland National Park (the Authority).
- The enforcement notice was issued on 9 May 2016.
- The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: the installation of 14 no. UPVC windows to the north, south and east elevations of the Building labelled W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W7, W8, W9, W10, W11, W12, W13, W15, 2no. UPVC doors to the north and south elevations of the Building labelled D1 and D2 in the attached document 'Appendix 1: Photos as existing'.
- The requirements of the notice are as follows:
- 1) Carefully remove the UPVC windows and doors as shown labelled W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W7, W8, W9, W10, W11, W12, W13, W15, D1 and D2 in the attached document 'Appendix 1: Photos as existing' to create an opening in the existing surround so as not to damage the surrounding stonework.
  2) Following completion of step (1) above install replacement timber framed windows and doors in each of the openings W1, W2, W3, W4, W5, W6, W7, W8, W9, W10, W11, W12, W13, W15, D1 and D2 using suitable propriety fixings. The form, profile and design of the windows and doors must exactly replicate that shown on the plans which should be read in conjunction with the specification table in attached document 'Appendix 2: Specification for replacements.
  3) Glaze all of the windows and doors specified in step (2) above with a clear single glazed unit using floating glass.
  4) Clean and prepare the woodwork of the newly installed windows and doors identified in step (2) above, using a suitable exterior and interior primer. Following proper preparation, apply 1 no. coat of alkyd based undercoat and 2 no. coats of white (RAL shade 9016) alkyd based gloss finish paint. Remove any paint fro surrounding masonry using non chemical or abrasive methods.
  5) Remove the external installed flue shown on Appendix 1 'photos as existing' marked as 'Metal Flue' and all associated external fixtures.
  6) Where the flue has been removed in accordance with step (5) above, repair work should be completed to the specifications of the attached document 'Appendix 2: Specification for replacements'.
  7) Where external features are removed affected stonework should be repaired using a proprietary stone repair mix colour matched to the surrounding stone such as Lithomix. This material should be applied to the damaged area in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, the repair material should be finished flush with the surrounding stone'
  8) Prepare and then paint the 2 no. downpipes as shown, labelledDP1 and DP2 in the attached document 'Appendix 1: Photos as existing' matt black (RAL shade 9017).
  9) Remove all materials arising from compliance with steps (1) – (8) above from the building.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is six calendar months.
- The appeal is made on grounds (f), (a), (c), (d), (e), (g) and (h) as set out in section 39(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 13 December 2016.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed in part and dismissed in part on ground (e) and succeeds to a limited degree on ground (g). Otherwise the appeal is dismissed and the Listed Building Enforcement Notice is upheld as varied (see formal decision below).

Background information, planning history and relevant policy

2. The late 18th Century Grade II listed building was formerly a byre with a granary over and was listed in 1987. It is only partly recognisable from its list description due to the alterations (both authorised and unauthorised) which have been carried out since its listing. The building is located within the hamlet of East Twice Brewed on the B6318 (Military Road), to the east of Twice Brewed and within the Northumberland National Park Authority (NNPA) area. The byre/granary was initially part of the East Twice Brewed Farm and is located off the main road to the south and rear of the existing houses which are adjacent to the road. The hamlet is roughly midway between Carlisle in the west and Newcastle in the east and it is close to Hadrian's Wall and the main Roman sites of Vindolanda and Housesteads.

3. Following listing in 1986, it has a fairly detailed planning history dating back to May 1988, when Planning Permission (PP) and Listed Building Consent (LBC) were granted for a change of use (and works for conversion) from agricultural use to a dwelling house use. Later that year PP was granted for a new access to the site. In June 1990 LBC for partial demolition of an agricultural building and conversion to residential was refused. In October conditional PP and LBC were granted for conversion of a barn to a holiday letting unit and in June 2009 a conditional PP and LBC were granted for a storage building.

4. There was an Appeal in 1989 against conditions attached to the PP and LBC of May 1988. The relevant conditions required the windows to be painted white and the pipes/water goods to be painted black. The Appeal was dismissed and this in effect, required the works to be carried out in accordance with the conditions.

5. Following a request for advice about replacement windows from the Appellant in February 2012, the NNPA advised that LBC would be required. The NNPA advised that, although single-glazed timber sash and case windows were preferred, there were some slim-line double glazing units which have been successfully installed in Listed Buildings. A list of necessary documents required for a LBC application was provided to the Appellant. In my view this advice was not as thorough as it might have been and it clearly left some doubt in the Appellant's mind about what changes (particularly to windows) could be carried out.

6. On 18 November 2015, Planning and Enforcement officers from NNPA noted that all of the windows in the dwelling house (as set out in the LBEN) had been changed from timber windows to white double-glazed uPVC; that there was a flue attached to the east elevation and that the rainwater/soil pipe goods were grey. The appellant had not, for whatever reasons, applied for LBC for these works.

7. At the time the Appellant is reported to have informed the officers that the timber windows, granted LBC in 1988, had been replaced some 4 or 5 years ago and that it had been the intention to replicate the 1988 approved top-hung timber windows with a style which matched those windows as closely as possible. Photographs indicated that the front and rear doors had been of uPVC prior to the windows being changed. This might well be the case but there is no evidence to indicate that the uPVC doors had been in place at the time of listing.

8. A planned meeting, arranged for January 2016 between the Appellant and NNPA officers (including the Historic Building Advisor- HBA), did not take place and later that month NNPA wrote to the Appellant. The letter, amongst other things, referred to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA) and indicated that LBC was required for the works as carried out. The HBA considered that the works carried (uPVC windows and the flue) were harmful to the character of the listed building and that, in accordance with the 1988 PP and LBC, the pipes should have been painted black. The letter indicated that it had been the NNPA's intention to discuss (at the pre-arranged meeting) exactly what was required of the Appellant in terms of remedial action. This is what is now set out in the LBEN.

9. A response to the letter from the Appellant (dated 11 February 2016) was placed before the Development Management Committee (DMC), along with a report seeking authorisation to issue the LBEN. The DMC considered it expedient to take Listed Building Enforcement action and the LBEN was then issued. In the photograph of the north elevation attached to the LBEN two windows (one to the ground floor and one to the first floor) are labelled W1 and there is no W4. I have, therefore referred to the ground floor window under W1 as W4.

10. The most relevant planning policies are Policy 3 (P3) and Policy 18 (P18) of the NNPA Core Strategy (CS). Policy P3 seeks to uphold and promote the principles of sustainable development, where the special qualities of the National Park will be conserved or enhanced. Policy P18 states that the NNPA will support proposals which conserve, enhance and promote the cultural heritage of the national Park and particularly those which give protection to Listed Buildings.

11. The CS policies accord with, and are up-to-date with, the relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to which I have had regard. This sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In section 12 it indicates the national policy aims to conserve and enhance the historic environment. I have also had special regard to the requirements set out in section 16(2) of the PLBCAA. In accordance with the duty set out in section 16(2) of the PLBCAA I have had special regard to the requirements of a decision-maker set out therein.

The appeal on ground (f)

12. A Local Planning Authority is obliged to serve any enforcement notice on any person or body with an interest in the land/property. In this case, therefore, in serving it on the mortgage provider, as well as the Appellant as owner of the property, I consider that the LBEN has been served (by NNPA) in accordance with section 38(4) of the PLBCAA. The consequences of serving it on a mortgage provider, prior to the outcome of an appeal, cannot carry any weight as to whether or not it was served properly in the first instance. The appeal fails on ground (f).

The appeal on ground (a)

13. An appeal on this ground challenges the listing and is made on the basis that the listed building is not of special architectural or historic interest and that it should be removed from the list. I do not agree that this is the case, or that it should be removed from the list. As indicated above the former byre/granary, despite all of the alterations, is still partly recognisable from its list description with its squared rubble stone and dressings; alternating tooled quoins, steeply pitched roof and its basic form and relationship to the other buildings.

14. The fact that it was converted to a dwelling many years ago and that inappropriate windows and doors have been added does not detract from the fact that it is of important historical significance having previously been part of a typical

Northumbrian farm grouping. As indicated by the NNPA, there is no evidence pointing to as to why the building is not of architectural and historic interest. It is also the case that it was listed for its group value with the two adjacent listed buildings; the L-shaped shed; the East Twice Brewed House and the adjoining barn. I consider that it is still worthy of its listed status and the appeal fails on ground (a).

The appeal on ground (c)

15. To be successful on this ground of appeal it must be successfully argued that the unauthorised works carried out have not altered the character of the listed building. In a ground (c) appeal the merits of the works are not considered. The question to be asked relates solely to whether or not the character of a listed building has been changed by the works. This is irrespective of whether or not such works are considered to have been harmful, or not to the listed building.

16. It must be conclusively shown, therefore, that firstly the works have not altered the character of the building and thus they do not constitute a contravention of the PLBCAA. Or that a LBC is in place for the works. Clearly there is no LBC in place for the UPVC windows and doors or for the flue and grey soil pipes. The question to be considered, therefore, is whether or not LBC is required for the installation of the replacement uPVC windows and the other works (flue and pipes).

17. The Appellant indicates that she made inquiries about replacing the rotten timber windows and understood (from advice given by a NNPA officer) that 'high quality, 'Energy A' rated windows and doors which were 'like-for-like' would most likely be acceptable. It is also stressed that they are 'Fensa' certified as approved by NNPA for installing windows and doors. It is also stressed that the flue was required due to lack of a chimney and that the wood-burning stove is by 'Hetas'.

18. However, as indicated by the NNPA, the windows as installed are not 'like-for-like' and I agree with their view. 'Like-for-like' means just that. Replacement windows which were exactly the same as the timber ones removed would not have required LBC. The uPVC windows, particularly the top hung ones are indeed similar to the old timber ones in the way they open. But there are still differences in appearance. The sections are not the same as the timber sections; the overall proportions are different with different frames, cills, jambs and glazing bars. They are clearly recognisable as uPVC, as opposed to timber, and in my view have materially affected the character and appearance of the listed building. I deal below, under ground (e) as to the extent of how the front, side and rear windows have affected the character of the the listed building whether or not these changes are acceptable.

19. The flue and the grey water/soil pipes are also distinctly noticeable features as fixed to the building. At this stage I am not dealing with whether or not the works as carried out are acceptable or not. In a ground (c) appeal I must simply conclude whether or not LBC is required for the works as carried out. For the reasons set out above I consider that the works, whether harmful or not, do affect the character of the building and thus LBC is required. There is no LBC in place and the appeal also fails on ground (c).

The appeal on ground (d)

20. This ground of appeal addresses situations where essential and urgent works were needed to preserve the listed building. The emphasis is on the words *'essential'* and '*urgent*'. This ground of appeal comprises three tests. The first test is whether the works were urgently necessary in the interests of safety or health; the second test is that it was not practicable to achieve the aims of safety, health or preservation of the

building by repair or temporary support and the third test is that the works carried out were the minimum measures immediately necessary to achieve the aims of safety, health or preservation. For an appeal to succeed on ground (d) all three tests must be met and the onus is on an appellant to conclusively show that this is the case.

21. On the first test it is stated that the works to the windows and doors were rotten, running with condensation and causing dampness to the internal walls. This was stated to be a health concern for an elderly occupant. It is also stressed that, since the installation of the stove and flue, the house has been dryer and warmer. I accept that this may have been the case but it has not been shown that the works carried out were so '*urgently necessary in the interests of health and safety*'.

22. Other measures could have resolved the same issues and there is no firm and conclusive evidence to indicate that the uPVC windows, as opposed to 'like-for-like' timber windows were necessary. Neither has it been shown that the flue was necessary in this particular location. On the second test there is also no evidence to indicate that the works were so '*urgently necessary'* that further consultations (with NNPA to check if exactly what was proposed would be acceptable) could not have been carried out. Thus, again it does not seem to me that the situation was of such a pressing nature that the works carried out were so '*urgently'* necessary for safety or health reasons.

23. Finally I acknowledge that the works may have been the '*minimum measures'* necessary to overcome condensation issues and heat loss. However, other works could have solved the same problems and as indicated above it has not been conclusively shown that the works carried out were '*immediately*' necessary to overcome any health or safety issue. The appeals fail, therefore, on two of the three tests and cannot succeed on ground (d).

The appeal on ground (e)

24. The main issue is the effect that the various works carried out have had on the character and integrity of the listed building, on its setting and on its features of special architectural and historic interest.

25. In support of this ground the Appellant contends that since the windows and doors have been installed there have been no adverse visual effects and that the flue was part of a sustainable way of heating the house. It is indicated that the pipes have been coloured grey for many years and it is also stressed that the works have not generated any local interest or objections and that LBC ought to be granted for the retention of all of the works.

26. The NNPA considers that the proposals do not accord with policies P3 or P18 of the CS and also consider that the works are contrary to the relevant NPPF policies. They refer in particular to paragraphs 131 and 132 of the NPPF which refer to the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, as well as requiring that great weight be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The NNPA considers that all of the unauthorised works have resulted in damage to the character and significance of the listed building. I deal below with each element of the works as carried out.

The uPVC windows and doors

27. NNPA contends that the installation of the 14 windows and doors has had a materially damaging effect on the historic character and significance of the building. It is stressed that uPVC is not a material that is acceptable on listed buildings, due to its non-traditional nature; that these examples do not sustain the significance of the building and that windows and doors are often the key to the significance of listed

buildings. Whilst it is acknowledged that the timber windows and doors were later additions to the property when it was converted in the late 1980s, it is considered that these were key to sustaining the historic significance of the building.

28. The NNPA indicates that the former byre, which was converted after the listing and prior to the PLBCAA, had traditional openings with timber frames typical of other Northumbrian agricultural properties. It is stressed that uPVC is not traditional and that the windows installed are crudely detailed; with larger frames and a shiny finish. As such they are considered to be obtrusive. It is indicated that alternative materials such as aluminium and uPVC are almost always damaging to listed buildings

29. Typical owners' and manufacturers' arguments in favour of uPVC windows (maintenance free, draught-proof etc.) are questioned and it is stressed that there are other ways of resolving such issues by the use of blinds, draught strips and secondary glazing. Reference is made to case law relating to listed buildings including where the financial burden of replacement is acknowledged but found not to constitute a reason for allowing works which did not preserve the building's special interest.

30. I have already concluded above under ground (c) that all of the works carried out have affected the character of the listed building. The question now is whether the various works have affected the character of the building in such an unacceptable harmful manner that LBC ought to be withheld.

31. In making my assessment, I find that the planning history of the building (and particularly what has been granted PP and LBC since listing) is a major material consideration. In my view, following listing in 1987, the granting of consent (including for the top-hung timber windows) resulted in a negative effect on the character of the former byre and granary. I consider that the top-hung windows were an inappropriate and poorly designed alternative to the traditional timber windows that would have prevailed at that time in traditional farm buildings and dwellings in this part or Northumberland.

32. It would appear that there have been numerous examples of such top-hung timber windows allowed LBC in this part of Northumberland. In this case I find that the 'hotchpotch' of other windows (albeit timber ones), together with the other alterations allowed in 1988, detracted markedly from the character of what had once been a typically recognisable Northumbrian farm building. It is most unlikely that what allowed in 1988 would be granted consent today.

33. I consider that what was allowed at that time must have resulted in the '*Former Byre with Granary Over'* being almost unrecognisable as such. This left only limited architectural and historic features as set out in the list description (squared rubble dressings; alternating tooled quoins; central doorway; partly blocked doorway and steeply pitched roof). I consider, therefore, that the PP and LBC at that time set an unfortunate precedent for what might, or might not be, considered as being acceptable future alterations to windows, doors and other external elements. It also set a precedent with regard to how future works might affect the character of the listed building.

34. Having seen the building and having noted the unauthorised windows and door (D2) I consider that the uPVC windows to the south (W6, W7, W8, W9 and W10) and east (W11, W12, W13 and W15) elevations are significantly harmful to the building. These elevations, in my view, are the most significant in defining and understanding what remains of the architectural and historical features of what was originally listed in 1986 (the former byre and granary). The stone finish generally; the stone quoins;

the steep roof; the stone ventilation slits and the built-up doorway (east elevation) and other evidence of the byre and granary structure are still recognisable.

35. I have already referred to my view that the top-hung timber windows allowed in 1988 were not ideal in terms of what should have been fitted. Nevertheless they were granted LBC and I appreciate that an attempt has been made to replicate these windows. Unfortunately, trying to do so in uPVC, has exacerbated the situation regarding these two elevations. The thicker frames have resulted in a much wider mid-rail and although the side frames are approximately the same size, the proportions of the 4 light sections are significantly different to those as seen on the 2002 photograph. The top-hung sections of the uPVC windows are shorter than the bottom sections. All of these factors result in the appearance and character of the south elevation being unacceptably changed and harmful to the listed building.

36. The north (rear) elevation, on the other hand, has been drastically altered with most window openings being of non-traditional shape. Apart from the stone ventilation slits there is nothing to suggest that this is a conversion of a former agricultural building. In my view the uPVC windows to the rear elevation (W1, W2, W3, W4 –marked W1- and W5 as referred to in the LBEN) have hardly changed the character of the building from what was granted approval in 1986. I do not consider, therefore, that the windows and door to the rear elevation are so detrimental to the character of the listed building so as to withhold consent for these works.

37. In conclusion on the windows and south elevation door, I consider that windows W6, W7, W8, W9, W10, W11, W12, W13, W15 and the door D2 should not be granted LBC. On the other hand, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that W1, W2, W3, W4 (marked W1 on the photograph attached to the notice), W5 and D1 to be acceptable and LBC for their retention will be granted. I shall, therefore issue a split decision and vary the LBEN so that the window and door works to the rear are allowed to remain in place.

The flue

38. Whilst acknowledging that this element of the works relates to the necessary heating of the property, I agree with NNPA that the flue is on a prominent elevation and that it is completely at odds with the character of the building. It is high, noticeable and intrusive as well as being crudely fixed to, and damaging to, an early stone door lintel. Thus, as well as being visually harmful it is also detrimental to one of the special architectural and historic features of the building namely the door surround and lintel. I do not consider, therefore that it ought to be granted LBC to remain in this location.

Grey pipework

39. I also agree with NNPA with regard to these elements of the works. It matters not when they were carried out since an authority can take listed building enforcement action at any time. Also, in this case the plastic components were only granted LBC on the basis that they would be painted black. That was mainly to ensure that they were not seen as typical grey plastic elements. At least painted black they would not so obviously out of character and will match the colour of the guttering and rainwater downpipes.

40. Approval for the guttering and piping dates back to 1997 and I consider that the condition which required them to be painted black was both necessary and appropriate. I agree with both the NNPA and the previous Inspector who dealt with the appeal against the conditions that the pipes should be painted black. Again,

therefore I do not consider that LBC should be granted for them to remain grey in colour. The appeal fails in relation to these elements.

The appeal on ground (g)

41. On this ground of appeal it is argued that the requirements of the LBEN are excessive. It is stressed that the windows and doors are of high quality; of Energy A' category and that they are 'Fensa' Approved. The reference to them being 'like-for-like' is again quoted and that they have been fitted to the original openings. Photographic evidence of before and after is provided and I have noted that the LBC granted was for top-hung timber windows as opposed to traditional sash and case windows.

42. Following on from my conclusions on ground (e) above, it follows that I find some of the requirements to be excessive. I have concluded that only the uPVC windows to the south and east elevations (in the particular circumstances of this case and the planning history) cause sufficient harm to the integrity, character and setting of the listed building to require their removal and replacement. I also find the requirement that the replacement windows be single glazed to be excessive. The NNPA HBA acknowledges that 'slim-line' double glazing can be acceptable and in this type of top-hung timber window as specified I consider that slim line units would be acceptable. I shall vary the notice accordingly.

43. For the reasons set out above (and based on what was previously allowed LBC), I do not consider that the rear (north elevation) windows have caused demonstrable harm to the character of the listed building. They have affected the character of the building, but not sufficiently to require their removal and replacement by those specified by the NNPA. On the other hand I find that the requirements relating to the windows and door to the south and east elevations to be necessary to overcome the harm caused. The appeal succeeds to a limited degree under this ground and again I shall vary the LBEN in accordance with the powers transferred to me.

The appeal on ground (h)

44. Taking into account my findings above, I agree with the case put forward by the Appellant that the compliance date of 6 months falls short of what should reasonably be allowed in order to comply with the varied requirements. Matters relating to a likely planning and building programme for works to doors and windows; acceptable specifications (for example for the slim-line double glazing elements referred to by the NNPA officer); resolving how an alternative and visually appropriate stove/flue situation are resolved and sorting out a contract for the works are likely to take much longer. It will necessitate close liaison with the NNPA officers.

45. I agree, therefore, that a period of 24 months would be a reasonable time period for the varied requirements to be carried out. As referred to above I shall vary the notice and the appeal succeeds to a limited degree on ground (h).

Other Matters

46. I sympathise with the predicament in which the appellant finds herself but unauthorised works have been carried out to the listed building. It matters not when the works were carried out or who caused them to be carried out. When a listed building changes ownership the responsibility for any unauthorised works carried out previously is transferred to the new owner and as indicated above there is no time limit by which a LPA can take action.

47. In this case the works to the windows, for whatever reasons, were carried out without the obtaining of LBC. If LBC had been applied for in relation to the works

carried out the NNPA would not have granted consent. Even though I have found the works to the rear elevation to be acceptable, there can be no justification in granting LBC at this appeal stage for the works to the south and east elevations; the retention of the flue and the retention of the grey colour to the downpipes.

48. In reaching my conclusions I have taken into account all other matters raised by the NNPA and by the appellant. These include the full planning history; the initial facts relating to each ground of appeal; the photographic and drawings evidence; the parties' detailed statements and final comments; the examples of other uPVC windows fitted to other listed buildings and the disagreement relating to whether or not the LPA worked with the appellant in relation to the proposed works.

49. However, none of these matters carries sufficient weight to alter my conclusions on the grounds of appeal and the main points at issue. Nor is any other factor of sufficient weight to change my decision.

50. I have also noted the contention that the appellant has been victimised and that NNPA had no legal right to write to the mortgage company. However these points are not for me to consider and if the appellant is aggrieved about any of the NNPA's actions in relation to this case, then it is for her to resolve the matters directly with the authority.

Formal decision

51. The appeal is allowed in part on ground (e) and listed building consent is granted at the Former Byre with Granary Over, south east of East Twice brewed, now known as Craws Nest, east Twice Brewed, Bardon Mill, Hexham, Northumberland NE47 7AL: for the retention of the windows and door numbered in the Second Schedule to the enforcement notice enforcement as follows: W1, W2, W3, W4, W5 and D1.

52. The appeal is also allowed to a limited degree under grounds (f) and (g). See variations below.

53. I direct that the notice be varied by deleting any references to W1, W2, W3, W4, W5 and D1 in parts 1) and 2) of the Third Schedule to the notice. For the avoidance of doubt section 6 of the notice (WHAT YOU ARE REQIRED TO DO) does not apply to these windows or to the door.

54. I direct that, after the words '*single glazed float glass'* in 'Appendix 2: Specification For Replacements' in the notice, the words '*or slim-line double glazed units'* be added.

55. I also direct that the words '*six calendar months'* in section 7 be omitted and the words '*Twenty four calendar months'* be substituted therefor.

56. Otherwise the appeal is dismissed and the Listed Building Enforcement Notice is upheld as varied. Listed Building Consent is refused for the installation of windows and door numbered W6, W7, W8, W9, W10, W11, W12, W13, W14, W15 and D2 (to the south and east elevations); the installation of a metal flue to the east elevation and the retention of grey plastic pipework to the north elevation: all being works carried out in contravention of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

Anthony J Wharton

Inspector