



Sedgefield Borough Council

Local Development Framework:
Windlestone Hall Supplementary Planning
Document

Statement of Consultation

October 2008

Statement of Consultation for Sedgefield Borough Council Draft Windlestone Hall Supplementary Planning Document

1. Introduction

1.1 Regulation 17 and 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 requires Local Planning Authorities to prepare a statement of consultation when preparing Supplementary Planning Documents. This is a reflection of the Government's belief to strengthen community involvement. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

2. Initial Consultation

2.1 An initial Development Brief for Windlestone Hall was prepared following the notification by the land owner that the site was being available for sale. The contents of the Brief were discussed with English Heritage. Following internal discussions, it was agreed that the Development Brief should become a Supplementary Planning Document to carry full weight as an adopted document in the Local Development Framework.

3. Formal Consultation

3.1 The Draft Supplementary Planning Document was considered by the Borough Council Cabinet and Council during February 2008 and subsequently approved for public consultation. This consultation exercise took place between 17th March and 28th April 2008.

Letters

3.2 Various interest groups and other organisations whose contact details are held on our consultation database were sent letters notifying them that the draft Supplementary Planning Document was be available for a six-week consultation period, inviting their comments upon this draft. A CD was also included with the letter containing the bundle of Windlestone Hall documents. The Borough Council believe these groups and organisations to be inclusive of all the specific and general consultation bodies as specified by Regulation 25(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and those that are relevant to planning at a local level.

Availability at Council Offices and Buildings

3.3 During the 6-week consultation period, copies of the draft Statement of Community Involvement and comments forms were available:

- At the main Borough Council Offices (Green Lane); and,
- In all libraries in the Borough.

Availability on the Council Website

- 3.4 The draft Supplementary Planning Document was available for download on the Council's website (www.sedgefield.gov.uk).

Publicity – Advertisement in the Local Press

- 3.5 The draft Supplementary Planning Document was advertised by way of a legal notice placed in the following newspaper circulating within the North East (**Appendix 1**):

Newspaper	Date Notice Published
The Northern Echo	17 March 2008

4. Procedures Following Consultation

- 4.1 All representations received on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document during the consultation period were formally recorded by Sedgefield Borough Council and sent either an acknowledgement letter or e-mail.
- 4.2 Following the consultation period, all representations have been summarised and recorded in a single document. Appendix 2 of this report lists all representations received, a response to that representation and a recommendation as to what changes, if any, should be made.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Statutory Advertisement in Local Press

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Notice of Deposit of Draft Windlestone Hall Supplementary Planning Document, Local Development Framework Contextual Indicators and Validation of Planning Applications Procedures

Sedgefield Borough Council has started to develop its Local Development Framework and has now published the Draft Windlestone Hall Supplementary Planning Document. In addition, the Council has developed the Local Development Framework Contextual Indicators and a new Validation of Planning Applications Procedure.

Copies of these documents are available for public inspection, free of charge, from 17 March to 28 April 2008, at:

Sedgefield Borough Council Offices, Spennymoor	on	Mondays - Thursdays Fridays	8.30 am - 5.00 pm 8.30 am - 4.30 pm
---	----	-----------------------------------	--

The documents are also available on the Council's website at www.sedgefield.gov.uk

Representations in respect of these documents should be sent in writing to the Forward Planning Team, Neighbourhood Services, Sedgefield Borough Council, Council Offices, Spennymoor, DL16 6JQ before 5.00pm on 28 April 2008. Representations should specify the matters to which they relate and grounds on which they are made.

Further information is available from Forward Planning Team, on telephone (01388) 816166 or via the website www.sedgefield.gov.uk

**Dennis Hall
Solicitor to the Council
Council Offices, Spennymoor**

17 March 2008

Appendix 2 – Consultation Representation and Council Response

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH001	One North East	No	It is noted that the Council considers the appropriate uses for the site to be hotel, office, institutional and residential. Clearly a sequential approach should be adopted for assessing any proposal for such uses.	Noted – However, the Council has decided to remove references to the need for a sequential approach due to representations received from English Heritage.
WH002	One North East	No	In considering a proposal for hotel development, the Agency would encourage the LPA to make use of the North East England Accommodation Study - an Investment Action Plan. This study provides advice on current and future patterns of market demand, recent trends in accommodation development, product gaps in the North East, analysis of future potential and recommendations on intervention for Tourism Network NorthEast.	Noted – Reference to the sequential approach to uses is dropped.
WH003	One North East	Yes	As you are aware the Regional Economic Strategy promotes the need for quality of place within existing and proposed development. Agency initiatives include delivering developments/regeneration schemes to comply with a set of Quality Design Standards and demonstrate best practice in areas of accessibility, sustainability, whole life costing and general design standards. We welcome the inclusion of paragraphs b, m and n within the draft document's Key Recommendations relating to climate change, renewable energy and waste/recycling issues.	Noted.
WH004	County Durham & Darlington Fire & Rescue Service	Yes	Fire Authority has no objections to the proposed alterations provided they are carried out in compliance with Building Regulations.	Noted.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH005	Durham County Council	No	The detailed development framework for the Hall is generally welcomed as it provides explicit guidance to potential developers about what type of development, repair or restoration would be acceptable including the retention of Listed Buildings & structures & the demolition of unsympathetic, uncharacteristic & relatively recent additions in order to preserve & enhance the historic buildings & their setting. An amendment is, however, suggested to the proposed wording in relation to the clock tower. This is because listed building legislation imposes an objective limitation on repair works so that the maximum that can be required is for the restoration of a building to the "state at which the building was listed" and not "restoration to former splendour".	PPG15 (Para's 3.13 & 7.10) make reference to this point, but do not explicitly preclude seeking improvements to former splendour. Paragraph 3.3 of PPG 15 is categorical in its view that once lost, listed buildings cannot be replaced. There is a general presumption in favour of the preservation of the listed building. It is the statutory requirement of the Borough Council to "have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses". No Change.
WH006	Durham County Council	No	The majority of the key recommendations contained within the document for the Hall generally appear appropriate. However, it is considered that the approach of specifying appropriate uses within the document i.e. hotel, office and institutional uses before residential, in a strict preferential order (key recommendation (c)) may not be appropriate and should be reconsidered in order to reflect the provisions of national guidance.	Noted – However, the Council has decided to remove references to the need for a sequential approach due to representations received from English Heritage.
WH007	Durham County Council	No	PPG15 'Planning & the Historic Environment' specifies that, 'The best use will very often be the use for which the building was designed, & the continuation or reinstatement of that use should certainly be the first option when the future of a building is considered', 'Policies for development & listed building controls should recognise the need for flexibility where new uses have to be considered to secure a building's survival', (Para 3.10 of PPG15). "Generally the best way of securing the upkeep of historic buildings & areas is to keep them in active use. For the great majority this may mean economically viable uses if they are to survive, & new & even continuing, uses will often necessitate some degree of adaptation" (Para 3.8 of PPG15).	Noted – This would dictate that the building is reinstated as a single residence.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH008	Durham County Council	No	(PPS7) "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' indicates that the 're-use of buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations, and for some types of building". PPS7 also specifically highlights, "the need to preserve, or the desirability of preserving buildings of historic or architectural importance or interest, or which would otherwise contribute to local character" (Para 17, PPS7). Taking into account the guidance in PPS7 it is suggested that the key test should be that the applicant needs to demonstrate that the re-use of the Hall and estate preserves & enhances the character & setting of the listed building & structures.	Agree with sentiment of comment, especially the reference to paragraph 17 of PPS 7. The key test is for the applicant to justify their proposals in line with national, regional and local policy. Paragraph 3.4 of PPG 15 is clear when stating "Applicants for listed building consent must be able to justify their proposals. They will need to show why works...are desirable or necessary. They should provide the local planning authority with full information, to enable them to assess the likely impact of their proposals on the special architectural or historic interest of the building and on its setting." There is therefore a need in the document to refer to a full development appraisal, setting out the economic justification for their proposals.
WH009	Durham County Council	No	Should the Borough Council retain the approach of encouraging hotel, office and institutional uses before residential uses, it is recommended that the document clarifies how this preferential approach would be applied & provides details of the specific tests that should be applied in considering alternative uses.	Noted – However, the Council has decided to remove references to the need for a sequential approach due to representations received from English Heritage.
WH010	Durham County Council	No	Document refers to a presumption against 'enabling development' as defined at Para 6. However, it needs to provide clarity for those exceptional cases where some additional new development may be the best solution for conserving the listed buildings. The document could set out the approach to new buildings in the grounds of the Hall & estate, for example PPG15 specifies that, "the design of new buildings intended to stand alongside historic buildings needs very careful consideration. It is better that old buildings are not set apart, but woven into the fabric of the living & working community. The new buildings must respect their setting, follow fundamental architectural principles of scale, height, massing & alignment, & use appropriate materials.	Disagree. English Heritage's document on Enabling Development provides advice on the instances when Enabling Development may be acceptable. It is not the role of the SPD to reproduce or regurgitate national policy. There is therefore a need for applicants to refer to a full development appraisal, setting out the economic justification for their proposals as per key recommendation (i).

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH011	Durham County Council	No	The document refers to the accessibility of the Hall in relation to the highway network and the need for the applicant to seek detailed guidance from the County Highways Authority. This is welcomed. The County Highways Authority has provided detailed highways comments on the document and these will be forwarded to the Borough Council for their attention. These comments include the need for a detailed assessment of junction arrangement onto the A689 and the potential for highway improvements including a relocated access onto the A689 and improvement to both the nearby bus stop arrangements and the public footways from the gated entrance to the existing bus stops.	Noted.
WH012	Durham County Council	No	The implementation plan seeks to provide clarity on what information should be submitted by an applicant. An omission which needs to be rectified is the lack of any reference to the long term maintenance of the Hall and estate, particularly if these are to be in multiple ownership.	Agree – New sentence included.
WH013	North East Assembly	Yes	The draft SPD establishes development principles for each component of the hall and estate. In summary, this proposes to retain, restore and appropriately re-use of all listed buildings and structures; demolish the extension to the hall and staff accommodation unit; and restore and enhance the historic parkland and open spaces. The principle of protecting and enhancing listed buildings and historic structures is consistent with the objectives of RPG1 policies ENV14 and ENV19, and RSS further proposed changes policies 2, 5B, and 34.	Noted.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH014	North East Assembly	Yes	A number of key recommendations are included in the document, which should form part of the redevelopment proposals for the site. These include the requirement for a thorough appraisal of the archaeological, historical & biodiversity potential of the property; the preparation of a site-wide conservation plan; the retention & the appropriate re-use of all listed buildings within the site, for uses that provide benefits to the local community; the removal of all unsympathetic, uncharacteristic & relatively recent additions to the hall & its curtilage; & the restoration & enhancement of open spaces & the historic park & garden. This is consistent with RPG1 policies ENV5; ENV10; ENV14; ENV19; ENV20 & EN1, & RSS further proposed changes 2, 2A, 5B, 24, 34 & 35.	Noted.
WH015	North East Assembly	No	Whilst reference to embedded renewable energy in the recommendations is supported, the council is encouraged to promote high energy efficiency measures and minimise energy consumption through the achievement of BREEAM and the Code for Sustainable Homes standards in the re-use of the buildings. This approach would be consistent with RSS further proposed changes policy 39.	Agree – Reference to be included in finalised SPD.
WH016	North East Assembly	No	In the list of recommendations, the appropriate uses for the site are identified, and are listed in preferential order as a hotel; offices; institutional use and then residential use. In identifying the precise nature and scale of appropriate uses for the site, it will be necessary to justify the scheme in the context of the sequential approach to development in RPG1 policy DP1 and RSS further proposed changes policy 3; the regional locational strategy in RSS further proposed changes policy 5; and the principles for sustainable communities in RSS further proposed changes policies 2, 8 and 24.	Noted.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH017	North East Assembly	Yes	The NEA welcomes the preparation of the draft SPD. The document fulfils a useful role in providing clarification and further detail on the application of existing 'saved' local plan policies in relation to this site of historic importance. The SPD also describes the varied designations on the Windlestone Hall estate, and provides guidance to potential developers about what type of development, repair or restoration would be acceptable.	Noted.
WH018	North East Assembly	Yes	It will be necessary to consider carefully the scale and nature of development appropriate to the site and buildings, in the context of the regional locational strategy and sequential approach, and the site's rural location and historic setting. The NEA will appraise any subsequent planning application against the objectives of regional planning policy separately, through its statutory conformity function. The broad objectives of the SPD, to protect and enhance the historic estate, are considered to be in general conformity with both RPG1 and the Secretary of State's further proposed changes to RSS.	Noted.
WH019	Great Aycliffe Town Council	Yes	Great Aycliffe Town Council are in support of the proposals and documentation regarding the future of Windlestone Hall. It is important that these historic sites are maintained and wherever possible brought back into use for the benefit of others.	Noted.
WH020	Great Aycliffe Town Council	No	We are mindful of potential traffic problems and the access/egress from the site and encourage that these are discussed fully with the responsible highway authority before any redevelopment is approved. There may also be potential problems with works traffic and heavy plant equipment during any redevelopment which must also be taken into account when proposals are put forward for consideration.	Noted – Planning conditions can be attached to any subsequent planning approval to ensure that construction works do not have a detrimental impact on the heritage asset.
WH021	Great Aycliffe Town Council	Yes	The removal of the unsympathetic and uncharacteristic additions would clearly be an advantage to the redevelopment.	Noted.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH022	Great Aycliffe Town Council	No	We would also like to stress that we do not consider the site should be sub-divided and sold for housing development.	Noted – Proposals to sub-divide Windlestone Hall for housing will be scrutinised closely to ensure that such a proposal will not be destructive of a building's special interest.
WH023	Environment Agency	No	Where development on the site involves any increase in impermeable surfaces, such as car parking areas or new buildings on existing green areas, developers should maximise opportunities to incorporate sustainable drainage systems in order to protect against the effects of surface water flooding.	Noted.
WH024	Environment Agency	No	Sustainable drainage systems could help achieve Key Recommendations (b) by helping to mitigate against the effects of climate change, and (j) by using storage ponds/lagoons to create wetland habitats.	Fully support sentiments of comments, although not considered necessary to specifically mention the many different methods available within finalised SPD.
WH025	Windlestone Parish Council	No	We acknowledge the historic importance of the Hall and its ancillary buildings as well as the park, which is part of a conservation area. It is to be hoped that any new buildings which may be built, as opposed to the conversion of existing buildings would be of a small scale and designed in a similar way as to be sympathetic to the original architecture and its surroundings.	Noted.
WH026	Windlestone Parish Council	No	We also feel that there should be some regard paid to the increase in traffic using the A689 from the main entrance and as a consequence of this we ask that there be no more than 12 dwellings and that the developer consider upgrading the road around the main entrance.	Disagree. It would be wrong for the SPD to set an arbitrary figure of 12 dwellings. Proposals will be assessed closely with the Highways Authority to ensure that proposals do not adversely impact on the highways network. Notwithstanding this point, new housing in this location would be contrary to established planning policy, so a special justification would need to be made, for example, enabling development.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH027	Natural England	No	A significant concern is that the recommendations of the SA/SEA have not been clearly integrated in to the body of the SPD in advance of this consultation as part of the iterative process of plan preparation. Many of these recommendations are critical to the sustainability of the redevelopment & future use of Windlestone Hall & should be clearly addressed within the document rather than included in a table as 'key recommendations'. The conclusion of the Appropriate Assessment screening report highlight the need to include those recommendations which are critical to meet the precautionary approach required by the Habitats Regulations. These must be met before the LPA can 'ascertain that the plan will not adversely effect the integrity of a European Site	Changed opinion following discussion. See Ref: WH072
WH028	Natural England	No	It is the responsibility of the local planning authority to ensure that an assessment process is carried out in accordance with the Habitats Directive and the amended Habitats Regulations. In accordance with DCLG draft guidance on Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment section 7, the draft DPD must be subject to a HRA process to enable the planning authority to 'ascertain that it will not adversely affect the integrity of a European Site' before the Plan can be adopted. Please contact us if you require further information on this process.	Changed opinion following discussion. See Ref: WH072
WH029	Natural England	No	We are most concerned that the recommendations of the Report have not been integrated into the Draft SPD as the Planning Authority cannot adopt the plan until they have 'ascertained that the plan will not adversely effect the integrity of a European Site'	Changed opinion following discussion. See Ref: WH072
WH030	Natural England	No	This opinion is based on the information provided by you, and for the avoidance of doubt does not affect our obligation to advise on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan or programme which is the subject of this consultation, and which may despite SA/SEA have adverse effects on the environment.	Noted.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH031	Natural England	No	Protected Species - Natural England welcomes the recognition of the potential for the Windlestone Hall site to support a variety of protected species. A Phase I Habitat Survey should be undertaken as part of any development proposal, and the results of this used to inform the need for further, species-specific survey work, undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced persons.	Text to be included within the final SPD specifying that this survey work is required.
WH032	Natural England	No	Protected Species - In addition to the Phase I Habitat survey, SPD Section 4.26 (p11) specifically mentions surveys for Badger, Bats and Breeding Birds within the site boundary. Natural England advises that consideration should also be given to whether ponds & terrestrial habitat to the south of the site have the potential to support Great Crested Newt populations, as the aforementioned ponds are within 500m of the site boundary and works within the site may affect the terrestrial habitat of these protected species. This will ensure, as far as is practicably possible, that the policies of the SPD are deliverable in respect of the relevant wildlife legislation.	Noted. Text to be included within final SPD.
WH033	Natural England	No	BAP Species & Wider Biodiversity comments - Future proposals for re-development of Windlestone Hall may impact upon habitats and/or species listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). These Priority Habitats and Species are listed as "Habitats and Species of Principal Importance" in Government Circular 06/2005. Habitats and Species of Principal Importance can be considered as a material planning consideration. Consideration should also be given to those species and habitats included in the relevant Local BAP.	Agree.
WH034	Natural England	No	BAP Species & Wider Biodiversity comments - Future proposals for the development of the Windlestone Hall site should give appropriate weight to the wider biodiversity issues within the site, in accordance with Key Principle (ii) and paragraphs 11, 12, 14 & 16 of PPS 9.	Agree.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH035	Natural England	Yes	BAP Species & Wider Biodiversity comments - Accordingly, Natural England welcomes proposed change to SPD Key Recommendation 'b' (p13), namely the production of a site-wide Conservation Plan, acknowledging not only the Heritage, but also the potential biodiversity asset of the site. We also support the proposed change to Key Recommendation "J" - 'create, protect and enhance wildlife habitats', giving a clear indication of the importance of this aspect in any future development.	Noted.
WH036	Natural England	No	Landscape - Consideration of any impacts on the wider landscape from any future development proposals should reflect the approach set out in Landscape Character Assessment- guidance for England and Scotland, 2002, published by the Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage. The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of any proposed development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area.	Agree – Reference to document to be included in final SPD.
WH037	Natural England	No	Green Infrastructure - The role of the open space at Windlestone Hall in the wider green infrastructure of Sedgefield and County Durham should be recognised. Opportunities to integrate appropriate multi-use of these areas including for biodiversity, access, recreation should be realised.	Noted.
WH038	Natural England	No	Accessibility - This section should address access by sustainable transport and travel including public transport and links with foot and cycle routes/ networks.	Noted.
WH039	Local Resident	No	The proposals for Windlestone Hall seem to me to be somewhat optimistic and misplaced. The proposals as they stand (215 units) contradict the area Core Strategy for development in several ways: PO2 - The site is not a regeneration area; PO6 - The proposal will be detrimental to the natural environment of the site. The woodland as it stands is fertile ground for the land based animal life; PO7 - The site is a conservation area & this development would go against sound conservation principles; PO9 - It does	Agree that Windlestone Hall is not suitable for 215 units. Believe that confusion has arisen from Draft Major Allocations DPD which identified that the size of the site could accommodate 215 dwellings if the whole site were to be developed. However, this would never be the case given the conflict new housing in this location has with established planning policy.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH040	Local Resident	No	In the SBC Major Allocations Report under "Opportunities" it states the site lies within 400 metres of a primary or secondary school. However, it is 1.4miles to Kirk Merrington, 1.6miles to Coundon and 1.6 miles to Chilton school and therefore I doubt the truth of this statement. The nearest school would be at Kirk Merrington but direct access would be along the classified road no.43.21 which leads to Kirk Merrington and is a single lane road with at least two right angle turns. This route would be totally unsuitable for a school 'rat run'.	Noted.
WH041	Local Resident	No	While there may be some merit in allowing the conversion of the main building into a small number of apartments in order to assist finance the general restoration of the Hall, I believe the proposals as they stand are totally inappropriate.	Noted.
WH042	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	There is no reference to PPG16 (Archaeology), and from the Local Plan, Policies such as E5, E17, E19, E20, E21, E22, E23, IB11, H13, L17, L20 all of which could have illustrated a more proactive approach to the restoration, replacement regeneration and use potentials advocated for the site.	<p>Policies E5, E17, E19, E20, E21, IB11 & H13 were not policies which were saved and are therefore no longer part of the development plan. This accounts for their omission.</p> <p>Policy E22 was saved, but not considered relevant as it does not apply to listed buildings.</p> <p>Policy L17 was saved, but not considered relevant.</p> <p>References to Policies E23 & L20 to be included in Final SPD.</p>
WH044	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	The document does not relate to the demolition or retention of the Headmasters House or the most unfortunate infill between the two northern wings of the Hall.	Noted. Issue addressed in finalised SPD.
WH045	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	Historically the document shows no appreciation of the changes and developments of the Hall over 150 years, including the fact that for the last 100 years it has not been used as a hall or the destruction and acute state of the buildings & their setting.	Section2 of the Supplementary Planning Document has been expanded to provide more context.
WH046	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	The SPD does not appear to be based on any investigation or supporting data related to many of its recommendations.	Disagree. National, regional and local planning policies have shaped the SPD and its recommendations.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH047	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	A secondary response is one of disappointment in that the LA appears to have finalised the SPD as a basic reactive response to the County's 2007 marketing of WH (this is despite knowing the DCC chosen developer & entering into considerable negotiations with them on the production of a Conservation Management Plan). A more proactive response might have been to revise the SPD into the form of a Conservation Area Appraisal.	Disagree. The LA did have the resources to produce an SPD. The lack of detailed planning advice by the County Council to prospective purchasers when marketing the site left the Local Planning Authority with little choice but to produce an SPD. Unlike an SPD, a Conservation Area Appraisal does not carry a significant level of weight when determining planning applications and would not provide the protection needed here.
WH048	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	A Conservation Area Appraisal would have needed a similar consultation but would last much longer & could have approached the following important issues: The study area/site cuts across features of woodland, parkland, listed buildings, important landscape features & important aspects of the conservation area but gives no response to their protection, restoration or enhancement outside the site. The acute derelict state of the listed Grade II North Entrance Lodge is ignored. The potential is missed to liaise with other landowners in the CA and HP&G to promote Countryside Stewardship Single Farm Payment project etc to restore aspects of the lakes, walls, ha-ha, hedges, woodland parkland and field boundaries.	A Conservation Area Appraisal does not carry a significant level of weight when determining planning applications.
WH049	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	The primary area of concern relates to the SPD Recommendations c, g & l. We appreciate & support the theme of Recommendation c, g & l, but feel that they could be more sympathetic to the practical regeneration of Windlestone Hall & make the following observations: Recommendation c: in the last sentence we strongly disagree with any preferential order for the following reasons. (a) a hotel use would most likely want to retain the western classroom block & convert it into en-suite bedrooms with a new façade. Staff accommodation would no doubt be located in the 6 dwellings advocated for demolition. A hotel is likely to want a swimming pool/recreational facilities. Car parking could have a considerable impact on the setting of the building and parkland.	Noted. The SPD has removed all references to a preferential order. (g) – Disagree (l) – Disagree
WH050	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	Similarly an office development would wish to retain the western block to create open-space offices & fit high tech facilities throughout the Grade II* building.	Noted. The SPD has removed all references to a preferential order.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH051	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	The existing use is already institutional and the County and District have shown no use interest in the buildings.	Noted. The SPD has removed all references to a preferential order.
WH043	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	The two Conservation Area and Historic Park and Garden boundaries are not shown in relationship to the actual site although the Historic Park & Garden definition is provided. The omission of these two boundaries will in our opinion limit the consulted parties' ability to respond to the document.	Noted. Plan showing boundaries inserted (Appendix 2).
WH052	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	PPG15 item 3.19 advocates that the best use will very often be the use for which the building was originally designed, this would be residential and all other buildings in the area are residential.	Noted – This would dictate that the building is reinstated as a single residence.
WH053	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	Recommendation g: it is felt that spaces should be restored related to the historic assessment, condition today and the regeneration uses for this new era at Windlestone Hall. Capital & long-term revenue costs are most unlikely to support the full extent of the demanding present recommendations.	This would need to be demonstrated through a development cost appraisal.
WH054	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	Recommendation I: the tone of this section appears to exclude the traditional regeneration approach that covers brownfield site & quality regeneration replacement for dwellings & demolished floor areas & instead often introduces an expensive financial study that is often counter to the primary regeneration of the site & takes up extensive officer time & resources. There is no appreciation shown of the acute state of the site or the amount of damage done to the interior, exterior & setting of the natural & built heritage.	Disagree. English Heritage's publication on Enabling Development makes it clear that where a scheme which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms, is the only practicable means of generating the funds needed to secure the future of the heritage asset in question, it is entirely appropriate to require applicants to provide financial evidence to the LPA in support of such a claim. The LPA has to ensure that it has sufficient information to make an informed decision upon the application. If it fails to do so, its decision may be vulnerable to judicial review and less likely to be supported on appeal.
WH055	Andrew Long Building Design Ltd	No	In summary we advocate the SPD should be transformed into a more proactive document i.e. a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for WH. This could then embrace many aspects of the forthcoming consultant's detailed report.	Disagree. Whereas an SPD would sit within the LDF, a CAA would not. However, nothing to prevent any future owner of the building from producing one.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH056	Sport England	No	Windlestone Hall contained playing fields in pursuance of its educational role. The football pitch was located on the western side of the formal driveway. On the Appendix 2 plan showing the land parcels the football pitch's location is the rectangular os base feature within the woodland parcel. It is Sport England's policy to oppose the loss of playing fields. We would expect to see the playing field at WH replaced by playing fields of at least the same size & quality at the school's new site. While I understand that the school now occupies a combined site just west of Chilton, SE were not consulted on this proposal. Although the new site looks large enough in terms of its playing field provision to meet our requirements, I need confirmation of this.	Sport England withdrew its objection. See below.
WH057	Sport England	Yes	Details of email provided evidence that Sport England's playing field policy had been satisfied at the new school site and SE was therefore satisfied in terms of the proposed disposal of the vacated Windlestone Hall site.	Noted.
WH058	English Heritage	No	In broad terms, I am satisfied that the draft SPD takes account of the advice my colleague David Farrington provided on the "planning statement & development brief" at the beginning of last year. However, the transformation of the document into a draft SPD has involved some "re-casting" and "trimming" of content which has altered its tone and emphasis. In some areas, this is a positive; in others, a negative.	Noted. Extra care taken to ensure that the final version is acceptable to EH.
WH059	English Heritage	No	We welcome the main thrust of the document and the Council's commitment to formalise the "planning statement & development brief" into a SPD in order to help guide & inform the repair, restoration & re-use of this important site. It is, however, rather disappointing that the earlier document on which we provided substantive comments was not drafted with a view to it becoming a SPD in order to avoid the need for repeat consultations.	Noted.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH060	English Heritage	No	Some explanation of the history, development & significance of the site & its constituent elements should be provided. The document should mention the fact that, in addition to the clock tower, the Hall is included on our Buildings at Risk register due to its vacant state and deteriorating condition. While the statement at paragraph 5.4 is very much welcomed, I think the Council should carry out periodic visits to ensure that appropriate steps are being taken to safeguard the building from water ingress and unauthorised access during the current "waiting period".	New paragraph containing background info introduced into final SPD. Noted, not one for SPD, but requirement for proactive steps to be taken by owners and Local Planning Authority to ensure that further deterioration of the building does not take place in an accelerated manner.
WH061	English Heritage	No	The document would benefit from more robust editing & proof-reading - to remove errors and typos like "PPS15", "ashler", and the reference in point (e) on page 13 to biodiversity "inside" the building.	Noted.
WH062	English Heritage	No	Section 3 (Policy Context) is rather light - e.g. there is no mention of PPG16, nor of the policies in the local plan with regard to listed buildings, etc.	References to PPG16 incorporated into final version of SPD. Policies of the Local Plan relating to listed buildings were not saved, and are therefore no longer part of the development plan.
WH063	English Heritage	No	Section 3 needs to explain the status of our enabling development policy in the context of this document. A clear steer needs to be provided on whether or not the principle of new development at Windlestone would be contrary to established planning policy If this is not the case, then presumably the reference to our policy statement is simply to flag up that this is the methodology the Council will use to determine the acceptability or otherwise of any new development on the site.	Noted. Clarification provided that housing in this location would be contrary to established planning policy.
WH064	English Heritage	No	The final sentence in paragraph 4.4 is unacceptably weak. I would suggest the following "it is a prerequisite that Windlestone Hall be put back into good repair and beneficial use".	Changes to be made to sentence in final SPD.
WH065	English Heritage	No	Points (a) & (b) do not make sense in the context of the preceding sentence. I suggest that point (a) should read: "be informed by a thorough appraisal (etc) of the site as a whole", while point (b) should say "guided by a site-wide conservation plan etc.	Changes to be made to sentence in final SPD.

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH066	English Heritage	No	The document should make clear that the Conservation Plan for the site, and restoration proposals for the historic parkland, will need to be prepared by a team of appropriate specialists with the relevant skills & experience of undertaking such work on comparable multi-faceted historic sites.	Changes to be made to sentence in final SPD.
WH067	English Heritage	No	Point (c): the document should mention here that the preferred use for the Hall is reinstatement as a single residence. Beyond this, I see little merit in arranging "in preferential order" the other uses which the Council considers would be acceptable, although it is helpful to identify them. In reality, a hotel conversion (which is cited as the Council's most preferred use option) could be just as damaging to the character of the building (if not more so) than dividing it into several (large) residential apartments.	Accepted. References to a preferential order have been removed.
WH068	English Heritage	No	The document should more explicitly acknowledge the fact that, while the grade II listed gatehouse at the north entrance to the site is in separate ownership, it is an integral part of the significance of the site and is in very poor condition. As such the document should encourage a comprehensive scheme which secures the future of this building in addition to other parts of the site.	Accepted. New paragraph introduced in finalised SPD.
WH069	Ancient Monuments Society	No	Firstly we would have preferred a clear statement that the strong presumption lies in favour of a development limited to the footprint of the historic buildings. This would create the expectation that the new purchaser would be required to demolish all the post war structures without compensatory new build to make up for the square footage lost to that demolition.	Noted.
WH070	Ancient Monuments Society	No	We note reference to the English Heritage guidance on Enabling Development. This reference is legitimate but again we would expect a clear statement of a strong presumption against new build of that status too.	Para 4.3.2 states there is a general presumption against "enabling development".

Reference No	Organisation	Support	Comments	Council Response
WH071	Ancient Monuments Society	No	We make that suggestion because we would urge your Council to require of the County Council that they dispose of the Hall at a price which reflects the needs for repair. It would be quite wrong if a new purchaser was placed in the position of arguing for an enabling development because in effect he had been obliged to pay too much for the site. This issue of the price tag is dealt with in the EH document but given that the disposing body in this case is a public authority with which your Council is familiar, pressure on the County Council to behave responsibly over the price is appropriate and legitimate.	Noted.
WH072	Natural England	No	Further to our telephone conversation earlier this week I have re read the SPD in the light of your comments and now accept that the Key Recommendations as included in the table on page 13 are adequately integrated into the context of the DPD. My apologies for the misunderstanding and any concern caused as a result.	Noted.