

**ANGUS COUNCIL**

**INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES COMMITTEE – 25 AUGUST 2009  
DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS COMMITTEE – 1 SEPTEMBER 2009**

**SUBJECT: CONSULTATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REMOVAL OF THE DUTY OF  
PLANNING AUTHORITIES TO NOTIFY HISTORIC SCOTLAND ON CERTAIN TYPES OF LISTED  
BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION**

**REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES**

**Abstract: This report comments on and provides a basis for the Council's response to the consultation on the "Implementation of the Removal of the Duty of Planning Authorities to Notify Historic Scotland on Certain Types of Listed Building Consent Application". The consultation report provides a summary of the outcome of the pilot project which aimed to explore whether it would be possible to protect the historic environment and deliver decisions more quickly to applicants.**

**1 RECOMMENDATION**

1.1 It is recommended that the Infrastructure Services Committee:-

- (i) notes the content of the consultation report by Historic Scotland;
- (ii) agrees this report as the basis for the Council's response to the Scottish Government.

1.2 It is recommended that the Development Standards Committee:-

- (i) notes the contents of this report.

**2 CURRENT POSITION**

2.1 At present, any planning authority that is minded to approve an application relating to a Category A or Category B listed building, or the demolition of any listed building or unlisted building in a conservation area, has to notify their intention to Historic Scotland before issuing the consent to the applicant. On 1 June 2008 section 55(2) of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006 came into force. This section amended section 13 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas)(Scotland) Act 1997 and as a result, it is now possible for Historic Scotland, on behalf of Scottish Ministers, to direct that certain planning authorities can determine listed building consent for certain works without first notifying Historic Scotland. As part of the Joint Working Agreement, report 66/09 of Infrastructure Services Committee refers, a pilot was run involving three planning authorities with an aim to explore whether removing the duty to notify Scottish Ministers on more straightforward types of listed building consent application for B-listed buildings would speed up the decision-making without impacting on the quality of the decisions made. Historic Scotland can give a planning authority permission to stop notifying it under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 by issuing a Direction. The pilot project ran between 1 October and 31 December 2008 and involved Perth & Kinross, the City of Edinburgh and Glasgow

City Councils and involved all applications which fell within Schedule 1 of the Direction. The four organisations involved have reviewed the pilot and have concluded, through the consultation report, that the aim was achieved and is a further step forward in the implementation of Joint Working Agreements between Historic Scotland and those planning authorities who decide to sign up and undertake the new duties.

2.2 It should be noted that the consultation report analysis is based upon the indicators from the City of Edinburgh and Glasgow City Councils only as the sample from Perth and Kinross was very small which skewed the results. The Perth and Kinross Council statistics are still noted for information within the consultation report.

2.3 The purpose of the consultation report by Historic Scotland is to:

- Seek views on whether and how Historic Scotland should take forward the removal of the duty to notify Scottish Ministers on certain types of listed building consent application, as tested by the pilot;
- Explain how the removal of the duty to notify pilot was designed, implemented and reviewed and set out its conclusions; and
- Seek views on a number of specific questions to inform the design of any future scheme should it be taken forward.

The general comments on how Scottish Ministers should implement Section 55(2) of the Planning Etc (Scotland) Act 2006 are picked up in the discussion section of this report and the response to specific questions is set out in Annex 1 of this report.

2.4 A copy of the consultation report and accompanying covering letter has been placed in the Members' Lounge.

### **3 DISCUSSION**

3.1 Section five of the consultation report outlines how the pilot was designed and operated. Currently planning authorities must notify Historic Scotland, on behalf of Scottish Ministers, if they are minded to approve listed building consent for category A and B-listed buildings and the demolition of category C(S)-listed buildings before they can issue consent. Scottish Ministers then have 28 days to decide whether they wish to call the application in for their own determination.

3.2 Historic Scotland recognises that many planning authorities have the skills and expertise required to handle certain listed building consent applications without involving Historic Scotland. A pilot project involving Perth & Kinross, City of Edinburgh and Glasgow City Councils was arranged to explore whether removing the 28-day notification period for straightforward application types relating to category B-listed buildings would speed up decision making without reducing the quality of decisions. The pilot tested how such a system might work and explored how it could be monitored and reviewed, in order to ensure that appropriate decisions continued to be taken in line with policy in the longer term. Meetings have also taken place with individual local authorities to discuss the possibility of a Joint Working Agreement. Officers from Planning & Transport met with Historic Scotland in May to discuss the possibility of removing the duty to notify for certain applications and the Joint Working Agreement.

3.3 The process involved the pilot authorities deciding which applications fell within Schedule 1 (see Annex 2) and determining them without any reference to Historic Scotland. Each week the pilot authorities sent Historic Scotland a list of applications which they had validated under the pilot. Once an application had been determined and decision issued the pilot authority would send Historic Scotland a pack of information (either electronically or hardcopy) which included the completed monitoring pro forma (Schedule 2 – Annex 3) so that Historic Scotland could monitor the process and decisions.

- 3.4 A total of 107 cases were validated under the pilot which was 63% of the total number of listed building consent applications validated within the 3 month period and of this 99 (94 %) of the pilot cases have been determined so far. Just over half (52%) of the pilot cases were determined in less than eight weeks. Of all cases (pilot and non-pilot) validated within the 3 month period, 39% were determined within 8 weeks compared to the equivalent 3 months in 2007 when only an average of 13.5% of listed building consent applications were determined within 8 weeks. These statistics are set out in tables 1 and 2 below.

**Table 1: Applications Received and Determined  
for Pilot period 1 October-31 December 2008**

	<b>GCC</b>	<b>CEC</b>	<b>P&amp;K</b>	<b>Whole Pilot Period</b>	<b>Whole Pilot Period w/o P&amp;K</b>
<b>Total B-Pilot cases validated</b>	51	56	6	113	<b>107</b>
<b>Total cases validated</b>	91	77	28	196	<b>168</b>
<b>Total non-Pilot Category B cases validated</b>	12	18	8	38	<b>30</b>
<b>Pilot cases determined so far</b>	46	55	4	105	<b>99</b>
<b>Outstanding pilot cases</b>	5	1	2	8	<b>6</b>

Table 1: Source Historic Scotland

**Table 2: Determination times for LBC Applications  
for Pilot period 1 October-31 December 2008**

	<b>GCC</b>	<b>CEC</b>	<b>P&amp;K</b>	<b>Whole Pilot Period</b>	<b>Whole Pilot Period w/o P&amp;K</b>
<b>Average time to determine pilot cases</b>	60 days	53 days	104 days	72 days	<b>56 days</b>
<b>Average time to determine non-pilot B cases</b>	96 days	71 days	91 days	86 days	<b>83 days</b>
<b>Average determination time for all cases</b>	78 days	57 days	73 days	69 days	<b>67 days</b>
<b>% all validated LBC cases determined in &lt;8 weeks</b>	29% Oct-Dec 2007: 7%	50% Oct-Dec 2007: 20%	25% Oct-Dec 2007: 16%	35% Oct-Dec 2007: 14%	<b>39% Oct-Dec 2007: 13.5%</b>
<b>% pilot cases determined in &lt;8 weeks</b>	43%	61%	0%	35%	<b>52%</b>
<b>% all non-Pilot B cases determined in &lt;8 weeks</b>	0%	17%	33%	17%	<b>8%</b>

Table 2: Source Historic Scotland

- 3.5 Conclusions from the participating pilot authorities felt that although Schedule 1 (Annex 2) had been clear and not open to interpretation it may have been helpful to have the schedule list exceptions rather than inclusions as the list of inclusions was quite significant and could be expanded further to include external ramps and curtilage buildings. It had been suggested that the exceptions should entail:-
- Demolition (including partial demolition);
  - Façade retention;
  - Roof remodelling (including rooftop extensions); and
  - Large extensions (those where the resulting building would be over 20m<sup>2</sup> greater than the original; the height of the resulting building would be greater than the highest part of the original; or, over four metres in height.
- 3.6 Some concerns were noted regarding the inconsistency of providing Historic Scotland with the weekly list in relation to the regularity of sending the list and the period which it covered i.e. not always Monday to Friday. Clear guidance needs to be set which sets out the parameters for monitoring and ensures that authorities are aware of the requirements of them providing such information timeously.
- 3.7 Scope already exists to use existing information stored within the Uniform database (as was done by Glasgow City Council during the pilot) and this can reduce the amount of double-handling required to provide monitoring information. The provision of the data was sent by hardcopy by two pilot authorities and electronically by the other and in most cases either of the routes of information provision were satisfactory in meeting the needs of Historic Scotland to monitor the applications but all recognised that extracting information from existing databases and electronic process would be far more efficient in the longer-term. As

monitoring information also included applications refused, Historic Scotland felt that this information demonstrated that the pilot authorities were comfortable refusing applications contrary to local and national policy.

- 3.8 All pilot authorities agreed that, once administrative processes were in place, the changes in procedure did not place additional pressure on their resources. The small amount of extra work required to generate and send off monitoring information was offset by time saved not consulting the agency during the determination of an application.
- 3.9 Feedback from applicants and agents regarding the pilot were positive and both recognised and welcomed the faster determination times. External feedback from the applicants and agents expressed concern regarding the ability of planning authorities to make good decisions in line with policy without Historic Scotland's advice. The pilot evidence did not support this view.

#### **4 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications arising from of the recommendations contained in this report.

#### **5 HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There are not any human rights implications arising out of the recommendations contained in this report.

#### **6 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The issues dealt with in this report have been the subject of consideration from an equalities perspective (as required by legislation). An [equalities impact assessment](#) is not required.

#### **7 SINGLE OUTCOME AGREEMENT**

- 7.1 This report contributes to the following local outcome contained within the Single Outcome Agreement for Angus.

12. We value and enjoy our built and natural environment and protect it and enhance it for future generations

- The importance and benefits to society of the environment is recognised.

#### **8 CONSULTATION**

- 8.1 The Chief Executive, the Director of Corporate Services, the Head of Finance and the Head of Law & Administration have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

## 9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The consultative report raised some issues regarding the need for a more consistent timescale and format for producing monitoring information. The layout of Schedule 1 may require to be dependant on the scope of application types that each individual planning authority wishes to determine without notifying Historic Scotland and therefore the use of exception rather than inclusion on Schedule 1 will be dependant on the individual authority. Consideration still has to be given as to how monitoring can be most effective and with options such as random sampling once an authority demonstrates its skills and expertise to determine applications without reference to Historic Scotland. This would free up further time for both the authority and Historic Scotland to focus on more complex cases and issues.
- 9.2 Overall, decisions were issued more quickly and in line with local and national policy and allowed for more time to focus on more complex applications for both the pilot authorities and Historic Scotland. The pilot scheme has been considered successful but before signing up to any future scheme each planning authority must ensure that they can demonstrate to Historic Scotland that they have:
- Signed up to the Joint Working Agreement;
  - Access to specialist conservation advice;
  - Appropriate policies; and
  - Supporting processes and monitoring to operate effectively.
- 9.3 The responses to questions set out in Annex 1 will form the basis for Angus Council's response to the consultation by Historic Scotland.

**ERIC S LOWSON**  
**DIRECTOR OF INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES**

**NOTE :** The background papers, as defined by Section 50D of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, (other than any containing to confidential or exempt information) were relied on to a material extent in preparing the above report are:

- Report 66/09, Infrastructure Services Committee: January 2009;
- Consultation on the Implementation of the Removal of the Duty to Notify Historic Scotland on Certain Types of Listed Building Consent Application: June 2009; and
- Covering Letter and Questionnaire from Deputy Chief Inspector, Historic Scotland: June 2009.

**P&T/GWC/KM**  
**14 August 2009**

## ANNEX 1 – RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

### **Background**

**Q1 – In what capacity are you involved, or have you previously been involved, with the listed building consent process (e.g. applicant, agent, amenity body, planner, etc)?**

Planning Authority

### **Entry Criteria**

**Q2 – What criteria do you think a planning authority should meet in order to qualify for taking sole responsibility for determining listed building consent applications and what resources do you think may be involved?**

The basic principles of criteria set out in the conclusion of the consultative report are sufficient enough to cover the basic perspective required to allow a planning authority to consider undertaking the delegation of straightforward listed building consent applications.

It should be essential under the “access to specialist conservation advice” criteria that those officers responsible for signing off any listed building consent applications should be a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (MRTPI). It would also be essential for planning authorities to have access to advice from officers with a conservation accredited qualification or membership of a conservation or heritage body. There may be resource implications in maintaining access to such officers.

An up to date development plan should also be set out as a requirement under the “appropriate policies” criteria to ensure that policies are up to date and fit for purpose to be able to consider applications under delegated authority.

Each planning authority should ensure that as well as having a sufficient level of conservation expertise to match their requirements regarding volume and type of applications, administrative support and availability of IT should also be considered when reviewing resource implications.

The nature of any monitoring arrangements may also have resource implications for planning authorities and any monitoring arrangements should be structured to ensure that they are proportionate to the level of risk involved.

**Q3 – Do you agree with the criteria proposed following the pilot?**

Yes. The basic principles of the criteria are acceptable but would be dependant on individual planning authority capabilities and should not be taken as a “one size fits all” approach. The amount of expertise available and the requirement for such will vary from authority to authority depending on the types and number of listed buildings within their individual area.

**Q4 – It is Scottish Ministers’ view that planning authority policies should be in line with national policy before they take on the responsibility for determining applications. Do you agree? If not please explain why.**

Yes but it is essential that a planning authority has an up to date development plan.

**Scope of applications included.**

**Q5 – Do you think the scope of applications identified in Schedule 1 is appropriate? Please explain your answer. It would be helpful if you could consider whether:**

- anything else be included/omitted?
- Schedule 1 be extended to include category A-listed buildings?
- Schedule 1 be determined by exception rather than inclusion?

Schedule 1 is quite comprehensive in the scope of included types of application for non-notification and the suggestion within the report to include external ramps and curtilage buildings within the Schedule would be acceptable. However consideration should also be given to the inclusion of small two storey extensions where the existing building is two storeys.

The inclusion of category A-listed buildings within Schedule 1 may be dependant on the ability felt by the individual planning authority to undertake determination of such applications without guidance from Historic Scotland. However, given that category A buildings are of national importance then it should be deemed appropriate that some form of consultation would still exist between the planning authority and Historic Scotland. Angus Council would favour formal consultation prior to determination.

The determination of Schedule 1 by exception or inclusion would again be determined by agreement between Historic Scotland and the individual planning authority. However Angus Council considers that Schedule 1 should be determined by exception.

***Monitoring of the scheme.***

***Q6 – Do you think the method of monitoring planning authorities' decisions during the pilot was effective?***

Yes. However, the requirement to provide the information required by Schedule 2 for every application, including copies of application forms, drawings, consultation responses, representations etc for every application appears unduly onerous and inconsistent with the government's planning reform agenda in terms of proportionate involvement of agencies. The evidence from the exercise does however support Angus Council's experience of limited call-in of applications and it is expected that this should provide Historic Scotland with the confidence to remove any such requirement from future monitoring arrangements.

***Q7 – Do you think that planning authorities' decisions should be monitored as part of any future scheme?***

***Please explain why/why not?***

Yes. A degree of monitoring is considered appropriate in order for Historic Scotland to confirm that the development proposals affecting the built heritage are being appropriately determined. However, it is considered that the level of monitoring should be proportionate with the risks involved through the decision making process. Any monitoring regime should be compatible with the government's objectives in terms of planning reform. Historic Scotland's focus should be to provide added value to the planning system by using resources that are freed up as a consequence of any new delegation to provide expert and constructive advice to planning authorities at an early stage in the decision making process as required. It is considered that this would be of greater value (to planning authorities and the built heritage) than using limited resources to review decisions that have already been made.

Post decision monitoring offers limited protection to the built heritage. A more positive approach might be to identify Historic Scotland as a statutory consultee in respect of listed building consent proposals affecting category A and B properties. This would allow Historic Scotland to intervene at an early stage where it was considered necessary thus ensuring that account is taken of their comments and minimising potential damage to built heritage interests. If a planning authority wished to depart from Historic Scotland's advice then the application would be notifiable. This would reflect comparable agency involvement with planning applications. It is considered that this would be no more onerous for Historic Scotland than reviewing the level of information currently required by Schedule 2. However, this review would be undertaken at an earlier and more useful stage in the process thus providing an additional safeguard to our heritage.

***Q8 – Do you think that there are other ways which monitoring could be done?***

***If yes, then how? It would be useful if you could consider:-***

- ***Who should carry out the monitoring?***



- ***Should all cases be monitored or just a sample?***
- ***How frequently should monitoring information be submitted?***
- ***If a sample of cases are monitored how should the samples be selected?***
- ***What would be good measures of success, i.e. what kind of information should be submitted for monitoring?***

There are a number of options available regarding the monitoring of decisions and would be dependant on individual planning authorities. Options for monitoring should always include Historic Scotland in some capacity but consideration could be given to an annual monitor of a sample of cases by Historic Scotland for each planning authority either solely or in conjunction with either the Conservation Officer or equivalent. It is considered that the format of monitoring should be determined by Historic Scotland and the individual planning authority when the relevant Joint Working Agreement is drafted. This could take account of local factors such as available expertise.

If required or on an intermittent basis then there should be the opportunity for Historic Scotland to undertake an audit of decisions taken for a specific time period. This would ensure national, as well as local level, consistency.

The value of submitting the monitoring information to Historic Scotland on a regular basis is questioned. It is considered that the planning authority should be required to provide Historic Scotland with a list of applications determined and to maintain a handling report for every listed building consent application that is determined. A sample of these could be requested on an annual basis by Historic Scotland with an annual review of a sample of cases undertaken in conjunction with the planning authority. It is considered that this form of monitoring would be more proportionate and would reflect the government's wider objectives in relation to culture change and the planning reform agenda.

Measures of success should be in relation to reduction in time taken to issue listed building application decisions, the percentage of approved applications that are in compliance with policies and evidence of added value through amendments to improve the final application submission or approved application.

***Q9 – Do you think monitoring information for planning authority decisions on C(S)-listed buildings should also be included?***

***Please explain why/why not?***

It is considered that planning authorities should be required to maintain a report on the handling of the application along the lines set out in Schedule 2. This would demonstrate that all relevant factors had been taken into account in the determination of an application. These reports would thereafter be available for Historic Scotland to review as necessary. A requirement to submit further information to Historic Scotland in relation to Category C(S) listed buildings would place an additional burden on planning authorities; would give rise to resource implications for planning authorities and Historic Scotland; and would not be consistent with the government's planning reform agenda.

***Review***

***Q10 – How regularly do you think a planning authority's overall performance should be reviewed and how do you think this should be carried out?***

It is considered that this is a matter for the individual Joint Working Agreements. Angus Council would favour annual monitoring with a formal review of the Joint Working Agreement every four years.

***Q11 – Do you think that there are any issues that might lead to the withdrawal of the ability of planning authorities to determine applications without notifying Scottish Ministers?***

Theoretically there may be occasion where in an unforeseen circumstance it might be necessary to withdraw the planning authorities' ability to determine applications for example if an authority were to lose a number of fully qualified and experienced officers or that the conservation expertise was no

longer available. Additionally there may exceptionally be circumstances where a planning authority does not determine applications in accordance with national or local policy as a matter of routine thus compromising the built heritage.

### **General**

**Q12 – Do you support the principle of giving planning authorities sole responsibility to issue listed building consent for more straightforward applications?  
Please explain your answer.**

Yes. The principle of giving planning authorities sole responsibility to issue listed building consent for more straightforward applications is welcomed. Although Schedule 1 itself requires to be robust and not open to interpretation regarding what is determinable under the scheme it is necessary for Schedules to be determined on an individual basis, suitable to the individual needs and abilities of each planning authority.

Angus Council's experience is that very few applications are called in by Historic Scotland which suggests that the planning authority's decision making is sound and robust. Allowing greater delegation should allow quicker decision making with the associated benefits for the economy. It should allow Historic Scotland to focus its attention on areas of genuine national interest which is consistent with the government's objectives for planning reform. It should also allow Historic Scotland to provide support and guidance to planning authorities during the application process where necessary. It is considered that this would be a more valuable and constructive use of Historic Scotland's resources than focusing time and attention on reviewing decisions through an extensive and disproportionate monitoring system.

It should however be reasonable to expect that a planning authority should be able to have access to an opinion or advice from Historic Scotland regarding any category type application during its determination should the authority feel it necessary. This should be no more onerous on Historic Scotland as consultation time required will have been sufficiently reduced through planning authorities taking on the delegated powers. This is something that could be undertaken at existing liaison meetings held between planning authorities and Historic Scotland.

Historic Scotland should also look to be involved at an earlier and more strategic level for potential larger proposals and projects regarding the historic environment. This would ensure that views are taken on board from the outset and therefore may allow for further delegated approval where initial discussions and conditions of proposal are set out prior to application submission.

Angus Council feels that this proposed delegation of power is welcomed to facilitate improvements in the determination of applications for listed building consent. Angus is proud that there has been no need in recent times to have an application called in by Historic Scotland regarding decision making. Angus Council is adequately set to be able to take on board the requirements of any delegated decision making as it has an established Planning Service which has a number of officers who are not only MRTPI accredited but also have conservation related qualifications. It also has a dedicated conservation team within its Natural and Built Environment Section and therefore would be acceptable to determining applications under delegated decision.

**ANNEX 2: SCHEDULE 1 FOR PILOT SCHEME****SCHEDULE 1****DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATIONS TO WHICH SECTION 12 SHALL NOT APPLY**

The descriptions of applications for listed building consent to which section 12 shall not apply are—  
Any valid application for listed building consent for works to a category B-listed buildings which is received by «INSERT PLANNING AUTHORITY NAME» on or after 1 October 2008 and which seeks consent for work described in paragraphs 1 to 8 below [as read with Notes 1 to 3 below.]

**External Works**

1. The alteration, replacement, removal or installation of:
  - external doors
  - gutters and downpipes
  - railings
  - windows
  - roof coverings
  - rooflights
  - stonework or masonry finishes
  - chimneys
  - steps and external stairs
2. Single storey extensions where:
  - the floor area of the resulting building is up to 20m<sup>2</sup> greater than the original;
  - the height of the resulting building would be below the height of the highest part of the original;  
and
  - the development would be less than 4m in height.
3. Installation of:
  - modern fittings (e.g. aerials, alarm boxes, CCTV, plant ducts and associated fixtures);
  - utilities (e.g. electrics, gas, plumbing, telecommunications etc.); and
  - micro-renewables.
4. Alteration, replacement or installation of:
  - shopfronts;
  - awnings;
  - ATMs; and
  - signage.

**Internal Works**

5. Subdivision of rooms
6. Creation of openings between rooms (excluding perforation of floor plates and ceilings)
7. Installation of modern fittings (e.g. suspended ceilings, kitchens, bathrooms, office furniture, bookcases etc.)
8. Alteration, replacement, removal or installation of:
  - floor surfaces and finishes;
  - doors and associated joinery;
  - shutters, pelmets and rods;
  - modern services (electrics, gas, plumbing, telecommunications etc.);
  - tiles;
  - chimney pieces/fireplaces;
  - decorative plasterwork;

- decorative wall coverings, fixed tapestries and decorative paints (which form part of an architectural scheme);
- built-in furniture (e.g. pews, wardrobes, cupboards); and
- decorative timber joinery (e.g. panelling, dado rails, picture rails, skirting boards).

**Note 1: Repair**

Repair using matching materials would not normally require listed building consent. Repair is normally regular maintenance, using matching materials, to remedy defects, decay (e.g. caused by normal weathering or wear and tear) or damage. The object of repair is to control decay without damaging the character of the building or altering the features which give it its historic and/or architectural importance or removing historic fabric unnecessarily.

**Note 2: Total replacement or extensive repair**

Total replacement or extensive repair of an element, e.g. window or door, will result in the significant loss of historic fabric and should not be considered to be repair, therefore LBC would be required. The decision on whether works constitute repair is for the local authority and is ultimately a judgement exercised in light of Note 1 above, so there will always be grey areas where opinions vary. The important issue is to ensure that the replacement of sound elements such as windows or doors is not undertaken without consent as a repair.

**Note 3: Curtilage**

Free-standing development within the curtilage of a listed building does not require listed building consent.

## ANNEX 3: SCHEDULE 2 FOR PILOT SCHEME

## SCHEDULE 2

Monitoring pro-forma: Information to be sent to Historic Scotland by Local Authority once an application has been determined PLANNING AUTHORITY TO COMPLETE		
Field Name	Type of input/options	
Planning Authority ID	Free text	
Name/address of listed property/site	Free text	
Council	Edinburgh	
	Glasgow	
	Perth & Kinross	
Description of proposed works	Free text	
Date validated	Date: dd/mm/yyyy	
LBC delegated	Y/N	
Date LBC determined	Date: dd/mm/yyyy	
Time taken to determine application	XX Days	
LBC Decision	Granted	
	Granted with conditions	
	Refused	
Delegated issues	External alterations	External doors
		Gutters and downpipes
		Railings
		Windows
		Roof coverings
		Rooflights
		Stonework & masonry finishes
		Chimneys
		Steps & external stairs
		Single storey extension
		Modern fittings
		Utilities
		Micro-renewables
		Shopfront
		Awning
		ATM
		Signage
	Internal Alterations	Subdivision of rooms
		Creation of openings between rooms
		Installation of modern fittings
		Floor surfaces and finishes
		Doors and associated joinery
		Shutters, pelmets and rods
		Modern services
		Tiles
		Chimney pieces/fireplaces
		Decorative plasterwork
	Decorative wall coverings	
	Built-in furniture	
	Decorative timber joinery	

Information included	Application form	Y/N
	Supporting information	Y/N
	Conservation officer advice	Y/N
	External representations	Y/N
	Relevant correspondence	Y/N
	Committee/Officer Report	Y/N
	Approved plans	Y/N
	Decision Letter	Y/N
	Other	Free
Was site visit carried out?	Y/N	
Date site visit was carried out	dd/mm/yyyy	
Have amendments to the initial submission (as a result of your advice) resulted in improvements to the approved scheme?	Y/N + explanation of amendments and why	
Relevant local policies/guidance	Free text/list	
Does decision follow local policy/guidance?	Y/N	
Relevant national policies/guidance	Free text/list	
Does decision follow national policy/guidance?	Y/N	
Justification if policy was not followed	Free text	
Was application determined in line with the planning officer's recommendation?	Y/N	