

**SPG on Windows and doors in historic buildings (their repair and replacement)  
Consultation responses**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>Response</b>
M Jones (Development Control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance should be readily accessible and clear on what is / is not acceptable; owners should be made aware of responsibilities</li> <li>• Suggests that specialist applications be handled by specialist officers</li> <li>• Asks for glossary of specialist terms</li>   <li>• Suggests that only specialist joiners should work on historic buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When adopted the SPG will be well publicised</li>   <li>• The availability of specialist staff is limited by expertise and resources</li> <li>• The existing publication on timber windows does contain annotated illustrations which show the specialist terms. It is intended that the document be re-published to include this SPG</li> <li>• The choice of contractor cannot rest with the department.</li> </ul>
E Stables (Development Control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asks what advice would be for later extensions to historic buildings, also where Crittal metal windows were original</li>   <li>• Suggests that where not publicly visible control is less strict</li>   <li>• Expresses concern at inconsistent decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If traditional, later extensions should generally have traditional windows; if of another architectural style then the windows should be appropriate to that style – wording amended to clarify point</li> <li>• Whole buildings are protected, not just the parts which can be seen from the public realm – wording amended to clarify point</li> <li>• This is not within the remit of the Historic Built Environment Team.</li> </ul>

G Way (Development Control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests the word ‘materials’ be added in relation to control for pre 1920 properties as well as registered ones</li> <li>• Notes that the Minister has approved uPVC windows at the rear of buildings at appeal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Materials’ were deliberately omitted here as it is the appearance of pre 1920 buildings that is of concern, not their historic integrity – if the latter they would be registered / listed</li> <li>• This guidance will assist with the consistency of decision making.</li> </ul>
M Bravery (by Email)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that Policy HE4 as drafted might block all change to windows and doors and should expanded to clarify this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy relates to the repair and replacement of windows and doors – this has now been recognised in the title and body of the document. Where other changes such as those he mentions are proposed then the emerging guidance on ‘Managing Change in Historic Buildings’ will be relevant.</li> </ul>
Daniel Wimberley (by Email)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports use of traditional materials as better lasting and more sustainable than plastic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
P le Gresley (Development Control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the draft guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
A Gibb (St Martin, Jersey)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports retention of historic windows and doors</li> <li>• Notes that properly selected softwood performs as well as hardwood if well constructed and maintained</li> <li>• Comments on the un-sustainability of PVC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Wording of guidance amended re the use of softwood.</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Ministers move to waive fees for replacement window applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
M Renouf (Advocate – by Email)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applauds document especially suggestion that already changed windows should go back to original form</li> <li>• Suggests reference to retention / restoration of shutters be included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Wording of guidance amended re shutters.</li> </ul>
C Tadier (Hartigans, St Saviour, Jersey)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that revised guidance brings more clarity;</li> <li>• supports presumption in favour of retention and repair;</li> <li>• notes previous mistakes where replacements not accurate;</li> <li>• decisions on such matters to be made by experts;</li> <li>• encourages department to protect historic buildings using better understanding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All noted.</li> </ul>
Société Jersiaise – Environment Section (R Anthony Chairman)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports draft guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
K Shaw (St Helier, Jersey)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that owners ignore regulation and department does not enforce</li> <li>• Asks for more publicity, survey, monitoring enforcement etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When adopted the SPG will be publicised</li> <li>• Comments regarding a more proactive approach are accepted but are limited by resources.</li> </ul>
Jersey Chamber of Commerce (J Poole – Chair, Building & Development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the need for control of change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Additional wording added in relation to</li> </ul>

Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests a joint policy between Planning and Byelaws to resolve conflicts and for clarity.</li> </ul>	Byelaws and this guidance.
R Schooling (Elegant Windows)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has witnessed damage from upvc t/t windows</li> <li>• Single glazing not equal to double glazing U values; refers to an experiment at St Peter which failed; cost of maintenance prohibitive; new windows save on energy</li> <li>• Does not support proposed policy HE4; Minister should consider global warming; owners should have the right to do what they want</li> <li>• Complains at length of time taken for determination of applications and inconsistent decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• Historic Building Team not involved in experiment at St Peter; wording amended in relation to performance of timber windows.</li> <li>• Minister has a duty to protect heritage under the Law and international conventions and must balance this with sustainability issues.</li> <li>• This is not within the remit of the Historic Built Environment Team.</li> </ul>
Environment Scrutiny Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applauds Minister's attempts to protect heritage</li> <li>• Single glazing not environmentally sustainable; sees no problem in replacing windows; supports increased sound and heat insulation; notes cost of maintenance and replacement of timber windows</li> <li>• Should make financial assistance available .</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Minister has a duty to protect heritage under the Law and international conventions and must balance this with sustainability issues.</li> <li>• Grants are currently available to assist with the additional cost of works such as this.</li> </ul>
M Roscouet (Building Control)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests some clarifications and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text amended and additions made to</li> </ul>

	additions in relation to thermal performance and issues relating to the Building Byelaws.	take account of these comments.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------