

Over the past years Transition Bath had worked closely with BANES, Bath Preservation Trust and others on the Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting SPD with special emphasis on Listed Buildings. We attended seminars and spent considerable volunteer time engaging with the process. We thought a version of the SPD we, and the other parties were happy to recommend had been agreed.

When the final version appeared in February 2012 the entire Listed Building Section had been removed. There was no forewarning, there was no explanation and certainly no consultation.

This is not the way to behave if you wish to the engage the community in the democratic process and formulate activities and plans for the good of the commonwealth of Bath.

We now find a new Annex to the Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document has been produced with virtually no consultation.

However, as an organisation Transition Bath is looking for practical solutions and whilst we would applaud the existence of the document there are changes we would to see.

We would ^{see} common sense prevail and our listed buildings treated as places to live and work in and not museum pieces.

As a general point we would like to see the emphasis on the positive – what you can do as well as what is not acceptable.

Also like to ^{point} ~~pin~~ out that not all owners of Listed buildings are 'well off'. An essential point when considering a charging structure for planning advice, applications etc

A more specific example would be in the case of secondary glazing. Secondary glazing is by its very nature a benign, removable and effective technology. Yet by making it compulsory to apply for consent to install it will mean that the less well off will be deterred from improving the comfort level and lowering the energy use of their house by the cost, complexity and general user unfriendliness of the planning process.

I would urge the council to adopt recommendation 2.2, to liase with other councils nationally to lobby government, to consult with local organisations, and to bring the legislation and implementation of policy into the 21st Century. We must have a listed planning process that is fit for a living, working city – not a Georgian theme park.