

**MA in CONSERVATION of HISTORIC BUILDINGS
INSTITUTE of ADVANCED ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES
incorporated in the DEPARTMENT of ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY of YORK**

**ASSESSED ESSAY I:
POLICIES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

***“WHAT ARE THE LIKELY INGREDIENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL
POLICY FOR THE PRESERVATION AND USE OF THE BUILT
HERITAGE?”***

with Special Reference to Pressure Groups

submitted by
Student no: C82119 (→ #. Ege Yildirim)
December 1998

CONTENTS

0. INTRODUCTION

1. CONSERVATION POLICY IN BRITAIN (ENGLAND)

- a. Brief History*
- b. Structure of the System*

2. THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR AND PRESSURE GROUPS

- a. History*
- b. Role of the Voluntary Sector in Policy*
- c. Pressure Groups*

3. CASE STUDY

- a. Pressure Groups in York*
- b. York Alliance and Coppergate II*

4. CONCLUSION

5. REFERENCES

6. APPENDIX

0. INTRODUCTION

Policy as a concept in itself is an inherent part of life, seen in different forms and manifestations, not only in national governments' administrative structures, but in more simple, daily routines as well. It is a necessary activity of the human intellect (though this can be questioned by more *laissez faire* mentalities) and a basic tool to maintain coherent meaning in all our actions. So it is with policy in the hugely complex matter of conserving the historic environment.

A precise definition of a policy could be 'the statement of principles to be followed in conducting an activity'. It is all very well in motive, but there is a 'catch' in laying out a policy, which is its twin sister: practice. Formulation and implementation of policies are two complementary stages of activity that rely on each other to work successfully and to be meaningful at all. Unfortunately, this necessary symbiosis is not as common to find as we would like. Serious discrepancies between what is intended and what is actually done come about easily; indeed, the practical half accompanying the theoretical half of a policy may be non-existent altogether.

It is with these assumptions that this essay looks at conservation policy, more specifically that of England, and with a particular emphasis on pressure groups, as actors working in the voluntary sphere, sometimes in affecting how policies are formulated, but more often pursuing the rightful implementation of policies on a 'real-life', 'citizen' level. Perhaps the secret ingredient of a policy's success lies in a closer look at these bodies' work.

1. CONSERVATION POLICY IN BRITAIN (ENGLAND)

a. Brief History

Conservation policy in Britain started to take shape following some voluntary initiatives originating in the seventeenth century, which gained momentum in the nineteenth century (see Part 2.a). In terms of legislation, a pioneering bill in Parliament in 1873 by Sir John Lubbock can be said to be the starting point. As some early archaeological legislation was being introduced, the London Survey by London County Council introduced the practice of public ownership to protect threatened buildings, mostly in reaction to the in-roads passing through the city's historic fabric. These first efforts were seen largely as ineffective, even backward, compared to most other European countries (Hunter, 1996, 9). Apart from Diocesan supervision, developed out of a rising trend of religious medieval revival, no comprehensive system of caring for historic buildings had been established, until interwar concerns about development pressures were transformed from vague attempts into stronger action after the

- Second World War. The Town & Country Planning Acts of 1944 and 1947, and later the Civic
- Amenities Act of 1967, were accompanied by a rising profile of the public's heritage consciousness, which has brought us to the conservation system of today.

b. Structure of the System

The legislation for conservation has a two-tier structure, consisting of the statutory Acts of Parliament, and the prescriptive but indirectly statutory Planning Policy Guidance notes (PPGs), and their supplementary regulations, development orders and directions forming the second tier. The principal Parliamentary Acts, to be mentioned here, are the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; the Town & Country Planning Act 1990; and the Historic Buildings and Monuments Act

1953 (as amended) for provisions for grants by English Heritage. PPGs are devolved legal statements, more easily accessible to the public than the Acts, which provide the full statutory and bureaucratic details of the policies. Their accessibility is the lead taken here to use PPG 15 as the guide to unravelling the British policy structure.

PPG 15 is the essential source on heritage, but other PPGs- PPG12 for Development Plans and PPG16 for Archaeology- are also relevant for reference in certain sub-issues. The significance of PPG 15 is understood from its functions described in the guidance itself: guidance to local authorities; explanation of the relationship between planning and other relevant policies; description of policies to be taken into account in preparing development plans; and guidance on individual applications. (The mixture of different types of agencies and groups and their relative roles as set out in PPG 15 can be seen in the Appendix.)

In analysing the structure of British conservation policy, there are some characteristics of PPG 15 worth noting, in my opinion. Firstly, PPG 15 is a central source of information which co-ordinates different bodies and pieces of legislation, and directs local authorities and owners to the relevant bodies when necessary. The distinction of role distribution is a crucial ingredient of a successful policy structure, and it is addressed thoroughly in the British legislation. In PPG 15, matters 'most directly related to the planning system', in reference to the Department of Transport, Environment and the Regions (DETR), and matters 'less directly linked to the planning system' in reference to the Department of Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) are explained in separate parts. The relationships of different bodies in acting together on various matters are set out, including consultation and confirmation of each other's decisions. The degrees of attention or regard required of local authorities, ranging from open-ended suggestions to special attention to be paid and exacting standards to be applied, are also laid out to show the extents of responsibility that local authorities will feel. Inter-legislation compatibility is also pointed out wherever relevant (eg. Section 3.26).

Secondly, the explanatory, educational passages assist throughout the guidance. In different places, a summary of an issue, a discussion of some concepts (eg fixtures and curtilage), or an introduction to the principles is made, leaving the rest to the authorities' own judgment. The flexibility left for manoeuvre and the element of trust in the good practice is admirable, and also reflects the recognition of the fact that every conservation case has unique characteristics. At the same time, the annex containing guidance on alterations to buildings provides quite a deep level of detail to which to refer. So the flexible generality and available detail together encompass the range which local authorities would seem to need in making their decisions. It really does total justice to being a guidance, and the compilation of such a 'legible', 'usable' document may indicate an important aspect of a successful policy structure.

There are some significant attitudes inherent in the system revealed in PPG 15. The basic assumption that compatibility of development with the historic environment overrides profitability (Section 3.9), whenever a fine line has to be drawn, is one of these. This does not imply rejecting the worth of development, but rather a protective attitude. Another is the measures of enforcement toward breaches of listed building and conservation area controls. Not granting consent to recognise a *fait accompli* (3.42) as a deterring measure of enforcement is a good way to keep the deviations of practice from policy under check. This is an aspect of statutory mechanisms, which work alongside other, namely voluntary, efforts to ensure successful implementation of policies.

2. *THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR*

a. *History*

Seventeenth and eighteenth centuries' antiquarianism in Britain was the source of early pleas for a system of conservation. But it was only successful to a limited degree, because of the need for a wider segment of educated population to be involved. This happened in the nineteenth century, with an increase in the number of antiquarian bodies. Although not drawing a great reaction from the Society of Antiquaries, excessively interventionist restorations of monuments were protested with an ability to arouse public opinion in the late nineteenth century with the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. The founding of the National Trust, based on the work of the Commons Preservation Society, also coincided with this time. Meanwhile, a cultural shift was occurring, toward romanticism, with a loss of confidence in the high hopes of Victorian industrialism. Feeling of national identity, parallel to the notion of national antiquities was growing, as tourist attractions sprung up. Twentieth century concerns related to development and war damage led to the founding of the Georgian Group in 1937, the Civic Trust in 1957, the Victorian Society in 1958, SAVE Britain's Heritage in 1975 (see Figure 2) and the Thirties Society (now the Twentieth Century Society) in 1979. The growth of a mass culture, demand for visitor attractions, 'commercialisation' of leisure, first with the coming of the railways, then increasing car ownership in the twentieth century eventually led to what is now a full heritage industry, and a closely associated leisure industry (Hunter, 1996,1-2).

The voluntary sector shows a strong foundation of development in Britain, looking at the fact that legislative action remained comparatively weak, while voluntary initiatives were predominant in the early years of this century (Hunter, 1996, 9). In this country, while having been guided by prominent individual personalities, like Sir John Lubbock, William Morris or Sir John Betjeman, conservation seems to have been a 'bottom-up', grass-roots movement from the start.

b. *Role of the Voluntary Sector in Policy*

The British voluntary sector already has an illustrious track record for having introduced the notion of national heritage conservation. This head start is reflected still in the multiple roles allocated to it in the legislation (see Part 2.b.i below), the abundance of both national and local voluntary organisations, and the public profile that the built heritage holds: an opinion poll in 1993 indicated that a high proportion of the population sees historic buildings as part of the British way of life, and approves of funds to protect them (Hunter, 1996,1).

Voluntary groups have contributions to make in both the formulation and implementation of conservation policy. They support both of these aspects by creating awareness among the general population and public authorities, as well as a climate of public opinion that will influence decisions in the long term; by various educational activities targeting different segments of society; and by building a network of preservation activists as a resource for the future.

Their involvement in formulation aspects is in the form of drafting bills; lobbying legislative bodies and rallying public support for adoption of policies, laws and funding favouring conservation; and legislative guardianship against laws unfriendly to conservation.

Implementation is the wider area of operation for voluntary groups, sometimes as advocates in urging

a response from the public and private sectors, and sometimes as direct participants. Fund-raising and campaigning are indispensable methods in pro-active conservation work.

Sometimes voluntary groups may become 'serious' in their activities, when they undergo a transition into professional structures with paid staff, or exercise property management by acquisition, ownership, operation of property, and entering into the real estate market where they purchase and sell endangered property on a revolving fund basis. This aspect is also contained in the legislation (see Part 1.b).

i. A selection of the voluntary sector's roles as referred to in PPG15

Amenity bodies and members of the public, as well as local authorities, are cited as a target audience for PPG 15 guidance. Responsibility of stewardship is shared by everyone, including business and voluntary bodies and individual citizens (Section 1.7).

Consultation is given a key role in many processes of policy forward planning and development control. Advisory groups, in various combinations of local residents, businesses, interests, chambers of commerce, national and local amenity societies, and specialist experts are required to assist in determining conservation area designation criteria (2.9), in preparing development plans (2.10), in formulating policies for conservation areas (4.10 and 4.13), in additions to statutory lists (6.8). Consultation with the national amenity societies are also contained within DETR Circular 14/97. Programmes for advertisement policies (4.35) are to be developed jointly with local businesses. Additionally, members of the public may ask the Secretary of State for CMS to make directions for urgent works to unlisted buildings in conservation areas (7.5).

Other functions of voluntary groups are described as cooperating with local authorities in historic building purchase, repair and funding by charitable or community ownership (3.11); regular 'street audits' for streetscape maintenance, with help from local amenity societies (5.16); and information-based duties, where national amenity societies are notified of de-listing proposals (Section 6.26). Notification and displays of notices are a valuable tool in communication of implemented procedures.

c. Pressure Groups

i. What are pressure groups?

This is not a firm concept. In defining pressure groups, the importance of economic roles as opposed to shared values is hotly debated. An accepted definition on pressure groups reads as 'any group which articulates a demand that the authorities in the political system [...] should make an authoritative allocation....such groups do not themselves seek [...] positions of authority' (Kimber and Richardson, 1974, 2-3 in Rydin, 1993, 229).

From my own experience, relatively little accumulation of literature on 'pressure groups' has occurred, as opposed to non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the voluntary sector in general. This may partly be accounted for by the 'pressure' factor. There are obviously many causes that need to be advocated constantly over long, indefinite periods of time, such as cultivating awareness, or changing public sentiment; however, these kinds of motives are perceived as positive things to be promoted in a so-called 'peaceful' way. On the other hand, many of the causes that are taken up by pressure groups need an extra edge, an insistence if you like, to persuade or dissuade another party from taking a certain action. It is frequently an urgent case, and the pressure group formations tend to come and go with the lifespan of whatever hot issue they are chasing. As we may see in the case study on York, the opposition group that has formed has done so due to the development that they are fighting. They may

not continue to exist after the application matter is settled (see again York 2000, Part 3.a).

Pressure groups are about people acting and speaking out for aspects of their own living spaces, and in this case, their heritage. It involves the way people feel and think about the environment and heritage. The virtue in their existence is setting the relationship of policy and the people for whom the policy is designed. As Yvonne Rydin says in her book (Rydin, 1993, 235) "the nature of local community experience centred around the home has not been adequately reflected in the organisation of political parties, even at local government level, leading to an organisational vacuum. When development pressures threaten that local experience, community groups arise."

A part of the wider circle of pressure groups, which actually include pro-development lobbies, are anti-development groups, defined as locally-based groups in opposition to a specific development proposal. Major examples of these were anti-motorway campaigners in the 1970s (see again York 2000, part 3.a), groups known as NIMBYists (Not In My Backyard) in the 1980s, and tenant organisations against sale of their estates in the 1990s. Anti-development groups are said to have a limited purpose and geographical area of activity, as well as a limited life-span, although able to become a broader-based amenity group (once again, see York 2000, Part 3.a). They are also said to be focused on local rather than central government (Rydin, 1993, 235).

ii. National Amenity Societies

While there are non-profit organisations, such as the National Trust, who have never acted as pressure groups, many organisations working in the voluntary sector, who are not by nature pressure groups, may become involved in pressure group work. National amenity societies are the most obvious example to this. Among their other responsibilities, applying their joint influence on local authorities who fail to notify them on related applications is in every way an exercise in pressure group work. Although the Department of ETR is the guard against such behaviour, the low priority that conservation has down the line of the policy hierarchy prevents it from being enough of a force, thus necessitating voluntary sector pressure.

'Amenity' is one of the key concepts in British town planning, although not defined in the legislation. The historic nature of urban landscapes is seen as a high level of amenity (Rydin, 1993). This high regard, coupled with the conditions prevalent when listed building consent came into force with the Town & Country Planning Act of 1968, i.e. the lack of sufficient expert staff under local authorities, provided the right ground for national amenity societies to become principal advisors in heritage matters. Thus, a sum of £150,000 has been annually distributed by the Department of CMS among the paid caseworker(s) of each body (the Ancient Monuments Society, the Council for British Archaeology, the Georgian Group, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, the Victorian Society and the Twentieth Century Society), who operate through a network of volunteers to tackle applications.

The establishment of conservation officers in local authorities theoretically ended the necessity of national amenity societies, but as we see, this has not been the case, and they are still very busy tending to matters of the historic environment. Their legitimacy must stem from the specialisation and thus the authority of each in their chosen area, rooted in decades' worth of experience, but probably most fundamentally, their pure, 'un-vested' interest in protecting the heritage. Although conservation officers are well-meaningly appointed for conservation, both the multi-faceted nature of town planning matters circulating within the walls of council buildings, and the intermingling of powerful, 'higher-statured' forces in the chain of commands, in pursuit of other 'facets' of land use and planning, can be a serious obstacle in proper treatment of listed building and planning applications. As a result, amenity societies inevitably face the prospect of being activists.

3. CASE STUDY

a. York

York has an early history of pressure group formation. The story of how Bootham Bar was saved, in the nineteenth century, by public resistance is an earmark in the city's civic history; it involved people protesting the attempts to take it down, led by William Etty, who endures with his statue in Exhibition Square today. The movement evolved into the York Footpath Society, which continued to be active until the end of that century. This society, which was also responsible for the creation of the walking circuit around the city walls, can be said to represent the embryonic stage of pressure group presence in York.

Some notable pressure group activity in York occurred in the 1970s, following the national pattern (see Part 2.c.i). A group called York 2000 was responsible, during 1973-4, for effective opposition to a dual carriageway, inner ring road (see Part 2.c). The group evolved into a permanent organisation, the York Committee for the Promotion of Planning, which acted as a heritage watchdog, discussing planning applications and was recognised by the Council. When advisory committees developed, this organisation faded out of the conservation scene.

The most notable societies acting as pressure groups in York are the Yorkshire Architectural and York Archaeological Society (YAYAS) (1842), whose activities include lectures, excursions and publications, including the York Historian, and the York Georgian Society (YGS) (1939), the second to be founded outside London, active in sponsoring lectures, visits with integrated social and educational aims, and being notified of planning matters involving historic buildings, such as the fight to save Café Andros (see Part 3.b). In 1979, the Society helped in founding the Yorkshire Buildings Preservation Trust, which engages in restoration projects, such as a successful campaign for upgrading the listing status of Elmswell Old Hall, Driffield. The Yorkshire Philosophical Society (YPS) (1835) and the York Civic Trust (YCT) also hold some activities. The York Natural Environment Trust (YNET) and the River Foss Society are voluntary groups active in wildlife issues.

The societies are quite well represented on the City Council's Conservation Area Advisory Committee, which formally brings together the heritage groups and has nominees of RIBA, the Society of Antiquarians, YAYAS, YCT, YGS and YPS. A parallel committee operates for nature and environment matters, forming the second of the two areas with separate specialist advisors. Apart from this, the societies go their own way, having their own regular agendas to tend to. However, they do get into heightened communication in special cases, such as that of Coppergate II. Their cooperation is similar to the national amenity societies' joining forces in necessary cases (see National Amenity Societies, Part 2.c.ii).

York City Council is known to stay on a re-active rather than pro-active level in conservation, solely offering advice when it is sought by citizens, and having no published material on the heritage subject. In fact, at this moment in time, there is no appointed Conservation Officer in the Council. This is all mainly a result of their lack of resources, and presents an opportunity for the community groups in York to fill the gap. However, relationships of the City Council with Advisory Committee members are not usually very enthusiastic, as we see can be the case in inter-body involvement in policy.

b. Coppergate II and the York Alliance

Coppergate II, the latest large-scale planning event in York, is a development proposal for a very large shopping and mixed-use complex on the site of the Castle and Clifford's Tower, seen by some as an answer to the out-of-town shopping malls that have sprung up around York. It is a continuation of the Coppergate I, a scheme of shopping and leisure development, which was realised in 1986 with widespread public support. The project started in 1991, with the preparation of a design brief (as advised in PPG 15, 4.18 for important 'opportunity' sites), and an invitation to several architectural firms for a competition, ultimately won by Terry Farrell & Partners. After a long period of quiet market conditions, it was registered in March 1998, discussed by Council officers in May 1998, to be withdrawn for revision in July, and was resubmitted in October. Principal changes requested were the retention of Café Andros, a Grade II listed building on the site, and the inflection of the facade of the new building. The revised proposal was submitted, only to spur yet more dissatisfied controversy, and a difficult planning decision was taken recently, in December 1998, to refuse the proposal in its present form. The scheme has been characterised by constant public disapproval, relating to its insufficient regard for its sensitive historic and urban setting. The case study centres on a pressure group called the York Alliance, which formed during the revision stages, and was influential in the final refusal.

Café Andros was saved independently of the York Alliance, but this was similarly a product of widespread public opposition, and the likely effect of a widely-circulated leaflet originating from Alison Sinclair, member of the York Georgian Society. The York and Humberside branch of English Heritage also presented their objections, largely related to the urban design aspects.

The York Alliance is an informal group of individuals, all opposing the Coppergate II scheme for a variety of reasons; former city planning officers, planning consultants, architects, engineers and artists are included in it. It is typical in its single-issue focus and sudden stimulus into formation. The objections it raised have overlapped with other voluntary York groups' opinions, which materialise into five aspects:

1. Traffic and pollution problems to arise out of the proposal's car-parking and access provisions;
2. The economic justification of the proposal, impossible due to departure from development plan policies and detrimental effects on retail commerce, but considered by the Council, whose financial involvement in the scheme blurred the argument of "what is good for York";
3. The wildlife of River Foss and the landscape that was to be affected by the proposal;
4. The scale and design of the proposal, which was a departure from design brief; and
5. The historic setting of the development site, damaged by excessive projecting distances and proximity of the proposal which crowded the Grade I listed Georgian buildings of the Castle Museum, and overpowered Café Andros.

In these arguments, a 'third-way' possibility was constantly reiterated, as opposed to a choice between shopping and conservation. The concept of development was not the problem, but the over-ambitious size of it.

The York Alliance resorted to a number of strategies. Visual material showing the effects on the site were displayed during public consultation exhibits, neighbourhood forums and Council meetings. A petition prepared by York Alliance had a huge response, reflecting how people had a long history of association with the site and felt a strong attachment.

A call-in application was made to the Secretary of State for ETR. The six national amenity societies,

and their local counterparts, (i.e. York's own pressure groups) were asked by the York Alliance to join their call-in request. The case was already expected to go to the Secretary of State, as suggested by the editorial of the Yorkshire Post of June 17, 1998, for its size and sensitivity. There were good reasons put forth for it, which were the more than local importance of the site, the involvement of the Council in the proposed scheme, and the application exceeding the footprint directed in the Council's design brief. The fact that since about two years ago, York had been leading an anti-car traffic policy consisting of strict controls and a park & ride scheme, was also an issue that questioned the consistency in policy of accepting this proposal with its heavy provision of car-parking.

The idea of contacting council members directly was dwelt on. (This resembles an act of lobbying, in the effort to influence authorities in any way possible.) Although this was not a significant line of advance, contact with media was quite central to the networking activities, especially through the Readers' Letters forum provided by the Evening Press newspaper, and advertising space considered to be used in this newspaper. The media issue can remind us that as a very current and fertile area of inter-personal and inter-organisational communication in our day, it is an important resource to draw on, in strengthening the bonds holding voluntary sector and pressure group work.

The Planning Committee meeting for the decision was scene to passionate pleas by local representatives organised through contact with the York Alliance, who presented the issues of objection, the counter-stories of the developer representatives, and questions directed at all speakers. A group of students from the King's Manor joined in supporting the opposing side, with visual slogans. The university contribution to this pressure group action was thus also provided.

While this case study was being followed, it was still not resolved. The sensation of living through it was exhilarating, and eventually becoming involved in it, I personally felt the energy of having the chance to influence the outcome of events. I think it was a taste of what drives people into this kind of dynamic mode of action, which, while less stable in organisation than institutionalised structures, compensates with its energy and cohesive force. Now it is for the most part resolved, awaiting the full City Council decision in January 1999, the odds for which are that the refusal will hold through. A retrospective question that can be asked is: "how much influence did the community pressure really have on the ultimate planning decision?" From the atmosphere of the decision meeting, it is not an exaggeration to say that public opinion expressed in many forms and in close proximity in the meeting had some effect. Although financial factors could have succeeded at the end, at the expense of heritage policy in York, the force coming from the 'bottom up' together with the authoritative disapproval of English Heritage, proved to be as powerful.

Parallels between York 2000 and the York Alliance are immediately drawn. Will the pattern of evolution repeat itself, and will the York Alliance continue? The local authority's own conservation advisory mechanisms are well-established now, so the necessity of a group such as what York 2000 became is no more applicable. However, it has been demonstrated that the anti-development, lobbying aspect of a pressure group is still quite valid. A new role, between that of a statutory advisor and an explosive, single-event project, may very well be defined for the future. Perhaps this way, the organisational vacuum in the local community experience pointed out by Rydin (see Part 2.c.i) can find a channel of fulfilment.

4. CONCLUSION

The legislation and the history of British practice of conservation, as commented in this essay, afford strong candidates for elements of successful conservation policy. At some points, the interlacing of forces into co-ordinated processes in development control is demonstrated; at other points, ways to find feasible and economic ways of preserving historic buildings 'in need' were indicated. A special point to examine, in my view, is how support mechanisms have evolved in critical parts of the system, where the practical realisation of formulated policies is vulnerable to overbearing influences. These support mechanisms may not have roots in the official policy framework, but their continuing function shows that there is a place for them in that framework after all. Although pressure groups are not formally represented in official documents, their presence is felt considerably, in civic, professional and 'mixed-sector' platforms. With their work, the products of much research, contemplation and discussion can reach their intended targets more effectively. *Effectiveness*, I think, is the key word for this essay. If a policy is realistic, bound for success and deserving to exist not just inside intellectual minds but also in the dynamic and tangible world, then it must also have the ability to provoke natural responses not pre-designed theoretically. It must be interactive. In a way, it must be alive. The understanding and conscious, willing application of conservation policies by the citizen, in short, the response of the people, is as sure a way of knowing the effectiveness of a policy as we will ever have.

Carrying on from these ideas, I would like to say that ensuring the complete and correct implementation of policies through inciting public enthusiasm for exercising those policies, and a widely representative, interactive system of public involvement are crucial ingredients for a good conservation policy. Openness to modification by feedback from the broader base of the public ensures adaptability for the future; and after all, this is what the survival of biological species has depended on since the beginning of life...

5. REFERENCES

a. Book form

- Denhez, M. and S.N.Dennis. 1997. *Legal and Financial Aspects of Architectural Conservation: The Smolenice Castle Conference*, Dundurn Press
- Hunter, M. (ed.) 1996. *Preserving the Past: The Rise of Heritage in Modern Britain*. Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd. (Gloucestershire), pp.1-2
- Rydin, Y. 1993. *The British Planning System: An Introduction*. MacMillan Press (Hampshire)
- York Georgian Society. 1998. *Annual Report*. The King's Manor (York)

b. Pamphlet form

- Department of the Environment, Department of National Heritage. 1994. *Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment*, Her Majesty's Stationery Office
- Articles from the Evening Press, Yorkshire Post and Star newspapers, January-December 1998
- Notes taken during Guildhall Neighbourhood Forum, December 2, 1998, and Planning Committee meeting, December 10, 1998 (contribution courtesy of William Hobday)

c. Through personal communications

- Alison Sinclair, member of the York Georgian Society.
- Jane Grenville, former Caseworker for the Council for British Archaeology

6. APPENDIX

An overview of the responsible bodies and their roles in the light of PPG 15

Central government:

- The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sports (CMS): General legislative and policy framework; listing of buildings and scheduling of ancient monuments; deciding applications for scheduled monuments; and the funding of main heritage agencies.
- The Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and Regions (ETR): Deciding called-in applications and appeals, in consultation with Secretary of State for CMS.

National Bodies:

- English Heritage: General duties of securing preservation and promotion of the historic environment; advice to central government on statutory lists, grants and loans, register making; listed building consent applications and appeals, to local government on issues requiring its notification. Acquisition or guardianship of historic property. English Heritage has extensions of power into a great many areas of the policy as a 'quasi-non-governmental body' (QUANGO) (Rydin, 1993, 86).
- Other important bodies: the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RHCME) for survey and recording; the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF) for financial assistance on maintenance and preservation of historic properties; distributing National Lottery allocations; the Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF) for giving local non-profit organisations access to capital on a low-interest, 'revolving fund' basis and establishment of; and Church bodies including the Church Commissioners for England, Advisory Board for Redundant Churches, Council for Care of Churches and other bodies sharing roles within the diocesan system of administration.

National professional organisations, maintaining a network of information and cooperation, in a line outside but parallel to the statutory structure:

- Institute of Historic Building Conservation (formerly the Association of Conservation Officers)
- Association of County Archaeological Officers

Local government: Local authorities are given a lot of responsibilities by PPG 15, their foremost role described as securing the conservation of the historic environment and integrating conservation policy with other policies in their areas; as well as designating conservation areas; controlling works and demolitions in the historic environment; and securing and making grants for the repair of historic buildings.

- County Councils in the first tier and
- District or Borough Councils in the second tier are now joined by
- Metropolitan Unitary Authorities, the City Councils, as an intermediate level of administration.

Voluntary bodies:

- National amenity societies: Being notified and consulted by government and advising on relevant aspects of preservation of the heritage (see Part 2); providing specialist expertise beside authorities' own staff or consultants for daily casework or long-term policy formulation; uniting under the Joint Committee of National Amenity Societies
- Other notable bodies: the United Kingdom Association of Building Preservation Trusts; the Garden History Society; and the Civic Trust.

*Pressure groups are
not mentioned.*