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ABSTRACT

In this policy-relevant thesis, the findings also revealed implications in conservation practice. Conservation importance takes precedence over the importance of Accessibility in the regulative framework of development control process, although Accessibility is placed with some importance. This is the main result of the findings from a triangulated study using a Single Case study to validate the findings obtained from the Survey Method using Interviews and Delphi Method conducted on the mechanisms of development processes on the Development Control Process in England and Wales.

Accessibility to Historic and Listed Public Buildings involves the practice of conservation, which is accommodating the needs of disabled people to access and use of the facilities provided in historical premises. The implications also include aspects of design, management and operations of the historic building and its services. My study took into account the Accessibility and Inclusive Design development in the United Kingdom since the start of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 until 2005 when the data collection stage was completed. This was when governmental initiatives to include disabled people in mainstream public activities were implemented by the adoption of the Social Model of Disability in U.K. government policies, the establishment of the rights based legislation and the creation of influential financial support for the active reusing of historic buildings by including access plans in applications for the Heritage Lottery Fund.

Concurrently, the efforts in adding the value of accessibility to existing historic buildings in many urban regenerated areas in England and Wales involved the stakeholders, local government, the client and their representatives to the development process including heritage service providers. The research aim of my thesis is to ascertain whether the mechanisms used in the development control process and the non development control process were able to contribute in achieving accessibility to historic public buildings in England and Wales.
CHAPTER 1
Defining the Issues of Accessibility in Historic and Listed Public Buildings in England and Wales

1.1 Introduction

Heritage tourism is recognised as a major tourism resource in the United Kingdom as “the backbone of our tourism industry” (DCMS and DTLR, 2001). However, disabled people are under-represented as visitors to the built heritage (PLB Consulting Ltd, 2001), and in 2003 the English Heritage estimated that only 8 to 9 per cent of visitors to its properties are disabled people. The percentages did not truly reflect the number of disabled people represented in the U.K., in addition to the benefits that an inclusive built heritage could bring to other disadvantaged visitors and users.

One person in five is disabled (11.7 million) in the UK and that, a further 18 million people would benefit from improved access to public spaces. This includes older people, families with young children and people with temporary or health-related impairments.

(ODPM, 2003)

With the advent of an urban renaissance agenda and sustainable development in the United Kingdom (Hobson, 2004), regeneration projects were created and funded “to realise the huge potential of historic buildings to contribute to the vitality of towns throughout the UK” (HLF, 2007). In order to establish ‘social equity’, which is one of the main components of sustainable development, the Government reviews had been persistent to achieve this objective within the bigger aim of social inclusion in urban communities (DCMS, 2003).

Disabled people were excluded in heritage tourism due to policies, practices and values of professionals for operating in ways that are inattentive to the end users (Imrie, 2001a; English Heritage, 1995). In terms of Accessibility, many historic buildings that had been listed and designated for development control were found to have “absence of strong regulatory controls” (Imrie and Hall, 2001a; Goodall, 2004). These regulatory controls
were identified as one of the factors that influenced the extent of accessibility in historic buildings.

The frame of reference for this thesis research was based on the idea that processes in development control relating to regulations would influence whether a historic building would eventually be inclusive and accessible. Hence, the research investigations were generally focused on two areas of concern: (i) Accessibility and inclusive policies; and (ii) Conservation practice, including those existed in the Listing Control, Planning Control and Building Control systems.

The key duty for development control of historic buildings is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 along with the circulars, planning policy guidance and standards that are referred to by the 1990 Act. In 1995, the UK Government established a rights-based legislative key duty which is the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. Therefore, these two key duties, the 1990 Act and DDA 1995 were the two main legislative policies interpreted in the early stages to launch the UK Government’s agenda in social equity and social inclusion for the built heritage (DCMS, 2003).

Apart from focusing on the key duties, this thesis included investigations on the English and Welsh local authorities’ main regulative enforcing mechanism, the Approved Document Part M Building Regulation. Other investigations included the role of Planning Control and Building Control officers, especially Access Officers who were employed to assist the planning and building control departments and, where available, a Local Access Group that was formed from the local community’s disabled residents, to provide consultation for access to be met.

Conservation of buildings was addressed by the protection accorded in the Listing Control regime, implemented by the Local Authority. The affective mechanism was the guidance outlined in Planning Policy Guidance 15 and 16 in England and in Wales, circulars, interpreted and enforced by Conservation Officers. The objective is to maintain the character of the building but to enable change to keep the building in use (English Heritage, 1995, 2004; CADW, 2002). Interpretation and approach may vary from one authority to another (DCMS, 2003; Ross, 1996), as such is the case with Conservation Practice where the Access Planning Process was quoted in the English Heritage guidance.
The use of the Access Plan was prescribed as a mechanism to ensure the continuity of the objectives in achieving accessibility throughout the project until completion (Adams, 2004b; English Heritage, 1995, 2004).

Another factor that influences the development control process is the non-development control processes. Both are part of the development process, where the reactive process of development control acts in tandem with the proactive process of non-development control. These varied mechanisms and processes will be further explained in Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

1.2. Perspectives and definitions

1.2.1. Disability and accessibility

‘Disability’ is defined in the Disability Discrimination Act, 1995, as:

A physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities

(Disability Discrimination Act, 1995)

This research will also take into account people with temporary impairments and elderly people who have mobility problems, with regards to access to historic buildings and the services provided in them.

‘Accessibility’ is a general term used to describe how easy it is for people to get to, use, and understand things. Accessibility is defined closely with Accessible and Inclusive Design, and used in more of a generic manner. It is arguably easier to use Accessibility when interviewing non-designers or non-technical people. Another common phrase is ‘disabled access’ which is a “…phrase generally used to refer to ramped access for wheelchair users…” (Foster, 1997).

Organisations responsible for the upkeep of UK’s built heritage, the English Heritage, CADW: Welsh Monuments and the National Trust have in place policy statements and guidance on how to integrate access into their properties (English Heritage, 1995, 2004;
CADW, 2002; National Trust, 2008). The Arts Council in England, which is responsible in disbursing grants under the National Lottery and the Heritage Lottery Fund that is the fund for upgrading heritage properties, stated that “the DDA 1995 and 2005, have far-reaching consequences for the arts provider” (Arts Council, 2004) and further emphasised in their guide ‘Action for Access’ (2004) that “we should provide and recognise where changes are needed in attitude, policies and procedures, physical access and access facilities and services,” and it also recognised that “progress cannot be made unless arts organisations embrace the social model of disability. Adopting and understanding the social model is key to opening up access to the art.” Thus, in defining disability, the social model has been used in policy statements by an arts organisation to further reinforce the idea of social inclusion.

On the contrary, the approach by designers and developers were to exclude disabled people’s needs, as Imrie’s (2001a) suggested that “the designers and architects tend to perpetuate aesthetic ideas and practices which are based on one-dimensional conceptions of the human form, and are preoccupied with ornamental and decorative aspects of a building rather than its use.” And within the context of Conservation Practice, “many legal frameworks do little or nothing to influence developers to be pro-active towards meeting the building needs of disabled people, or to educate the property industry about the diversity of people’s bodily capabilities” Imrie (2001a). The social inclusion agenda has yet to be translated into practice as observed further by Imrie (2001a) where, “the legal underpinnings of property development is also a basis for the estrangement or exclusion of disabled people from land and property processes. Access codes and statutes have been established in most countries yet, as a number of observers have noted, they are generally vague and provide regulatory control for substantial new constructions while doing little to regulate access provision in the refurbishment of existing buildings.”

The design process is translated in action in the Listed Building Consent (LBC), where Paul Velluet (formerly of English Heritage) had commented that “a dialogue is established at an early stage on the proposal scheme with the local authorities, architect, owner and surveyor. This is in order for English Heritage and the local authority to be comfortable with the solution (during LBC). Thus, it is important to engage detailed dialogue at an early stage, so that Special Interest (of the building) is established earlier…”

(English Heritage, 1997; Centre for Accessible Environment, 1997)
The issue of ensuring whether the Special Interest in a historic building is preserved and establishing a dialogue earlier to ensure that it is being met is reflected by researchers in the field, where Foster (1997) identified the conflict between social inclusion and conservation practice by suggesting that “the goals of independent and integrated access pose a great threat to the aims of building conservation, since key architectural elements which define a building’s special character or historical interest may typically constitute barriers to access.” Cave (2005) preferred to address access for all, rather than just focusing on disabled people. One of the objectives of this thesis research is to investigate whether disabled people where given a less satisfactory service when it comes to access to historic buildings, as a visitor and a user. However, Foster (1997) further suggested that “if real improvement in the accessibility of historic buildings is to occur, there must be a shift in conservation philosophy which takes into account the social duty to provide access and facilities for disabled people,” which is what this research seek out to examine, as explained further in this chapter.

Additionally, this research focused more on the physical barriers, as suggested by Foster (1997), although the study also investigated communicational barriers. The use of listed historic buildings outlined the problem of design to be balanced and solved by management and communication solutions, as mentioned by Bonnett (2005). Access consultants and inclusive designers were identified as important stakeholders to the preliminary discussions to the process of achieving accessibility to historic buildings and would be useful in the beginning stages of development of a historic building (Centre for Accessible Environments and Royal Institute of British Architects, 2007).

1.2.2. Practice of conservation

The practice of conservation, as suggested by Foster (1997) and further stated by Earl (1997), involved “conservation philosophy (which) is largely concerned with practice – determining precisely how historic buildings should be treated by the practitioner …any system of statutory protection must also, by its very nature, embody contemporary philosophical attitudes.” This further suggests that current society’s perceptions concerning conservation and the built heritage should be taken into account. Conservation
practice may change due to society's pressure and policy changes, which are suggested by developments in the UK (DCMS, 2003).

When referring to Accessibility and the Historic Environment, conservationist and heritage service providers would always refer to the issue of ‘Special Interest of a Historic Building’, in reference to the historic and / or architectural features of the building in question as stated in Planning Policy Guidance 15 (ODPM, 2005c). The Department of the Environment / Department of National Heritage: Planning and the Historic Environment stated that, “It is important, in principle, that disabled people should have dignified easy access to and within historic buildings. It should normally be possible to plan suitable access for disabled people without compromising a building’s special interest” (Corporation of London, no date). The protection of a historic building’s special interest would be the core interest for conservationist involved in the preservation, adaptive re-use that may include the alteration and extension of a heritage property and is clearly backed by statutory control.

The prevalent comments made in previous research suggest (Foster, 1997; Adams, 2004b; Imrie and Hall, 2001a) that the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 cannot override the current statutory control existing in the regulatory framework of conservation practice, and all listed historic buildings are not exempted from LBC. For example, Foster (1997) provided a case whereby a local authority did not grant Listed Building Consent to a local bank in England on a proposed ramp, as the proposal shown had intruded on the special interest of the historic building. Based on that example, Conservation Practice backed by conservation statutory control existing in the regulatory framework will have a considerable impact on Accessibility.

1.3. Research problem

1.3.1. Research questions and hypothesis

The topic of this thesis is “Accessibility to Historic Public Buildings: Planning and Building Control Process in England and Wales.” The basic question that is being posed after the preliminary studies and background research review is:

**Does the importance of Conservation take precedence over the importance of**
Accessibility in the process of developing a Historic and Listed Public Building, from the design stage until completion and post-occupancy?

Additional question: Which evidences existing in current practice in conservation to suggest that proposals submitted for Listed Building Consent approval, from the beginning to completion and post-occupancy, shows that conservation considerations are evidently more important than the inclusion of accessibility needs of disabled people?

The basic question and the additional question were then developed into three research questions:

**Research Question 1 (RQ1):**

1. How does the practice of conservation influence the accessibility of historic and public listed buildings in England and Wales?

Hypothesis 1:
The policies and practice of conservation has an influence on the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales.

Hence, the research objective for this question would further examine the following investigations:

(i) What are the policies of conservation?
(ii) What is the practice of conservation?
(iii) What is the impact made by the practice of conservation on the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings?
(iv) How do the policies and practice of conservation influence the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings?

**Research Question 2 (RQ2):**

2. How does the planning control and building control processes influence accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales?
Hypothesis 2:

The planning control and building control processes influence accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales.

Hence, the research objective for this question would further examine the following investigations:

(i) What are the planning control and building control processes that influence the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings?
(ii) How do these mechanisms that exist in the planning and building control processes influence the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings?
(iii) Have these mechanisms been effective in what they set out to do?
(iv) How and why have these mechanisms been effective or not effective?

Research Question 3 (RQ3):

3. How is the process to include accessibility done within the practice of conservation, and if the importance of conservation takes precedence over the importance of accessibility, how and why did that happen?

Hypothesis 3:

The processes to implement accessibility are effective within the practice of conservation.

Hence, the research objective for this question would further examine the following investigations:

(i) What are the processes to implement accessibility within the practice of conservation?
(ii) Do these processes influence the planning and building control processes?
(iii) How are these processes implemented within the practice of conservation?
(iv) Why are the processes effective or not effective?
By taking the three research questions, forming hypothesis statements and creating objectives under each one, the approach is to provide an investigative framework in different scales. The explanation is provided in detail in Chapter 5 and 6.

Research Question 1 poses a bigger question by reviewing the practice of conservation in general, investigating the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of conservation policies and practice and how the recent introduction of accessibility legislation and policies influences conservation practice.

Research Question 2 refers to the development process, in particular, the planning control and building control processes and how it influences the practice of conservation and accessibility, where the investigation of the main stakeholders, which is the UK Government and the function, which are the regulatory framework executed within the local authorities were examined.

Research Question 3 identifies the processes in more detail by focusing on recommended guidance and mechanisms that the major stakeholders proposed, which in this regard would be the Access Planning Process (English Heritage, 1995, 2004).

Each of the research questions were broken down into identifiable objectives for each of the three research questions. The objectives were addressed in the data collection stage of the thesis described in chapters 7, 8 and 9, which are the Delphi Method, Survey Method using Interviews and a Single Case Study, respectively.

The objectives for Research Question 1 (RQ1) as follows:

1. To examine the practice of conservation and the recent policy changes involving the accessibility and inclusive agenda governing historic buildings.

2. To investigate the impact of both the conservation and accessibility legislation and policies on disabled people’s rights to access and services of historic and listed public buildings.
And for Research Question 2 (RQ2) the objectives are as follows:

1. To examine the planning control and building control processes, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms that enforce the regulatory framework that deals with accessibility and conservation combined and examines the effectiveness of the implementation of these mechanisms.

2. To investigate the role of officers in planning control and building control process when addressing the access needs of disabled people, in local authorities in England and Wales.

As for Research Question 3 (RQ3) the objectives are as follows:

1. To investigate the Access Planning Process existing in a development process of a historic and listed public building in England or Wales.

2. To examine the policies and guidance published by English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments developed to incorporate access for disabled people.

1.3.2. The aim of the research

The aim of the research is to examine the influence of the regulatory framework and development control in the UK system, specifically of Planning Control and Building Control Processes, in the context of Accessibility of Historic and Listed Public Buildings in England and Wales. Listed Building Control is part of Planning Control. Planning and Building Control is only a part of a whole process of developing a project from beginning to completion and occupation. The extent of the accessibility of the building is influenced by the whole development process, including planning, design, post-control and management of the building.
1.3.3. Scope of the research

A MORI\textsuperscript{1} poll conducted in 2004 on visitors of museums and galleries in the U.K. registered that "there are significant numbers of people who feel that physical access is still a challenge – 11% mention the difficulty of getting to or around a museum, whilst 7% cite the distance" \cite{MuseumsLibrariesArchivesCouncil2004}. Museums and galleries are building types that people living in town and cities in the U.K. identify easily and are often the historic buildings that would be the easiest to be converted from its previous use as "one of the best ways is for the (historic) building to be used as a museum or art gallery, because the exhibitions and displays can be adapted in response to the history of the building and to enhance its qualities" \cite{Cave2005}.

Another reason to focus on public buildings is that "arts building are particularly relevant, partly because by being public buildings there is a need to be accessible to a very wide audience and also with museum and art galleries we are dealing with the information as well as the access to the building" \cite{Cave2005}. It is very much to do with the purpose of "seeing things and experiencing things and therefore you have to deal with the whole delivery of the museum has to offer" \cite{Cave2005}. This objective is in keeping with the service provision aspects of Disability Discrimination Acts 1995's code of practice as the legislation is deemed to have a strong impact to the whole development process.

This thesis identified public buildings for the case studies, specifically museums and galleries, as these are the building types that would most probably be funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund.

1.4. Research design

The research design (Figure 1.1) was conceived and structured to accommodate the particular problems with regards to a research that was done in a climate of uncertainty. The Disability Discrimination Act was recently introduced in 1995 and also reforms

\textsuperscript{1} MORI, now called Ipsos MORI, is a leading market research company that regularly conducts surveys with nearly every major industry and work with the world's leading businesses, governments and institutions. Ipsos MORI is the first agency in the world to be accredited to the new ISO 20252 international quality standard for market research.
conducted within the historic environment which recently reported that eventually in April 2009 the UK government will propose a new planning guidance (DCMS, 2008a).

The research design included preliminary studies that were conducted concurrently during the Literature Review stage in order to form the Hypothesis of the research (Figure 1.1)

Figure 1.1: Research Design Diagram
1.5. Structure of the thesis document

Chapter 1 introduces the research and explains the rest of the thesis document. This chapter includes the research questions and hypotheses that will be further explained in detail in Chapter 5.

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 are the literature review chapters. Due to the complexity of combining the two subject areas of conservation and accessibility, the review was divided into three sections. The chapters are exploring the theoretical and the practical implications of the issue of Accessibility to Historic and Listed Public Buildings, dealing with theory, policy and practice.

Chapter 2 – Theory and policy

Chapter 3 – Policy and practice (reactive process)

Chapter 4 – Policy and practice (proactive process)

Chapter 2 focuses on the topic of ‘The Influence of Conservation Theory, Policy and Practice on Accessibility to Historic and Listed Public Buildings in England and Wales’. This chapter deals with conservation theories, policies and practice and how accessibility theories and policies influence the practice of conservation. This includes a literature review on important conservation principles that are put into practice as well as conservation planning policy guidance. It also deals with the impact of rights-based legislation, Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and its accompanying codes of practice and government policies relating to accessibility and inclusion. Additionally, there is a review of the main key policy-makers influence through guidance.

Chapter 3 focuses on the topic of ‘The Reactive Process: Planning Control and Building Control Processes’. The review concentrates on the Planning Control and Building Control Processes, and specifically the function of the Local Authority’s mechanisms that regulates accessibility for disabled people.
Chapter 4 concludes the literature review by focusing on the topic 'The Proactive Process: Access Planning Process and the Role of Consultants'. Access Planning Process is a guided framework of processes and procedure that is being proposed by the English Heritage in order to practice conservation based on accessibility. This also relates to guidance provided by CADW: Historic Welsh Monuments.

The Preliminary Studies in Chapter 5 explains the rationale why preliminary studies were needed to form the hypothesis together with the literature review. This chapter provided primary data collected in the beginning stages of research, which was analysed and summarised to justify the hypothesis.

The Research Methodology in Chapter 6 explains the research hypotheses, research objectives and the research methods in detail. This chapter and chapter 5 forms the 'bridge' between the literature review chapters (2, 3 and 4) and the data analysis chapters (7, 8 and 9), explaining links and justifying why a research method was chosen to collect the essential data for analysis, based on a research design where a theoretical framework was developed.

Chapter 7 is centred around the Delphi Method study analysis and discussions on the findings obtained from a study of aggregated opinions on the thesis's objectives, involving 29 officers from the local authorities in England and Wales. Chapter 8 contains qualitative data analysis from 8 interviews with access consultants, conservation architects and architects involved in the proactive process which is the development process of a historic building. This group which is called the proactive participants to the development process does not include those in the local authority. The proactive participants were involved in the processes before planning application and after construction, where the building is in post-control, management and operations stage.

Chapter 9 which discusses the analysis on the findings from a single case study of a historic and listed public building completes the set of data to be analysed, corroborated and validated in this research. The single case study which provided for a typical case scenario provided evidence to support the assertion that 'Conservation importance did take precedence over the importance of Accessibility in the regulative framework of development control process, although Accessibility was placed with some importance.
The conclusion of the thesis will be discussed in Chapter 10, including the policy implications and contributions of this research to the body of knowledge.

1.6. Summary

The introduction chapter provides an overview to the rest of the thesis document, outlining the main research question and subsequent research questions that form the thrust of the research thesis. The basic research question asked earlier and the perceived debate regarding 'conservation practice versus accessibility' argument will be examined in the subsequent chapters.

The overview earlier asserted that the legislative process based on the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, the regulative process based on the local authority officers and consultants opinion on Conservation Practice and Accessibility and Part M Building Regulations were areas that needed to be studied in more depth in the literature review chapters, in order to produce stronger assumptions and to identify the mechanisms and processes to be examined using the research methods later.
CHAPTER 2

The Influence of Conservation Theory, Policy and Practice on Accessibility to Historic and Listed Public Buildings in England and Wales

2.1 Introduction

Ever since the Disability Discrimination Act was incorporated in 1995, conservation policies had been incorporated with accessibility and inclusive design values and principles as stated in the government reviews (DCMS, 2002; 2003). In the United Kingdom, the millennium started with extensive reviews of the historic environment, including appraisals of the legislative and regulative framework. This effort was conducted by the Department of Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (or previously known by the Department of the Environment (DoE) and Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR) respectively), and other associated statutory bodies, including English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments (DCMS, DTLR, 2001; DCMS, 2003; English Heritage 2004; CADW, 2002; ODPM, 2004).

The first sets of reviews were published, which included:

- Power of Place (English Heritage, 2000)
- The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Future (DCMS, DTLR, 2001)
- People and Places - Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment (DCMS, 2002)
- Protecting Our Historic Environment: Making the System Better (DCMS, 2003)

Consultations were conducted to ascertain the opinions of the public and those affected by the outcome on what they thought of the existing policies. Gradually there emerged policies and guidance that incorporated accessibility and inclusive design principles in the historic environment’s guidance and policies. English Heritage revised the 1995 publication ‘Easy Access to Historic Properties’ into an updated one in 2004, which the latter explained the impact of the DDA 1995 on historic buildings and the consultation

Currently in England, on-going consultation between the different government departments: DCMS, the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG), the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and English Heritage are still in the finalizing stages of the Heritage Protection Reform, the drafting of the Planning Policy Statements and awaiting for the Parliament’s acceptance of the Heritage Reform Bill (DCMS, 2008).

The idea for the Heritage Protection Reform (DCMS, 2007) is to achieve the following objectives:
- To develop a unified approach to the historic environment;
- To maximise opportunities for inclusion and involvement; and
- To support sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system.

The Heritage Protection Reform stemmed from UK Government’s effort in dealing with the limited resources of the country which includes the built heritage. The sustainable development agenda especially the ‘social equity’ as one of the main components, the Government reviews had been persistent to achieve this objective within the bigger aim of social inclusion in the communities (DCMS, 2003). Lobbies by concerned bodies and individuals from user groups and organisations representing disabled people stemmed from activities to promote a social equity model or concept which is the Social Model of Disability geared to challenge social, communication and physical barriers in society, as part of an inclusive environment principle (Oliver, 1983, 1990). Likewise, from the conservation movement, there emerged a conservation theory from the nineteenth century, the principle behind the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings Manifesto (SPAB, 2005) and its subsequent influence of the practice of conservation.

This chapter discusses theories and practices affecting policies, with the purpose of understanding how in the last decade significant changes had occurred within the practice of conservation, as indicated by the Government’s review. This presupposes the argument
that the creation of the theory is indicative of the precursors of change, subsequently informing policy development and formulation to make way for legislation.

Building conservation policy and practice is indirectly linked to building conservation theory. Nothing written in the government’s policies, standards and guidance reflected upon any conservation theory. However in practice, it is evident that theories do exist and implemented consciously or otherwise. A conservation architect interviewed for this research, admitted that his work philosophy is based on the SPAB Manifesto written by William Morris in 1887 (Coath, 2005), which will be explained in Section 2.2.1.

Conversely, accessibility theories and policies developing consecutively albeit two decades later would impose its ideas on conservation practice, such as the insistence of the Heritage Lottery Fund to include Access Plans in the application for historic buildings fund (HLF, 2005a). The influence of accessibility theories and policies is the main purpose of investigation in this section, among other study objectives. Together with this examination, the emergence of policies relating to accessibility in the practice of conservation will also be investigated.

The objectives for this section as derived from Research Question 1 (RQ1), which was mentioned in Chapter 1, are as follows:

1 To examine the practice of conservation and the recent policy changes involving the accessibility and inclusive agenda governing historic buildings.

2 To investigate the impact of both the conservation and accessibility legislation and policies on disabled people’s rights to access and services of historic and listed public buildings.

2.2. Conservation Theory

Since the mid 1970s, there emerged a philosophical debate on the theory of contemporary conservation (Vinas, 2005). The cultural landscape in the UK was confronted with the post-modern movement, which included new ideas in the development of conservation theories and practices, such as adaptive and creative re-use of old buildings. Strange et al.
(2003) stated that, "over the last 30 years conservation activity has been shifting from being characterized as an act of preservation towards being characterized as part of a broader vehicle for urban regeneration and economic development". Similar perceptions were suggested by other authors, when:

Strike (1994) posed that,

It is only in the last thirty years that the 'philosophical' aspects of preservation have entered into the conservation debate. The debate is an on-going process, which is now leading us to recognize that the philosophical aspects form an important part of decisions that have to be made in the field of conservation.

Vinas (2005) further pointed out that,

This decade (1980s) made the notion of post-modernism to be commonplace, with emphasis on many ideas that had a recognizable impact on conservation theory.

The argument for a contemporary theory of conservation is based on the idea that it is influenced by the principle of sustainability, which is regarded as a 'contemporary conceptual tool' (Vinas, 2005). Sustainability which has economic and ecological objectives, is applicable in conservation theory, as pointed out by Vinas (2005), "The economic sustainability of the conservation process has been called for by many authors...though this kind of sustainability is only possible in the case of objects with strong public appeal."

The development of conservation theories started to emerge in the mid 19th century, where conservationists and historians regarded this period's significance particularly in the UK, as suggested by Feilden (2003),

The first statement of principle for conservation was contained in William Morris' 1877 'Manifesto for the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings' (SPAB), which is considered to be the most influential in England.
SPAB was founded, "to counteract the highly destructive 'restoration' of medieval buildings being practised by many Victorian architects" (SPAB, 2005). Before the formation of SPAB, conservation interest had already taken root in the previous century, during the Romantic period in art and architecture. A significant development in the interest of conservation developed after 1849, when John Ruskin had a strong influence over public opinion with his writings. He published two well-known works, firstly, The Seven Lamps of Architecture, followed by The Stones of Venice (Vinas, 2005).

John Ruskin and Eugene Viollet-le-Duc were considered by many authors to be the first true conservation theorists (Vinas, 2005). Viollet-le-Duc who published in 1866 in France, and Ruskin in England had started the foundation of modern conservation theories by their work and influence, subsequently influencing the development of the early 20th century conservation movement development which resulted in the incorporation of the listing of historic monuments after the Second World War.

This resulted in what the historians called the 'Arts and Crafts Movement' in England in the last 30 years of the 19th century and the early 20th century, and subsequently, the establishment of amenities societies, such as SPAB. Other amenities societies were established later. The National Trust for England, including Wales and Northern Ireland, was founded in 1895 to counter threats of unchecked development and destruction of old buildings at the Lake District. The Victoria County Histories were begun in 1904, and the Royal Commissions' inventories of historical monuments in 1908. The Ancient Monuments Society was formed in 1924 as a defense against the many concrete constructions and destruction of historic structures in the early Modern Movement period in the 1920s. The Georgian Group was formed in 1937 to counter the destruction of mostly Georgian buildings (Pearce, 2005).

The conservation movement had to wait until the Second World War was over before any effort was made to protect the built heritage. The Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act was the first piece of legislation for the conservation movement in Britain incorporated in 1953 and the listing of historic buildings and ancient monuments began, but it was not until 1968, when the introduction of the Town and Country Planning Act solved the problem of indiscriminate destruction of historic buildings by implementing the
Listed Building Consent, a compulsory procedure of the planning approval system within the local government’s regulative structures.

2.2.1. Managing Change

Conservation was defined as an “action to secure the survival or preservation of buildings, cultural artifacts, natural resources, energy or any other thing of acknowledged value for the future”, and where buildings or artifacts are involved, such actions “should avoid significant loss of authenticity or essential qualities” (BS 7913:1988).

Conservation was also considered as the art of managing change. The 20th Century and the beginning of the new millennium saw the development of legislation and regulation that introduced a range of modern amenities, services, upgrading of comfort and modern standards to suit contemporary lifestyle needs including the need for disabled people’s physical access. Theoretically, a museum that was built in the 19th century still needed to change and adapt into a museum that complied with the requirement of the 20th century. In terms of physical access, this could result in a number of changes. Therein lies the conflict whereby the conservationists and the conservation professionals need to contend with.

“The work of SPAB in preserving traditional craft skills underpins the current revival in the use of lime mortars and other traditional repair techniques. Their influence on conservation in the UK today cannot be overstated” (Pearce, 2005). When SPAB was founded, the reaction was against the destruction of medieval buildings by Victorian architects, however in the 21st and the 20th century, it was regarded that SPAB’s manifesto is part of the training of conservation architects, which principles found in the manifesto are followed in practice (Coath, 2005).

SPAB’s manifesto urge their proponents to “resist all tampering with either the fabric or ornament of the building as it stands,” and if the building is not convenient for it’s present use, “to raise another building rather than alter or enlarge the old one” (SPAB, 2005). A principle influencing the idea of ‘keep’ rather than ‘change’, which is the main principle that lasted and developed into the traditional conservation principle and thus creating the philosophical debate until today. This was the only approach to be deemed acceptable and
the manifesto continued, “thus only we can protect our ancient buildings, and hand them
down instructive and venerable to those that come after us” (SPAB, 2005).

However, conservation is a broader term compared to preservation, rehabilitation and
restoration, as conservation could also define as "the action necessary to preserve anything
of acknowledged value" (Dundee University, 2008). As such, it can also embrace
completely new work, without historical precedent, making the term particularly suited to
areas rather than buildings or artefacts. On the other hand, preservation is defined as
“work undertaken only when necessary to ensure the survival of original fabric. No new
work or addition is involved” (Dundee University, 2008). Rehabilitation is defined as “the
process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which
makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features
of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values” (US
Department of the Interior, 2008). Whereas restoration is defined as “the alteration of a
buildings structure or fabric to return it to the state or condition it was in at a particular
point in its history. Such work is often conjectural” (Dundee University, 2008).

2.3. Conservation Policy

Recent developments showed the historic environment as an important part of the
Government’s agenda on changes to improve the government’s system of governance,
cultural identity and the heritage tourism industry’s earning potential (DCMS, 2003). Such
changes are made, by reviewing the legislative framework. The efforts in sustainable
development and policies on social inclusion formed soon after along with the DDA
(DRC, 2005; CABE, 2006) have invariably influenced policies for the historic
environment in the early 2000s, as reflected in an introductory quote from a DCMS
(2003).

Initially, the review on the legislation was preceded two years earlier by reports on the
policies of the historic environment. DCMS (2003), stated that,

In December 2001, the Department (DCMS) and the DTLR (whose relevant
responsibilities have now passed to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister)
jointly published ‘The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Future.’ This is the
The coming together of DCMS and ODPM marked a significant development whereby the challenges related to the historic environment were answered in conjunction with the local government and planning issues. The review included the contents and instructions, such as planning policy guidance and procedures, the listing process, designation of the processes and other planning aspects affecting the historic environment, such as consents and approval. In 2004, the House of Commons report by the ODPM’s Housing, Planning, Local Government and the Regions Committee on “The Role of Historic Buildings in Urban Regeneration” proposed ODPM to have more control on running the historic environment (House of Commons, 2004), coinciding with the emergence of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, reaffirming ODPM’s central role in developing the historic environment. Further discussion on conservation policies will be given in more detail in Chapter 3.

2.3.1. Planning Policy Guidance

Listed Building Consent (LBC) is the principal control regime that provides for the designation of listing. Listing is applied when ‘individual buildings and structures of special architectural or historic interest are assessed individually and thematically against national criteria...such as age, rarity and architectural merit.’ The legislative and regulatory basis backed by statute is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, with the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG15) in England (DCMS, 2003), and the National Assembly in Wales working on revising the Welsh Office Circulars 68/96 and 1/98, which provided ‘listing criteria and guidance on planning considerations and enforcement relating to the historic environment’. The listing process has recently been taken over by the English Heritage in 2005, but still needs to refer to the Secretary of State of Culture in DCMS.

Historically, the UK government provided guidance for the identification and protection of historic buildings within the planning system by the introduction of the PPG 15, by explaining the role of the planning system in their protection, while complementing the guidance on archaeology and planning given in Planning Policy Guidance 16 (PPG 16). In
certain cases, such as collieries and castles, relate to the designation of the Schedule of Monuments, the principal controlling regime is by the Notification Procedures. PPG 16 refers to the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

Recent Government’s Review on the ‘management and control items on the list’, which concerns listed buildings, was stated by DCMS (2003),

Under the current system, owners of listed buildings are required to obtain consent for demolition or for any works, which alter their property in a way, which might materially affect its character. Local authorities are responsible for deciding such applications and deciding whether particular works require consent (subject to consultation with English Heritage for grade I and II* buildings). They are guided by the policies set out in PPG 15. The objective is to maintain the character of the building but to enable change to keep the building in use. Interpretation and approach may vary from one authority to another.

PPG 15 and PPG 16 are used in England and Welsh Office Circulars 68/96 and 1/98 in Wales by local authorities, owners of listed buildings applying for LBC, heritage service providers, conservationists and conservation professionals. Local authorities were given the role to be the steward of the historic environment on behalf of the Government. The conservation officer and planning officer are the main decision-makers when it comes to giving permission for Listed Building Consent, Scheduled Monument Consent and Planning Approval for listed buildings.

The PPGs are also under review based on the report by DCMS (2003), which states that,

The Government is separately taking forward a number of other initiatives that are likely to have implications for the historic environment…include the review of Planning Policy Guidance Notes 15 and 16, a review into the scope for integrating the present array of controls in a single consent regime (the unification exercise) and a review into the scope for standardising the existing administrative procedures relating to applications for planning permission, listed building consent and conservation area consent in terms of the standardisation exercise.
2.4. Conservation Practice

The Government’s reviews and documents, including standards, guidance and policies are careful not to make any direct reference to any manifesto, ideal, model, philosophy or theory. This is emphasized in BS 7913:1998, *Guide to the Principles of the Conservation of Historic Buildings*, whereby it is quoted that,

*It should be recognized that the principles enunciated neither conform precisely to any previous manifesto or charter, nor are they intended to be definitive or prescriptive.*

However, it is commonly accepted that ‘practice’ is the product of a system that had been following certain principles and guidance, as mentioned earlier. The principles that were introduced by the SPAB’s manifesto, arguably had been carried forward by those in practice and in the continuing conservation movement, such as the principle of reversibility as stated in PPG 15’s policy (ODPM, 2004). Although BS 7913 had stated that no manifesto is followed, the following quote would indicate otherwise, as in BS 7913:1998:8,

*All significant work should be preceded by thorough documentary research and physical investigation. Where possible, work should be reversible, with a minimum of damage.*

SPAB’s manifesto is based on the central idea of leaving the building as it is, preserving exactly what is found and has evolved this idea in practice and reflected in the principle of reversibility (ODPM, 2004).

In conservation practice, the observation of removing or altering parts of the historic building is reflected in the principle of reversibility, that any intervention must be the minimum necessary. It should be reversible – or at least repeatable, and not prejudice possible future interventions.

(Feilden, 2003)
Feilden (2003) further explained that, "Reversibility is the concept of carrying out work to a building, part of a building or artefact in such a way that it can be reversed at some future time, with only minimal damage having been done to the fabric." Furthermore, BS 7913:1998, gives the definition of reversibility as, "Concept of work to a building, part of a building or artefact being carried out in such a way that it can be reversed at some future time, without any significant damage being done." The Government’s definition of this principle, shown in the standards, and that of conservationists are the same, but when translated in practice, has been shown to be negotiable (with the local authority officers), especially when dealing with grade I and grade II* listed buildings (Coath, 2005).

PPG 15 (ODPM, 2004) stated, that “disabled people should have dignified easy access to and within historic buildings...and it should normally be possible to plan suitable access for disabled people without compromising a building’s special interest”. Vinas, 2005, had stated that in the Burra Charter, which is a “guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance” (ICOMOS, 2004) the principle of reversibility had been criticized. This view is being moderated with the Venice Charter (ICOMOS, 2004) where it is stated,

The process of restoration is a highly specialized operation. Its aim is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument and is based on respect for original material and authentic documents. It must stop at the point where conjecture begins, and in this case moreover any extra work which is indispensable must be distinct from the architectural composition and must bear a contemporary stamp. The restoration in any case must be preceded and followed by an archaeological and historical study of the monument.

(ICOMOS, 2004)

ICOMOS, which is ‘The International Council on Monuments and Sites’ is an association of professionals on conservation throughout the world. ICOMOS supports the various international charters such as Burra Charter and Venice Charter on conservation.

Policies and guidance on the historic environment were being revised, as the Government’s objectives to make the development control processes more transparent. Principles of conservation, such as reversibility and minimum intervention, that are
deemed to be most vulnerable to impacts from accessibility policies, were explored and even innovated upon by conservation practitioners, even for grade I and II* listed buildings, which suggested that accessibility and inclusive design could be incorporated with historic building conservation objectives. (Jones, 2003; Noble, Lord, 2004)

2.4.1. Key policy-makers

English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments were established by statute to be the lead advisory bodies for conservation in England and Wales respectively. Both organisations have a similar role in providing guidance to heritage service providers and conservation professionals on the relationship between accessibility and conservation. CADW (2002) and English Heritage (1995, 2004) had provided guidance for building owners, architects, other professionals and the local planning authorities, articulating the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) impact on access to historic buildings.

English Heritage’s guidance *Easy Access to Historic Buildings, 2004*, was compared to CADW’s guidance *Overcoming the Barriers: Providing Physical Access to Historic Buildings, 2002*. English Heritage provided a more comprehensive understanding of the whole process, including advice on an Access Plan to be concurrently done with the Conservation Assessment. (Adams, 2005b) This was illustrated in the work process framework called the Access Planning Process found in EH’s guidance (English Heritage, 2004).

As stated in PPG 15, para. 2.10, “English Heritage is a statutory consultee on draft plans, but is also able to offer specialist advice at preparation stage… There will often be advantage in consultation at an early stage in plan preparation with other statutory agencies and with the national amenity societies and local conservation bodies, as well as wider public consultation at the formal deposit stage.” Hence, English Heritage’s designation is crucial in the issue of formulating policies, along with CADW in Wales.

Both organisations are similar on emphasising on the importance of taking into consideration the special architectural, historic or archaeological interest of the property concerned and underline the importance of conservation policies and legislation.
Apart from these issues, it was summarized that, “For visitor attractions, however, access for disabled people is only one part of improving access and customer services... The importance of training for staff and volunteers is important but the seminars also showed that small and often simple solutions can sometimes target needs better than big physical schemes. It was also found that maintaining contact with people who have provided opinions through consultations ensure that the organisations continue to learn. Best practice examples from disability organisations and how these can be achieved can provide useful benchmarking tools to measure progress...” (Heritage Link, 2005).

The Government’s review (DCMS, 2003) on the historic environment also provided a different perspective to the philosophical ideal of conservation and brought into question and debate about the listing system. Money was injected to regenerate deprived areas in English and Welsh urban areas, and as a result, the creation of the Heritage Lottery Fund, since 1994, played an important role on providing the catalyst for regeneration work. HLF in turn was instrumental to the accessibility and inclusive environment agenda by insisting on Access Plan to be a prime assessment for applying grants. Although the key policy-makers made the necessary best practice guidance for practitioners, without the HLF’s influence the progress might have been much slower.

“There is no point in applying to Heritage Lottery Fund, for example, unless the key objectives of preserving the heritage, interpreting it and giving wider universal access are being addressed.”

(Purcell et al., 2005)

These issues are inextricably engaged with the Access Planning Process work process framework proposed by English Heritage in the guidance, which is expected to inform and guide conservation practitioners and heritage service providers. Further explanation will be made on these issues in Chapter 3.

2.5. Accessibility Theories and Policies

The Social Model of Disability became the more acceptable approach to understand accessibility and inclusive environment compared to the Medical Model of Disability (DRC, 2005a). The rationale behind the social model was ‘founded on the belief that
disabled people are discriminated against by the design of the environment and how services are organised and delivered’ (DRC, 2005a). This includes how disabled people are discriminated upon by heritage service providers and the related institutions that made it impossible for disabled people to use historic properties as any other persons could, whereby not creating “the social inclusion aspects relating to heritage” (Pendlebury, 2004).

Most alterations of (historic) buildings were done to achieve access for people who cannot negotiate steps...the provision of level access for wheelchair users, for example, necessitates physical change to architectural features such as steps or it may require the installation of mechanical life devices to overcome level changes. These types of changes require consent from conservation authorities, hence my focus on mobility-oriented solutions.

(Foster, 1997)

Accessibility theories and policies with regards to the built environment explored further is on the regulatory controls that exist within the local authority’s function, whether it has any impact on the accessibility for disabled people to historic buildings, as mentioned by Imrie (2001) that “other researchers have highlighted the absence of strong regulatory controls, over the actions and operations of developers, as the key to understanding the design and development of disabling environment.”

Hence, regulatory controls work within a bigger framework in the context of the conservation practice, which further emphasized by Imrie (2001a) that, “The sources of disabled people’s exclusion from many facets of the built environment are multiple and complex yet are linked, in part, to the policies, practices and values of professionals involved in property development, design and construction processes. In particular, some argue that developers, architects and designers tend to operate in ways which are inattentive to end users.”

The ‘social model’ of disability thinking focuses on the barriers that prevent disabled people from participating in any situation as what disables them. The ‘social model’ arises from defining ‘impairment’ and ‘disability’ as very different things (Oliver, 1983, 1990; Reiser, 2002). The argument that presented here focus more on design and technical
solutions rather than focusing on the management aspects and a more rights based solution, which the DDA, 1995 addressed by having the Codes of Practice (DRC, 2005a). The management and services responsibility is to be under the heritage service provider concern. Many accessibility issues that concerned with partially sighted and blind persons, and intellectual access for intellectually challenged persons could be dealt within the management and services aspects of a heritage service provider (Bonnett, 2005).

“Current legislation clearly recognises that disability discrimination is a social problem. This social model of disability identifies disability discrimination as a result of social, psychological and physical factors and barriers in society. Increasing the social inclusion of disabled people and allowing disabled people to more fully exercise their right to participate in society is a matter of identifying and removing such barriers.”

(DRC, 2005)

Inclusive Environment was defined as, “one that can be used by everyone, regardless of age, gender or disability. It is made up of many elements such as society’s and individual’s attitudes, the design of products and communications and the design of the built environment itself. It recognises and accommodates differences in the way people use the built environment and provides solutions that enable all of us to participate in mainstream activities equally, independently, with choice and with dignity” (ODPM, 2005a).

The concepts of accessibility and inclusive environment principles were assimilated into the government’s agenda on sustainable development, and subsequently, the planning and development processes. As mentioned earlier, there are clauses in PPG 15 and Circulars 68/96 and 1/98, advising the owners of listed buildings on providing access for disabled people in the context of conservation legislation and policies.

As mentioned earlier, the most significant development is the introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) in 1995, the subsequent, Disability Rights Commission (DRC) Act 1999, the Disability Discrimination Bill in 2004 and the Disability Discrimination Act 2005. The legislative framework’s principles are based on the rights of disabled people in all areas of life (DDA, 1995, 2005) (DRC, 2005a). This will be explained further in Section 2.5.1.
Other aspects to rights based legislation is contained within The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities that was adopted on 13 December 2006 (United Nations, 2006) and ratified by many nations, where UK Government signed on the 30th March 2007 (United Nations, 2007). The guiding principles of the Convention include (i) Respect for inherent dignity, individual autonomy including the freedom to make one's own choices, and independence of persons; (ii) Non-discrimination; (iii) Full and effective participation and inclusion in society; (iv) Accessibility (United Nations, 2007).

2.5.1. Disability Discrimination Legislation and Policies

With regards to the historic environment, the responsibility is on the heritage service providers and owners of the buildings as stipulated in the Codes of Practice on the Rights of Access Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises (DRC, 2005a).

DRC, 2005(a) states that, “Part III of the DDA has made it unlawful for those who provide goods, facilities and services to discriminate against disabled people in certain circumstances, aiming to advance the elimination of discrimination against disabled people and to encourage good practice.”

The Revised Codes of Practice on the Rights of Access Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises, which is part of the DDA, stated that,

The duties on service providers are being introduced in three stages: (i) since 2 December 1996 it has been unlawful for service providers to treat disabled people less favourably for a reason related to their disability; (ii) since 1 October 1999 service providers have had to make “reasonable adjustments” for disabled people, such as providing extra help or making changes to the way they provide their services; and (iii) from 1 October 2004 service providers may have to make other “reasonable adjustments” in relation to the physical features of their premises to overcome physical barriers to access.

(DRC, 2005)
The concept of reasonable adjustments is believed to be open to interpretation and hence to debate, in a case-by-case basis and depends on the legal courts. The DDA referred to the codes of practice, reminded as guidance for applicants by the local authorities concern, when deciding whether a planning proposal, such as an alteration to a listed building has made reasonable adjustments to the alteration. An example of how a local authority deals with this issue was shown by the definition of reasonable adjustments:

A reasonable adjustment means making changes to the building your services are delivered from or the way you deliver the service so that it is not unreasonably difficult for the disabled person to use your service. Reasonable adjustments vary from case to case. You can take into account the type of service being provided, its size and resources and the practicality of taking a particular step. The Act also says that you can provide a reasonable alternative method of providing a service if a disabled person cannot access it.

(Brent Council, 2005)

For example, the door openings in a grade I listed building could still be left as it is, even if a wheelchair user cannot pass through it. But in view of ‘reasonable adjustments’ as interpreted in the DDA, the wheelchair user should be able to access the premises via another entry. Another example that illustrated an acceptable solution was when the service provider could instead provide a ‘virtual tour’ to view all the premises at an accessible level, rather than provide accessible means to the upper levels of the premises. The minimum solution provided was to make entry possible, and often the ground level area was accessible. Reasonable adjustment takes into account the resources that the service provider can afford to make (English Heritage, 2004).

The policies and legislation relating to accessibility and disability had taken a longer time to emerge than that of conservation, but in the last ten years, the emergence of policies and legislation, with revised regulations, considered both sets of objectives, but in terms of practice, the issues of satisfying both parties are still debatable (Table 2.1).

It has increasingly being recognised that the Building Regulations do not provide an appropriate mechanism for determining the accessibility of existing construction or the management of premises in use. With the introduction of the Disability
Discrimination Act, 1995 (DDA), an entirely new situation has been created in relation to the expectations, and now civil rights, of people with disabilities with regard to employment, the provision of services and access to the built environment.

(Penton, 1999)

Issues regarding Part M Building Regulations 2004 will be explained in Chapter 3, where a section on historic buildings was added for the first time, stating that it is not compulsory for a planning approval and listed building consent applicant to follow the requirements of the Part M.

In the United Kingdom, the development of Conservation occurred earlier than the development of Accessibility and the rights for disabled people. This is reflected in legislation and regulation established to ensure the historic built environment and landscape is protected. The Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act commenced in 1953, where the first listing of historic buildings were enacted, while some time later, the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act was established in 1970 (Table 2.1). Although the issues of general safety, health and well being had started a decade earlier in the first set of Building Regulations came into force in 1964, the issue of accessibility had only been properly addressed in the 1980s (Table 2.1). The Building Regulation was later amended in 1984, as “enabling Act under which new regulations can be made” (Billington, Bright and Waters, 2007), which subsequently established the first building regulation to enforce the implementation of facilities for disabled person in the Approved Document, Part M - Access and facilities for disabled people, 1987.
Table 2.1: Period and years corresponding with the list of legislation, regulation, policy and theoretical documents in Conservation compared to Disability, Accessibility and Inclusive Design. (Conservation related is in italics. Conservation and Accessibility related is denoted by bold, italics and asterisks).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Disability, Accessibility and Inclusive Design</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Seven Lamps of Architecture/ The Stones of Venice by John Ruskin, 1849</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manifesto for the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, 1877</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Disabled Persons Employment Act, 1944</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>National Assistance Act, 1948</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1900-1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act - PPG 15, 1953</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>European Cultural Convention (The Paris Convention), 1954</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1950s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>International Charter of the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice Charter), 1964</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Introduction of Listed Building Consent, 1968</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1960s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy and Legislative Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Disability, Accessibility and Inclusive Design</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972</em></td>
<td>- Fire Precautions Act, 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Ancient Monuments and Archeological Areas Act -- PPG 16</em></td>
<td>- Health and Safety at Work Act, 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons (Amendment) Act, 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BS 5619:1978, Design of housing for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BS 5810:1979. Access for the disabled to buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Part T Facilities for disabled person, 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- BS 5588-8: 1988 Fire precautions in the design, construction and use of buildings, Code of Practice for means of escape for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PD 6523: 1989 Information on access to and movement within and around buildings and on certain facilities for disabled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Legislative Documents</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Disability, Accessibility and Inclusive Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act -- PPG 15 (Gives listing criteria and guidance on planning considerations and enforcement relating to the historic environment), 1990</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town and Country Planning Act, 1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Compensation Act, 1991</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines on Education and Training in the Conservation of Monuments, Ensembles and Sites, 1993</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monuments at Risk Survey of England, English Heritage, 1995</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Museum and Galleries Commission: Disability Discrimination Act 1995 -- Update Fact Sheet, 1999</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Easy Access to Historic Properties, English Heritage, 1995</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles for the Recording of Monuments, Groups of Buildings and Sites, 1996</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Museum and Galleries Commission: Access to for people with disabilities, 1997</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability, Accessibility and Inclusive Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Regulations Approved Document, Part M -- Access and facilities for disabled people HMSO: (cover extensions to existing buildings as well as new buildings), 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Regulations Approved Document, Part M -- Access and facilities for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS 5588-8:1999 Fire precautions in the design, construction and use of buildings, Code of Practice for means of escape for disabled people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Discrimination Act, 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights Commission Act, 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.D.A. Code of Practice (Part III), 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Legislative Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disability, Accessibility and Inclusive Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Draft ICOMOS UK Charter for the Conservation of Buildings and Sites, 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990s (cont’d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stockholm Declaration, ICOMOS, 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Power of Place, English Heritage, 2000</td>
<td>• Building Regulation, 2000</td>
<td>2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Future, DCMS, 2001</td>
<td>• BS 8300:2001 Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people-- Code of Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People and Places -Social Inclusion Policy for the Built and Historic Environment, DCMS, 2002</td>
<td>• Office of the Deputy of Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Planning and access for disabled people-- a good practice guide, 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Authority Conservation Provision in England (Oxford Brookes University), 2003</td>
<td>• Government Response to ODPM Housing, Planning, Local Government and the Regions, 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting Our Historic Environment: Making the System Better (DCMS, 2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6. Summary

Theoretical and philosophical issues were discussed, where it was assumed that theories in conservation and accessibility informed and influenced the policies and practice of conservation. The two main areas of review were:

i) Conservation policies and practices; and

ii) Accessibility policies.

The review focused on theories and practices affecting policies. An overview of change since the inception of DDA, 1995, imbued with the Social Model of Disability suggested that theory does influence policies. As a precursor of change, the DDA, 1995 influenced...
policy development and formulation to realise the objectives of the legislation in anti-discrimination and rights based for disabled people.

Heritage Lottery Fund’s insistence for an applicant to submit an Access Plan showed a policy that could fulfil the sustainable agenda of social equity or inclusion and at the same time create an economic viability in historic buildings. This policy also managed to create interest in the issue of accessibility to historic buildings.

The concept of reversibility and minimum intervention which is translated in conservation practice is being challenged with innovative and best practice to find a way to make the historic properties engaging all users. Conservation architects, architects and access consultants are now forced to rethink on accessibility to create a balance in providing accessibility and yet, maintaining the conservation ideal. Innovative approaches to the design and management aspects would create the basis for change in attitude to inclusive design.

Key policy makers English Heritage and CADW provided guidance to create best practice and innovative solutions to get around the problems and finding solutions that would satisfy all people.

The impact of both the conservation and accessibility legislation and policies on disabled people’s rights to access and services of historic public listed buildings is focused on the DDA’s reasonable adjustments term.
CHAPTER 3
The Reactive Process: Planning Control and Building Control Processes

3.1. Introduction

This chapter explores the literature review on policies and practice that comes under Development Control where Planning Control and Building Control are the two main processes. This section will focus on the review of accessibility and inclusive environment policies relating to the local authority’s function. The planning control and building control function of the local authority have mechanisms that are in place to concurrently protect the historic environment and provide for access for disabled people, existing in all the development control systems. Planning and building control under an English and Welsh local authority’s jurisdiction will be explored, within the development process of the practice of conservation. Detailed examination of the mechanisms in planning and building control, including listed building control, will be presented in this chapter.

The regulatory control existing within the local authority’s function is the ‘reactive’ part of the development process, as the mechanisms were designed to enforce the legislative and regulative reaction to the applicant’s proposal for development and for seeking approval. The ‘proactive’ part of the development process includes everything except for the local authority’s function which commences before applying for planning approval at the Strategic Briefing stages (RIBA, 2005) during design and planning application (Figure 3.1).

The proactive process continues with building application, during inspection and after completion. This implies that the whole development process involves many actors and stakeholders, including the client/developer, the architect, conservation professionals and other consultants, the local authority officers, the service providers and the users of the buildings. Those involved in the development process have differing roles in either the reactive and proactive processes. Some roles are exclusive to the accessibility and inclusive environment agenda such as the access officer, access consultant, inclusive designers and disabled users (Adams, 2004b; Figure 3.1).
Hence, the Reactive Process is defined by the processes reacting to the proposal and application of a building project seeking for planning control, listed building consent or building control approval by the local authority and these reactive processes "exist in Development Control" (Bonnett, 2005). 'Development process' is another phrased to explain both the development control and the non-development control processes together. In other words, development control processes are reactive processes and non-development control processes are proactive processes (Bonnett, 2005; Figure 3.1).

Mechanisms that exists within both the reactive and proactive process, albeit the whole development process will be reviewed in this chapter, whether it is in the planning control listed building consent (LBC) and building control, which are processes that are regarded reactive or whether it is in the design process before and during the control process, conservation assessment before LBC and the resultant accessible design after completion (Figure 3.1). Both processes may share certain mechanisms such as the Conservation Assessment which is made by the conservation architect prior to submission for planning control and LBC.
Figure 3.1: The relationship of the Reactive Process with the Proactive Process with reference to Development Control (author).
Naming the two processes is essential to the narrative clarity of this thesis where there are many processes and mechanisms involved from whether it is a function, process, procedure or guide to be explained in Chapter 6 and 10. Thus, using the phrases ‘reactive process’ and ‘proactive process’ to further categorize the different development processes, helps to distinguish and configure where the different mechanisms operate within the existing work process framework of developing a listed building (Adams, 2004b), which was proposed by English Heritage and explained further in Chapter 4.

In conjunction with the research questions (RQ2) and hypothesis in Chapter 1, the study objectives of this section are to:

1. Examine the planning control and building control processes, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms that enforce the regulatory framework that deals with accessibility and conservation combined and examined the effectiveness of the implementation of these mechanisms.

2. Investigate the role of officers in planning control and building control process when addressing the access needs of disabled people, in local authorities in England and Wales.


The practice of conservation in the United Kingdom involves the use, adaptation and managed change of the existing building stock protected under the system of listing, designated to be important in terms of heritage value of historical or and architectural significance (DCMS, 2003). Listed buildings undergoing work for demolition, extension and/or alteration are subjected to conservation legislation, providing protection from indiscriminate destruction and unsympathetic work, repairs and maintenance. Owners who alter listed properties without obtaining listed building consent, or scheduled monument consent are served with listed building enforcement notices, and will be liable
to heavy fines and prison sentences, as stipulated in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3.2.1. Listed Building Control

Historically, local authorities were not required to consider accessibility issues until the Disabled Persons Act, was enacted in 1981. The planners started to draw the attention of developers to the relevant provisions of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970, and also to the relevant design guidance such as the Building Standards (BS) 5810, 1979, when granting planning permission (Davies, 1996). In the decade before the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 commenced, issues on accessibility to buildings was controlled by the implementation of the Building Regulations. However, limited central government policy support statements encouraged planners to negotiate with applicants to provide access and facilities such as car parking spaces for disabled people (Davies, 1999). Since regeneration work had begun, the policies and strategies were created to assist planners to lead the issues on accessibility within the local authority’s function with the recent introduction of access statements and access planning guidance attempts to provide a continuous and sustaining procedure in the planning approval process.

The House of Commons report indicated the increasing importance of ODPM in the reactive process of developmental control for listed building and the protection of historic buildings should be better integrated within the planning system. “It is disappointing that these reforms (DCMS introduced legislation to simplify the regulations affecting historic buildings) only apply to controls specifically affecting historic buildings and were not coordinated with the ODPM’s review of the planning system which had resulted in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act” (House of Commons, 2004). English Heritage recently were given the responsibility for providing expert advice on which buildings meet the criteria for listing, and for administering the process, which was originally under DCMS. The 2004 Act is also applicable in Wales, and the responsibility falls within the National Assembly for Wales and CADW jurisdiction.
Listing is “an integral part of the system for managing change to our environment through the planning process administered by local planning authorities and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister” (DCMS, 2005), and is embedded in the UK Government’s agenda for preserving the nation’s heritage, as mentioned in Chapter 1, and the statutory power is enforced at the local authority’s level by the listed building control mechanism. Although the prime concern in developing a listed building is to be granted listed building consent, the mechanisms to ensure that access for disabled people is being provided for are included in the DCMS (2005) processes, as follows:

(i) Negotiations made in the decision-making process of planning and building control;
(ii) The need for service providers (applicants) to make provisions for accessibility and inclusive environment through the DDA Code of Practice requirements;
(iii) Good practice guidance on access being encouraged by planning control advisory services and;
(iv) The requirements stipulated in the Approved Document M of the Building Regulations.

Point (i) above relate to existing mechanisms such as the function of the local authority officers, within the authority and with consultants and their clients. This will be discussed in section 3.4. Point (ii) regarding ‘applicants making provisions through DDA’s requirements’ either point out to mechanisms of the regulatory and legislative framework, which is Part M and ‘reasonable adjustment’ respectively. This will be explained in Section 3.3.1 and in Chapter 4. Point (iii) refers to the local authority’s initiative to provide good practice. Point (iv) will also be explained in Section 3.3.1.

“Listed buildings represent a finite resource and an irreplaceable asset. Applicants for consent accordingly will need to demonstrate why the proposed works are desirable or necessary” (PPG 15 in Ross, 1996), which explains the use of conservation plan, will be explained in Section 3.2.3 in this chapter. On the other hand, the recently introduced access statements would be asking in contrary to PPG 15, on how the applicant would
specify the provisions for accessibility needs, as stipulated in AD Part M, the access
guidance and DDA Code of Practices.

This issue had been documented by Foster (1997) whereby, “the scheme for the addition
of an access ramp to the front elevation (of a listed building functioning as a bank)…demonstrates the need for local authorities to reconcile access policies, which, for
political reasons, rightly promote front door access schemes with the policies of
conservation and planning departments. The appeal arose following the planning decision
of Norwich council not to grant listed building consent to the proposed ramp. National
Westminster Bank had applied to Norwich City Council for planning permission and
listed building consent for an access ramp to the main entrance” (Foster, 1997). This
certainly resonated with the House of Commons suggestions for an integrated approach
regarding developmental control.

In retrospect, a significant development in the 1980s occurred when, “local authorities
were also encouraged to designate a member of staff as an access officer, to provide a
clear point of contact on questions of access for disabled people” (Greed, Davies, 1996),
which will also solve the problems of access for elderly people, parents with young
children and small children as well. The inclusion of access officers (in the development
control process) started in 1981 at Leicester’s Planning Department (RTPI, 1988), and
access officers were expected to provide “advice and guidance to local authority officers
and others on the technical requirements” (Fleck, no date). However, not all local
authorities designated new personnel to be an access officer (GLA, 2003), preferring to
implement AD Part M under the job of the building control officer or surveyors. With the
introduction of the access statements and access guidance at planning control stage, a
dedicated access officer would be able to be more involved on access issues in the
council filling the gap in other than building control. The discussion on access officers
will be further discussed in Section 3.4.

For planning and listed building control, one of the main issues addressed in the House of
Commons report (2004), was the lack of integration of the mechanisms in place, in trying
to create an approach which balances well between the needs and objectives of conservation and accessibility. Much of what had been discussed in the 2004 report focused on the planning policy guidance under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In the case of England, Planning Policy Guidance 15, and in the case of Wales, Circular 61/96 and 1/98 (Amendment) the planning guidance on the historic environment prescribes in detail on how the applicant should repair, alter, extend or demolish a listed building and the guidance’s strength is compounded by the 1990 Act. A White Paper was completed by the UK Government on the revision of PPG15 and Welsh Circular 61/96 and 1/98, called ‘Heritage Protection for the 21st Century: an analysis of consultation responses 2007’ was completed and the Heritage Reform Bill is still awaiting enactment by Parliament (DCMS, 2008).

3.2.2. Planning Policy Guidance

Planning Policy Guidance 15 provides a “full statement of Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment” (ODPM, 2005), and is currently under review together with the Welsh version (DCMS, 2008). “The DCMS, which manages the listing system, is proposing to introduce legislation to simplify the regulations affecting historic buildings”, which implies that the policy guidances will be reviewed to suit with the current Government’s objectives, as it further states that, “the reforms…were not coordinated with the ODPM’s review of the planning system which had resulted in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (and) the protection of historic buildings should be better integrated within the planning system.” (House of Commons, 2004) With the current historic listed building stock in the UK at about 500,000 in numbers, and most of these buildings are located in areas for regeneration, the idea to combine DCMS and ODPM to review the planning system in conjunction with historic buildings makes a lot of sense.

In 2004, the Government planned to transfer of responsibility for the historic environment from the DCMS to the ODPM, with CABE and English Heritage being responsible for certain parts (House of Commons, 2004). However, recent development
showed that an on-going consultation between the different government departments: DCMS, the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG), the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and English Heritage and are in the finalizing stages of the Heritage Protection Reform, the drafting of the Planning Policy Statements and awaiting for the Parliament’s acceptance of the Heritage Reform Bill (DCMS, 2008).

The Government further emphasized that the current system was creating a lot of problems when “too many consents and permissions are required before a historic building can be altered or adapted,” (House of Commons, 2004) and recognised that the listing system is important in obliging developers to have appreciation for the value of the historic buildings, but also to “adopt a more creative approach” (House of Commons, 2004). The extensive reviews by the UK Government on the planning policies and guidance include the replacement of PPG 15 with a new Planning Policy Statement on historic buildings, which is yet to be published. One of the reasons why this is being done is that “PPG15 does not reflect the current regeneration agenda”. The situation at present is that “the revision of PPG15 has been deferred pending the results of DCMS’ pilot projects...will take place as and when necessary” (House of Commons, 2004).

Research and guidance by English Heritage (2004) referred to PPG15, 1994, where it stated that;

It is important in principle that disabled people should have dignified access and within historic buildings. If it is treated as part of an integrated review of access arrangements for all visitors or users, and a flexible and pragmatic approach taken, it should normally be possible to plan suitable access for disabled people without compromising a building’s special interest. Alternative routes or reorganizing the use of space may achieve the desired result without the need for damaging alterations.

(English Heritage, 2004)
English Heritage stance is similar to the DDA 1995 and PPG 15 and this posed more arguments to the issue, which will be addressed later in this thesis. There is little guidance for accessibility and inclusive design in PPG 15 and the corresponding Welsh Office Circular 68/96 and 98/1, and the guidance was evidently left to those in the local authorities to interpret.

3.2.3. Conservation Assessment

The Conservation Assessment is a mechanism used in both the reactive and proactive process. Applicants for LBC are expected provide the local planning authority with full information, such as a conservation plan or statement, to enable the authority “to assess the likely impact of their proposals on the special architectural or historic interest of the building and on its setting”, and “an authority should not accept an application for consideration until it has sufficient information to provide such understanding” (PPG15 in DoE/DNH, 1994). Conservation Assessment was also prescribed to be conducted at the same time as the Access Audit (English Heritage, 2004). The importance of this mechanism was underlined to be,

"The complementary part of the process (with Access Audit and) will be to review or prepare a conservation assessment that will establish the relative significance of a building or site and its constituent parts in terms of its special architectural historic or archaeological interest. Architectural historians or conservation architects usually prepare these although amenity societies and local authorities may also be a source of guidance."

(English Heritage, 2004)

Foster (1997) stated that (during the Conservation Assessment) the “conservation authorities look most favourably on proposals which have the minimum physical effect on historic fabric, as well as the least visual impact.” Hence, the coming together of both the audit and the conservation aspects at this early stage, right after Access Strategy
would juxtapose the main issues and potential conflicts pertaining to the conservation project. The Access Planning Process (APP) (English Heritage, 2004; see also Chapter 4) is expected to run at the same time, yet separately from the development of the listed building. Usually the conservation architect is designated to prepare the Conservation Statement, which defines the significance and special interest aspects of the conservation project in order to apply for funding and subsequently, prepare a "Conservation Management Plan", which is a more detailed document. Both definitions are explained below,

Conservation statement is a summary of a heritage asset, including what it is, why it matters, what is happening to it and what needs to be done to care for it. A conservation statement will usually identify any gaps in our knowledge and the next steps to be taken. It is not as detailed as a conservation management plan and is often done on the basis of existing knowledge, and, Conservation Management Plan is a detailed document which sets out the significance of a heritage asset and identifies all of the actions needed to conserve or retain that significance, including management and maintenance. It is usually based on a good understanding of the asset and its condition, and is likely to involve consultation with different stakeholders. Use it to manage a complicated site and to influence major decisions.

(HLF, 2004)

The level of detail in a Conservation Assessment may influence the decision-making process for the Access Planning Process (English Heritage, 2004). The level of information gathered at the point before the Draft Access Plan, which highlights the potential conflicts that may occur within the conservation project, and be investigated by the various parties could influence the decisions on how inclusive the project could become.
3.3. Building Regulations and British Standards

Under the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, the regulative powers for building control are founded in the Building Act 1984 and its Building Regulations. Historically, the development of accessibility in the development control processes was only enforced by the Building Regulations, rather than by a statutory body, following the proposal in Section 6 of the Disabled Persons Act (1981), which referred to the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act (1970) and Amendment Act (1976) a decade earlier. The Building Regulations firstly came into force in August 1985 with Part T, and later Part M, in 1987, in England and Wales (RTPI, 1988). Part M was again revised in 1991 and 2000, in conjunction with the Building Regulations, and the amended 2004 version to include historic buildings.

The different objectives between planning and building control inevitably influenced the way accessibility issues were and are currently being addressed. Building control mechanisms occur later in the development process, when large scaled plans and details have been already worked out in conjunction with RIBA Plan of Work Stages D and E (RIBA, 1999) making the applicant more reluctant to change in the later stages due to financial and contractual commitments.

This thesis will focus on mechanisms having the most direct impact upon the decision-making process of building control relating to accessibility, as follows:

(i) Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations;
(ii) The Access Statement as a document to accompany the Full Plans;
(iii) The role of the Access Officers and other local authority officers.

Building control generally operates as a two-stage process, referred to as the Full Plans application. The first stage (known as the plan stage) involves the applicant submitting detailed plans for approval...the second stage (inspection stage) starts when work commences on site after which a series of site visits are made to check that the work...
proceeds in accordance with the plan, and hence complies with the regulation” (Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council, 2005).

Full Plans application are involved in the first application and later in the process, the applicant obtains the plans certificate, final certificate and completion certificate for the building to be lawfully used and occupied. The Building Control Officer or Approved Inspector are those designated under building control that could issue these certificates, depending on the resources and the way a local authority operates.

3.3.1. Approved Document Part M Building Regulation

Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations provides guidance for the incorporation of access facilities and access features to a generic building type and will need to be interpreted when used to solve specific building types. Only recently from the revised 2004 version has Part M, being interpreted for new buildings and new work in refurbishment projects and the historic buildings section has only been included in the 2004 version as well. Previous research has shown according to Imrie (2001) of this development for the refurbishment of buildings.

The legal frameworks underpinning property development are also a potential source of disabled people’s estrangement or exclusion from land and property processes. Part M of the building regulations governs access provision (in England and Wales) – yet, as a number of observers have noted, they are broad, vague and provide regulatory control for substantial new constructions while doing little to regulate access provision in the refurbishment of buildings (Barnes, 1991; Imrie and Hall, 2001).

The reason to place together the listed buildings with non-listed buildings undergoing refurbishment when understanding Part M, was based on the assumption that both type of buildings face in the development process. “Appropriate solutions to access problems may vary depending on the size, scale, nature and intended use of the building. This may be particularly true when applied to existing buildings where constraints of structure and
context may make generic solutions impracticable” (Part M, 2004). This implies that the limitation Part M possesses when specifying for listed buildings access problems, which faces more than just constraints of structure and context, but also of historic and architectural significance (Adams, 2004b).

“Part M in the case of historic buildings is secondary to the proper conservation, and the regulations need not comply strictly. It (Part M) is primarily directed at new buildings and is likely to be taken into account in anything but a most comprehensive refurbishment that is subject to building control” (Building Design, 2004). This quote suggested that Part M is inferior to conservation regulation. As subjected to interpretation and negotiation, the new 2004 version of Part M included a section on Historic Buildings, where the two sets officers involved were mentioned together:

- In arriving at an appropriate balance between historic building conservation and accessibility, it would be appropriate to take into account the advice of the local authority’s conservation and access officers, and English Heritage or CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments, as well as the views of local access groups, in order to make the building as accessible as possible (Part M, 2004).

3.3.2. British Standards

BS 8300:2001 – Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people – Code of Practice

Building standards are best practice guidance and are not compulsory for the applicant in a development control approval. The scope of the BS 8300 covered all categories of buildings, except residential buildings exclusively designed for disabled people. BS 8300 is opened to interpretation on how it can be applied to listed buildings, as building standards are meant to be referred to and not to be enforced. However, the building control mechanism to determine whether BS 8300 is to be followed is AD Part M Building Regulations, as, “Part M (2004) of the Building Regulations (2000) has been
revised to incorporate the new standards established by British Standard 8300,” (HELM, 2005), which means that the standards had influence the revision of AD Part M (2004). BS 8300 was prepared by a “Technical Committee, as a revision and an amalgamation of BS 5619:1978 and BS 5810:1979,” (BS 8300, 2001) involving the consultation of 38 government, institutional, public services and charitable bodies, and is considered to be the most comprehensive and reliable source for acceptable design standards currently in the UK.

The Building Regulations were not sufficient enough to provide the specifications required, and local authorities use the British Standards in conjunction with the approved documents in building regulations (HELM, 2005). “To assist in achieving bye-law standards, greater use of British Standards was called for” (Ley, 2000), however the use of the standards would depend very much on how the practice of conservation is perceived.


BS 7913 is being referred to by English Heritage, 2004, and CADW, 2002, for guidance on access to historic properties. The language in this standard is similar to PPG15, giving a similar view to what conservationists insist upon. For example, the section on “alterations, extension and new buildings” (clause 7.4.1), states that, “there are some buildings and settings in which no alterations or new work of any sort should be acceptable,” which may apply to grade 1 and grade 2* listed buildings.

Building standards BS 8300 and BS 7913, to be used together as best practice, are regarded to be the main reference point upgrading of historic buildings, hence it is important that the preparation such as “an access audit is carried out to identify barriers and provide a basis for any reasonable steps that need to be taken”, and “to highlight those features that cannot be altered or removed because of their historic value” (Kent, 2005).
3.3.3. Access Statements

In England, under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Amendment) 2005 Regulations, access statements are required to be submitted for planning approval and listed building consent. In Wales, the National Assembly Wales have not made it compulsory in a planning regulation, therefore the provision for access statements was only referred to in A D Part M of the Building Regulation, a building control mechanism.

The purpose of an access statement is to outline how a project has been designed, amended, or extended to deliver an accessible environment... (and) is maintained to be a “living” document, where it is to be updated at every stage of project development, and whenever there is a change to the building that affects access.

(Dickinson, 2005)

Access statements were regarded to be the long awaited mechanism that could take forward the accessibility and inclusive design agenda in the planning and building control processes. (Barker, 2003) Recommendations from the UK Government on using access statements were found in the government publications: “(i) the Planning and Access for Disabled People: a Good Practice Guide, ODPM, 2003; (ii) the May 2004, Approved Document Part M Building Regulations and; (iii) the Inclusive Projects by DPTAC, 2003” (Dickinson, 2005).

When implemented, the Access Statement is believed to be the way to sustain the agenda from the beginning of the project until completion. Planning legislation puts the onus on the applicant to submit an access statement with the planning application, and for building control officers (or approved inspectors) to make sure that the access statement is included and satisfactorily complete documentation for building approval DRC, 2005) (CABE, 2006). However, there had been concerns of the effectiveness of the implementation mechanism, relying on the expertise or lack of expert training of the local authority officers involved (Barker, 2003), and in some local authorities there are no access officers working in the councils (GLA, 2003).
In ODPM’s (2005d), *Planning and Access for Disabled People*, the research findings highlighted issues concerning planning officers, whereby “inclusive design is not seen by planners to be of relevance to planning applications,” and suggested planners to be “working more closely with the applicant” in order to achieve inclusive environments from the beginning of the development control process which further suggested a “joined-up thinking, with the local planning authority taking the lead role.”

Another significant development arising from the extensive reviews emerged in 2004, as evidently shown in Part 4, Development Control, of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, whereby under the “applications for planning permission and certain consents (42)”, it stated that “a development order for planning permission, must be accompanied by, (a) a statement about the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the development; (b) a statement about how issues relating to access to the development have been dealt with.” This resulted in the usage of Design and Access Statements together since 2006 (CABE, 2006). Design statement could adopt inclusive design as the main thrust of the work rather than an additional requirement to be insisted by the local authority officers. Another perspective to this is to insist on good practice rather than minimum standards alone, as it would preserve the design intent rather than local authority officers to insist on “harming the historic fabric” (Barton, 2005).

The 2004 Act development order concerns both the Secretary of State in England and the National Assembly for Wales. However in Wales, it stopped short of the implementation mechanism, as the National Assembly Wales had not adopted it in the planning regulations such as the listed building consent, whereas in England the 2004 Act had been taken further to be enforced by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2005 as mentioned earlier, for listed building consent, under the sub-heading of “design and access statements” whereby, “(3)…a design and access statement shall (a) explain how those principles (design) and concepts take account of – (i) the special architectural or historic importance of the
building; (ii) the particular physical features of the building that justify its designation as a listed building; and (iii) the building’s setting.”

The corresponding guidance to the 2005 Act is PPG 15, which is currently being revised to see these changes taking place within the regulatory regime, and findings to ascertain the success of implementing the Access Statement in the listed building consent will be forthcoming. PPG 15 would need to incorporate on how to include the demands for an explanation of the access policy or access approach, including alternative means of access considered, and how access policies relating to local development documents had been taken into account, with reference to the quoted requirements (i), (ii), and (iii) as mentioned, as it is assumed that the policy documents needed to be read together.

The access statement is “a statement prepared by an applicant indicating the applicant’s approach to inclusive design” (ODPM, 2005d), but a question that needs to be addressed would be whether access statements would be able to provide the much needed leverage counter-balance the strong legal and regulative control of conservation. As mentioned earlier, the legislative and regulative control for conserving listed buildings were in place for a longer time than that of accessibility and inclusive design, and the DDA cannot override conservation legislation (English Heritage, 2004; CADW, 2002; PPG 15).

The access statement as a tool to provide for a better planning approval mechanism, will only be successful if the local authority officers in charge of regulatory control made the necessary administration and monitoring of the tool. The access statement is expected to solve the many issues addressed in the review and the role of the local authority officers in terms of the decision-making process and negotiation between those representing accessibility and those representing historic buildings would be helpful with the documentation process.

3.4. Local Authority Officers
For local authorities that did not appoint a designated access officer, the common practice was to appoint a building control officer or surveyor or the appointed approved inspectors to oversee the control based on Part M of the Building Regulations. The idea of the access officer became more apparent since the introduction of the DDA 1995, but rather than spending more on the access officer, the idea of having access guidance and access statements to ensure that accessibility needs were being considered as an alternative approach favoured by many local authorities.

3.4.1. Access officers

The role of the Access Officer is varied, such as being the “first contact point involving consultation with user groups” to “providing technical guidance to the local authority on the needs of disabled people” (Fleck, no date). Not all local authorities in England and Wales have an Access Officer working in the council. In London, a third of the boroughs have no access officers. Of the boroughs that do have an access officer, less than a third had access officers working in departments other than building or planning, such as community development or social services (GLA, 2003). This implied that the access officers would not be concentrating on planning and building issues. One of the access officer’s remit was to have a close connection with the local access group, so that the project’s consultants could obtain the access officer’s help to get a group organised. For example, the consultants especially the access consultant may not be local and was appointed because he or she is an expert specialising on a particular design type, like museum design, and would not know of the access group in that locality. It is likely that an access officer be proactive in getting the access consultant to be involved in certain projects that the disabled community would like to be involved in.

3.4.1. Other officers

The other local authority officers that would be involved in assessing and deciding on the development of a listed building are the planning officer, the conservation officer and the building control officer / surveyor or approved inspectors. As mentioned before, the
planning officer and conservation officer often work together as the listed building control issues are similar to planning issues, dealing with the external aspects of the building and the context, especially in Conservation Areas.

**Figure 3.2: Percentage of Access Officers in London Boroughs (GLA, 2003)**

3.5. Consultation with the Users

In English Heritage’s 2004 version for the APP, there is a step before the “Draft Access Plan” that involved a list of studies not connected to each other but are argued to be relevant in the scheme of things, but however, neither suitable to be placed under Access Audit nor Conservation Assessment. These studies, such as “means of escape”, “impact analysis” and “consultation with relevant access and conservation bodies”, are placed under “Feasibility and Option Studies” (English Heritage, 2004). The suggestion is only “consultation with access bodies” and not a group formed especially for consultation on a
particular project. According to Herschel-Shorland (2005), the function of the user group could be defined as follows;

(i) To involve disabled people in the process of redevelopment of (the project);
(ii) To increase awareness and understanding of user needs for the (project's) site;
(iii) To gain an understanding of how disabled people consider (the project) can be made more accessible and inclusive.

Earlier research by Imrie (2001) stated that, “The sources of disabled people's exclusion from many facets of the built environment are multiple and complex yet are linked, in part, to the policies, practices and values of professionals involved in property development, design and construction processes. In particular, some argue that developers, architects and designers tend to operate in ways which are inattentive to end users.” Apart from Imrie, and increasingly since the start of the DDA 1995, opinions have been encouraging on the inclusion of user group such as access advisory groups to be involved in the development process to inform the developer and thus complement the design process (Dickinson, 2005).

Further discussions with experts indicated that the use of the user group to be kept to a minimum (Bonnett, 2005). The usefulness of such a group is apparent but a skillful moderator, usually in the form of the access officer and/or access consultant would be crucial in steering the discussions to a fruitful conclusion. As mentioned by Dickinson, the user group should not be used as a substitute for technical advice and guidance, but to advice on issues that is particular to the project to aid in decision-making for the consultants.

Imrie and Hall (2001) suggested that, “much of the built environment remains unaffected by access directives, while some research indicates that developers seek to ‘dumb-down’ standards by rarely providing more than is required by the regulations. Two points are evidently indicating that developers have a: ‘Dumb-down’ approach or minimum requirements were done to get away with it at minimal costs”, when it comes to providing
access facilities and services, and that developers are “not legally obliged to consult directly with disabled people, is a point frequently being raised.” Experts in the area (e.g. Barker, 2003) had argued the need for developers to provide the financial backing for the existence of the user group consultation within the design and building process.

A significant development regarding the usage of user group came about in the 2005 regulation when it further made the requirement in “(4) (c) state what, if any, consultation has been undertaken and what account has been taken of the outcome of any such consultation,” which seems to suggest directly addressing an issue that had been highlighted often during reviews, as stated by Imrie and Hall (2001), whereby, “developers are not legally obliged to consult directly with disabled people over development proposals, and evidence suggests that disabled people and their organizations rarely meet developers or their agents.” Although still not fully practiced, the idea has become more accepted to consult user groups, although for how long during the project’s duration and how many people should be involved in a group is debatable and implies the cost implications.

There have been efforts to incorporate user groups into the local authorities’ activities, as mentioned, that “counties, districts and unitary authorities provide access for disabled people in a very piecemeal and reactive manner. This is partly due to the fact that local authorities’ ability to contribute to providing a service to disability groups is restricted by central government budgetary controls. In these circumstances partnership schemes emerge in which the local authority is a participating member, such as the Windsor and Maidenhead Access Group” (Davies, 1999).

3.6. Summary

This chapter summarized the reviews involving the policies and the implementation of the policies, that include the regulatory mechanism of Part M and the function of the local authority officers and in particular the access officer.
The reviews showed that there are discrepancies between the Planning Control and Building Control processes in the development of the mechanisms to ensure accessibility needs are included. The Access Statement was created to ensure the transparency of the development control system to create efficiencies in developing the listed building stock.

Approved Document Part M Building Regulation was not used as much as it should when dealing with listed buildings in the control system. The use of AD Part M depended on the subjective interpretation of the local authority officer.

Access officers are not seen to be playing an instrumental role but a more supportive role. Training issues or the lack of access officers to implement the Access Statement are apparent in the development process.

The mechanism of "consultation with a user group" has implication within both the proactive and reactive processes as it may be argued that the Access Officer's role is interlinked with the Access Advisory Group.
CHAPTER 4
The Proactive Process: Access Planning Process

4.1 Introduction

The Access Planning Process (APP) was introduced by English Heritage (2004), as a guided process framework providing guidance for a more inclusive design and building approach for historic listed buildings (Figure 4.1). The APP framework emphasised on a series of mechanisms and procedures to be considered when dealing with the design and building process, however not including the management of services and operational side of the occupation phase (English Heritage, 2005). Mechanisms such as Access Strategy, Access Audit, Access Plan and Conservation Assessment are included in the guided process framework. Some of the mechanisms are more commonly used, however the Access Plan has made a lot of impact after 1994 when the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), was established by Parliament and used as a compulsory document for the applicant of HLF grants to complete (HLF, 2005; Bonnett, 2005).

For the purpose of this research, the term ‘Access Planning Process’ was adopted and used to describe the proactive process of implementing accessibility and inclusive design principles in the development process. The English Heritage’s 2004 APP version will be used to provide the basis for analysis and discussion on the proactive process. In this section, the main intention is to investigate all aspects of the APP to form a further understanding of how the APP work comprehensively, from the strategic phase to the occupation phase of development, similarly suggested by DPTAC (2003).

The 2004 English Heritage APP version was developed and refined based on recommendations by experts and was designed primarily for architects and designers, as an accessibility checklist on the processes and procedures of alteration, extension or demolishing listed buildings in England (Adams, 2004b) and to also be understood by clients, service providers, and other professionals when dealing with the design and building processes for historic listed buildings. Similarly, the APP framework is also
being considered by CADW (2005) as guidance for Wales, although the framework or a similar framework was not included in CADW’s guidance.

**Access Audit**
- Identifies all access needs
- Prioritises recommendations
- Relates to management plan

**Feasibility and options studies**
- Technical studies, including means of escape
- Impact analysis
- Mitigation measures if required
- Test of 'reasonableness' of proposed adjustment
- Consultation with relevant access and conservation bodies and with disability user groups

**Conservation Assessment**
- Identifies special architectural, historic and archaeological interest
- Describes relative value of the constituent elements

**Access Strategy**
- Agree strategic commitment
- Evaluate accessibility of employment / services offered
- Consider timescale and budget
- Identify person to progress the process

**Draft access plan**
- Reconcile access and conservation needs
- Establishes short- and long-term aims in relation to opportunities
- Sets timescales for changes

**The access plan**
- Is site or building specific
- Incorporates a comprehensive range of access solutions, from managed change to physical alteration
- Is adopted by all concerned
- May be implemented in stages according to prioritised access needs and long-term building development strategy
- Should be reviewed and endorsed at regular intervals in relation to the access strategy

**Measures have no apparent impact upon significance, or physical alterations not required**
[Confirm that statutory consent is not required]

**Measures have impact and/or physical alterations are recommended – statutory consents or other approvals required**
- Detailed design
- Development and impact assessments
- Further technical studies
- Further consultation
- Prepare access statement for Building Regulations
[Obtain listed building, scheduled monument, planning consent or other approvals]
The framework addressed a variety of mechanisms from the beginning stages right up to Listed Building Consent, and significantly proposed that the Access Plan be carried throughout the development process. There is no other model for guidance for listed buildings in England and Wales. One way of understanding the APP is to look critically at the processes in the RIBA Plan of Work Stages (RIBA, 1999; Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: The RIBA Plan of Work Stages 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>List of The RIBA Plan of Work Stages 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Appraisal: Identification of Client’s requirements and possible constraints on development. Preparation of studies to enable the Client to decide whether to proceed and to select probable procurement method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Strategic Briefing: Preparation of Strategic Brief by, or on behalf of, the client confirming key requirements and constraints. Identification of procedures, organisational structure and range of consultants and others to be engaged for the project. [Identifies the strategic brief (as CIB Guide) which becomes the clear responsibility of the client]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Detailed proposals. Complete development of the project brief. Preparation of detailed proposals. Application for full development control approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Final proposals. Preparation of final proposals for the Project sufficient for coordination of all components and elements of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Production information F1: Preparation of production information in sufficient detail to enable a tender or tenders to be obtained. Application for statutory approvals. F2: Preparation of further production information required under the building contract. [Now in two parts, F1 - the production information sufficient to obtain tenders and F2 - the balance required under the building contract to complete the information for construction]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>List of The RIBA Plan of Work Stages 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tender documentation. Preparation and collation of tender documentation in sufficient detail to enable a tender or tenders to be obtained for the construction of the Project. [Solely concerned with the documentation required for tenders. Particularly useful with D+B or management contracts]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Tender action. Identification and evaluation of potential contractors and/or specialists for the construction of the project. Obtaining and appraising tenders and submission of recommendations to the client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Mobilisation. Letting the building contract, appointing the contractor. Issuing of production information to the contractor. Arranging site handover to the contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Construction to Practical Completion. Administration of the building contract up to and including practical completion. Provision to the contractor of further information as and when reasonably required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>After Practical completion. Administration of the building contract after practical completion. <strong>Making final inspections</strong> and settling the final account. [Clearly separated from the construction phase]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other guidance that had emerged recently dealing with development processes are: (i) the RIBA Inclusion and Access Policy’s “Model Project Access Method Statement” (2005) that attempted to compare the RIBA Plan of Work Stages to architectural practice’s processes and inputs, outputs and the Government’s development control system; and the (ii) Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee’s “Inclusive Projects: guide to best practice...” (DPTAC, 2003) that had been quoted by the Government’s planning review as one source of reference for inclusive policies and design. For the last two cited guidance, the refurbished building was taken into account in devising the guidance but not specifically for listed buildings, hence the guidance mentioned could be used in general to analyze the mechanisms and procedures for this research study.
Other guidance for analysis, which will be discussed in this section, is the Heritage Lottery Fund’s guidance on Conservation Management Plans and Access Plans. As a funding body, it could be argued that the HLF had been instrumental in influencing the development processes for the historic environment by including access plans as one of the compulsory requirements to obtain the HLF financial awards and grants.

Although the guidance mentioned are to be considered in reviewing the processes, procedures and mechanisms of the development of listed buildings, the main aim of this section is to review and investigate how these processes, procedures and mechanisms could influence the impact accessibility and inclusive design principles have on the development process and not just reviewing the guidance.

4.2. The Mechanisms of the Access Planning Process

The five main mechanisms to be studied and investigated are the Access Strategy, the Access Audit, the Access Plan, the Conservation Assessment and the Access Management of Services and Operations (Figure 4.2). The first four are mentioned in English Heritage’s 2004 version, and although not mentioned, the Access Management of Services and Operations is included as well. A step-by-step review of the English Heritage’s 2004 version will be described towards the end of this chapter before the Summary, and will be compared to the RIBA Plan of Work Stages.

![Access Planning Process Diagram]

Figure 4.2: The five main mechanisms in the Access Planning Process (The Proactive Process) (author)
The Access Strategy, Access Audit and Access Plan are three processes that are interrelated culminating in the documentation of an audit and a draft access plan. Access plans are useful to use as a document to obtain grants such as the Heritage Lottery Fund. The Conservation Assessment is part of the process, which is also a procedure to obtain Listed Building Consent, although it is prepared by the conservation architect in the proactive process. Post control processes include the Management and Services and Operations (Figure 4.2). This could also be read in conjunction with the development control or reactive process in Figure 3.1.

The two distinctive processes of Planning and Building Control (PBC) and Access Planning Process (APP) are linked together via the Development Process: firstly, the ‘proactive APP’ happens before submitting for planning and listed building consent, usually initiated by the applicant (client and/or developer), and carried out by the agents (architect and/or project manager); and secondly, the ‘reactive PBC process’ come about after the application for planning and listed building consent and the building control aspects thereafter (Adams, 2004b). The ‘proactive APP’ continues after project completion, which is regarded as the management of services and operations process, as it falls under the applicant’s and/or service provider’s control. The recurring explanation referring to Figure 3.1 and 4.2 is necessary to present the next two figures (Figures 4.3 and 4.4) to illustrate why the five main mechanisms are important to be reviewed where each mechanism determines how relevant they are to achieving the objectives of accessibility to historic listed buildings.

English Heritage’s APP version using the mechanisms such as Access Strategy, Access Audit, Access Plan and Conservation Assessment, and placing the user groups of both conservation and access under ‘feasibility and option studies’ (Figure 4.3), and ends the process by the Access Plan. The thesis will also investigate all of the above mechanisms as well as the missing framework, which is the Access Management of Services and Operations, while expanding the conservations aspects in the Conservation Assessment / Conservation Plan. Hence the research will explore the possibility of an alternative
version to be considered by English Heritage and CADW, which will be reviewed in this section and discussed at length in Chapter 9 (see also Figure 4.4)

The processes in the Access Planning Process mainly deal with the client and or service provider and their consultants, who are the architects, inclusive designers and conservation architect. The Access Strategy which is the earliest process may not include the consultants. However, the sub-sequent processes, such as the Access Audit and Access Plan require the involvement of the access consultant, architects and conservation architect to an extent. The Conservation Assessment would certainly require the conservation architect’s involvement (Figure 4.3). These processes should occur before development control and planning submission and the continuity of the process is represented in Figure 4.4.
The continuity of the process that provides the resultant Accessible Design after undergoing development control or post control involves the client overseeing the Access Management of Services and Operations process. The engagement of the access consultant and the user group may be extended to this post control process for a number of years to get Accessible Design right. The extension of the processes complete the picture for Access Planning Process, which in the English Heritage version (2004) did not reflect this model. This model is reflected by the Single Case Study explained in Chapter 9.
4.2.1. Access Strategy

An Access Strategy is a set of decisions agreed and documented by the client/applicant on a project, usually in the beginning or inception stage to set forth the accessibility and inclusive design policies envisioned for the project. It is similar to an access policy where the client/applicant plan ahead the management of the services and operations aspect to the project. English Heritage (2004) proposed that the Access Strategy, "requires a strategic commitment at a high level in the organization to making the service more inclusive either through design or management measures, or more often a combination of the two." Similar conclusions were echoed after English Heritage (along with the National Trust and DRC) conducted a series of seminars on the historic environment in 2005. Two important points to be emphasized here are: (i) the strategic commitment at an organization’s high level; (ii) making the service more inclusive through design and/or management measures.

The significance of this mechanism was underlined further by the Disability Rights Commission and the Heritage Lottery Fund. The DRC has outlined the importance of having a strategic statement, when stating that,

This ‘strategic’ statement could include an expression of the level to which accessibility is considered in the management procedures of the initiator of the project. It should also include a strategic overview of the legislation …and the scope and level of the guidance that will be adopted. Comments should be made on how accessibility issues will be addressed at both the operational and the ongoing management phases of the development and how the Project Sponsor will ensure that the evolving duties of the DDA are to be met…for example, on staff development and training.”

(DRC, 2005)

Again, stress was given to the management procedures and operations phase. The Heritage Lottery Fund, has outlined seven criteria in relation to the conservation of arts
An access policy is a top-level document, which shows your commitment to the principles of improving access throughout your organization. It will outline your main areas of responsibility and show how the aim of improving access relates to your organizational aims. It will outline your approach to removing barriers in all aspects of your activities and the ways in which you work to put the policy into actual practice. The main areas your policy should cover are: (i) access to services and facilities; (ii) access to programmes and products; (iii) consultation with users, non-users, staff and other stakeholders; (iv) including relevant groups in developing the policy; (v) the role of your own processes such as training and recruitment; (vi) how you will monitor, evaluate and review the policy; and (vii) the relationship of the access policy to your other policies and documents such as conservation plan (HLF, 2005)

English Heritage (2004) further advised that the Access Strategy should be considered according to the timescale and budget of the project and that, “someone must assume responsibility for overseeing, evaluating and reviewing the implementation of any measures that are subsequently identified in the access planning process.” The points discussed for Access Strategy will be summarized and concluded with other points from the literature review in the Conclusion section of this chapter.

4.2.2. Access Audit

According to the Centre for Accessible Environments (2005), an Access Audit is, in very broad terms, "an assessment of an aspect of an environment (building or external area) and services in terms of accessibility". The centre further explains that, "It is a measure of how well the environment and method of service delivery meet the needs of existing and potential users, whether they be staff, visitors, volunteers, pupils, patients and students or others." The usage of an access audit before restoration work commences is a
requirement that was emphasized by major stakeholders such as the HLF and DRC. Access audits for listed buildings, as proposed by the Heritage Lottery Fund, require the auditing of programmes and improving services to help the public to compensate for the lack of physical changes, as stated,

Access audits focus on physical, sensory and sometimes intellectual access to heritage sites. However, you can take the same approach to auditing organizational, social and cultural, or financial access...by reviewing your current access arrangements and identifying ways you can improve services or programmes.

(HLF, 2005)

This reflects on the importance of the access management of services and operations of an organization outlined by the Access Strategy previously. Further more, Bone, 1996:15, had stated in a survey done based on 52 buildings, that included listed buildings, and 310 user responses, whereby four important conclusions were made concerning accessibility issues: (i) the emphasis given to improvements for people with mobility disabilities; (ii) where finance for improvements was available, architectural and planning requirements were seen as the main constraints preventing improvements; (iii) The need for comprehensive (but also flexible) planning for improvement and the need for imaginative design were apparent. Where improvements were tackled piecemeal, without an overall plan, opportunities were lost and money was wasted; (iv) Care and consistence of detailing is necessary, not only for improvements but also throughout the building.” Bone’s conclusions placed the importance of having Access Audits done on all existing buildings, to as comprehensive and detailed as possible, and the issues pertaining to Access Auditing may go beyond the scope of this research, even covering the training aspects of auditing and the specialization needed when dealing with historic listed buildings echoing the relevance of access audits similar to the CAE. Access Audit is done at the very beginning of a project, as stated by the CAE, whereby, “Access auditing involves an inspection of a building or environment to appraise its accessibility – judged against predetermined criteria. The audit includes a report, which outlines the
current situation and makes recommendation for improvements where necessary” (CAE, 2005).

Access Audit is closely linked with Access Strategy, as the former is the logical next step to identify the accessibility requirements early on the project. Access audits are usually conducted by an auditor or consultant, preferably registered under the National Register of Access Consultants. The access audit reports are expected to provide possible solutions, which could easily be used to specify and quantify to complete a total cost of the expenditure. Arguably the Access Audit could be done concurrently with the Access Strategy to provide a more realistic knowledge of the access parameter for the scope of the project. English Heritage’s APP 2004’s version placed the Access Audit to be done simultaneously with the Conservation Assessment, which would enable the decision-making process on both conservation and accessibility to come together early, which would give more time to engage with both sides of the issue.

Another possibility for the Access Audit where there is a direct implication from auditing to forming Access Statements, which are considered to be relevant in the APP as suggested that “…details of any professional advice – such as access audits or design appraisal…” (Dickinson, 2005). Hence, the relevance of the access audits in the planning and control processes, via the client applicant, in order to provide a clearer picture of the intention of managing change, which is a crucial point in applying for the Listed Building Consent. The points will be discussed further in the summary and Conclusion section of this chapter.

4.2.3. Access Plan

The Access Plan noticeably emerged on the first publication advice on access to historic properties by English Heritage, in 1995, and developed further, prior to the latest publication in 2004. The first guidance which provided a checklist to determine whether alterations should be made provided a step-by-step guide, briefly stated as follows “(i) identify your access needs; (ii) consider whether access can be provided in ways that
avoid alterations to the building; (iii) if some alteration is still necessary consider the following (including the protected status of the building)…” (English Heritage, 1995), was more of a set of assessments, and not linked to the development process until Adams, 2003, presented the Access Plan and the Access Planning Process as part of the planning control process, and made it clearer in the English Heritage, 2004 version. Hence the emergence of the Access Plan had provided a clearer picture to include accessibility and inclusive design in the process of developing the listed buildings.

An assumption is being made that the decision for an Access Plan may have originated from and/or coincided with, the Heritage Lottery Fund’s application procedure, whereby HLF’s decision to include the Access Plan prompted English Heritage to consider a similar approach and/or review their guidance. HLF was created by Parliament in 1994, advising grant applicant’s to include an Access Plan, as mentioned that, “an access plan will show how you plan to put your policy into action. It will of course include access for people with physical and sensory disabilities but its scope is much wider. It will cover all forms of access including organisational, physical, sensory, intellectual, financial, social and cultural” (HLF, 2005).

Heritage Lottery Fund, as an important funding body for regeneration work and giving incentives for many historic listed buildings to rebuild and restore, had arguably provided the necessary catalyst to promote accessibility to the historic environment. The detail to which HLF requires the applicant for funding to subscribe to inclusive design is as stated, An access plan is a document which: (i) takes an overall view of your heritage site, including buildings, structures, collections, landscape and interpretations; (ii) takes an overall view of your organisation’s policies, practices and procedures which may restrict or improve access; (iii) identifies the barriers to access; (iv) identifies strategies to deal with these barriers and improve access; (v) identifies priorities and resources; (vi) can be used to help you with longer-term access improvements; (vii) sets a standard against which you can
measure future improvements; and (viii) helps to strengthen and review organisational policies.

(HLF, 2005)

The issue of linking the Access Plan with the Conservation Assessment (in English Heritage's 2004 version), was mentioned by Adams, 2003, when he stated that, "access plans should reflect a workable reconciliation of needs established by the Access Statement with the conservation needs of the building (possibly in form of Conservation Statement)." This suggests even more so the link between the Access Plan, as a mechanism on the proactive process and the Access Statement, a mechanism on the reactive process. This inquiry will be further investigated in the Conclusion of Chapter Two.

HLF's Access Plan requirements stated earlier however has yet to be interpreted clearly with English Heritages's guidance, as the Government has yet to produce a White Paper on the implementation of the Access Statement by policy guidance such as the Planning Policy Guidance 15, currently under review. However, the research needs to inquire further the links between the reactive and proactive processes, such as the "consultation of (user) groups", as HLF placed importance on that particular mechanism that is not emphasized in the English Heritage 2004 version, as mentioned, "you should aim to include:...(vi) evidence of consultation with a wide range of relevant individuals and interest groups (HLF, 2005); and further more HLF is willing to fund, "consultation with relevant individuals and groups; and translation and interpretation costs you have to pay during consultations" (HLF, 2005). As a funding body, the pressure is not on English Heritage to conform, but from the owners of historic listed building indirectly influencing English Heritage by reacting the HLF’s requirements. The issue of consultation of groups will be discussed further next.
4.3. Access Consultancy

Access Consultancy fulfilled the need for the DDA 1995 requirements. The problem was identified that there was a need for Access Consultants when the legislation was in place as well as the impact when the establishment of the Heritage Lottery Fund, passed in Parliament in 1994 occurred. This set a momentum for change to accommodate access requirements in refurbishment projects and building conservation projects. When the “DDA became into effect, so properties managers and owners need to get advice on how to make their buildings accessible and anybody could call themselves an access consultant” (Cave, 2005) It resulted in bad advice given to building owners where “I have seen many examples where I have seen people have spent a lot of money improving their building and in fact it has not been satisfactory for disabled people particularly WCs that were meant to be fully accessible” (Cave, 2005)

That called for the setting up of a registry and body to create the registered Access Consultants, which is called National Registry on Access Consultants (NRAC).

4.4. Management of Services and Operations

Heritage Lottery Fund provided the definition of management of heritage assets to be as follows:

Management is all the operational activities your organisation undertakes including business planning, setting priorities, working with partners, interpreting, using and caring for the heritage.

(HLF, 2004)

Management would also include the maintenance of heritage assets, defined as, “the routine work needed to care for an asset, including regular inspections and minor work” (HLF, 2004). English Heritage, 2004, had included management to be an important aspect but did not expand this aspect in the APP as the framework was to cater for the
design and restoration aspects rather than operational. The objective of the Access Plan was however to aim for the management aspects to be considered, as stated,

A key element of all access provision, and a fundamental aspect of the access plan, is the ownership of the policy at the top of the organisation backed up with staff awareness and training, together with continuing management support for best practice. An accessible WC used to store cleaning materials rapidly ceases to be accessible; a cluttered reception desk with a profusion of leaflets and notices offers clear information to no one – good access is thus dependent upon the effective management of the whole service. In many instances a change in management or operational practices can overcome a physical access issue. (English Heritage, 2004)

From April to September 2005, the English Heritage, National Trust and Disability Rights Commission conducted a series of 13 seminars on the historic environment, whereby the objective was to find out from disabled people and user groups their concerns and issues pertaining to the historic environment. A summary from the Heritage Link, 2005, stated that, “cultural change in organisations is the fundamental condition for success and that the engagement of senior management (or trustees) makes delivery more effective and more firmly embedded in working practices.” This suggests the importance of thinking about management aspects earlier on in the access planning process at the strategic level as the top level decision-making process is often at the beginning with budgetary commitments. Aspects of staff training and appointing a customer access officer for the service provider is underlined further in another seminar findings such as “the importance of training for staff and volunteers is important,” and “small and often simple solutions can sometimes target (access) needs better than big physical schemes” (Heritage Link, 2005). Although physical access was suggested as important, the management aspects were highlighted frequently and in different ways, such as training of staff on disability awareness and access needs.
For listed buildings, compromises made to physical change necessitate innovative and creative solutions to providing the satisfactory services expected by the provider, and one aspect that had resonated throughout practice is the concept of “reasonable adjustments”.

4.4.1 Reasonable Adjustments

Reasonable Adjustments is a term closely associated with the legal interpretation found in the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), 1995. It was briefly discussed earlier and the term was derived from the Disability Discrimination Act, 1995, Code of Practice, Part Three on Goods, Facilities and Services, on the Duty of Providers on Making Adjustments, whereby, in Section 21(2),

Where a physical feature (for example, one arising from the design and construction of a building or the approach or access to premises) makes it impossible or unreasonably difficult for disabled persons to make use of such a service, it is the duty of the provider of that service to take such steps as it is reasonable, in all the circumstances of the case, for him to have to take in order to:
(a) remove the feature;
(b) alter it so that it no longer has that effect;
(c) provide a reasonable means of avoiding the feature; or
(d) provide a reasonable alternative method of making the service in question available to disabled persons.

(DDA, 1995)

Reasonable Adjustments point of departure focused on the physical access first and when that is not possible, an alternative access that compensates the physical access could be acceptable based on the legality implications of the act, but not necessarily satisfying the visitor or user. An example of this could be castles with ramparts, thick walls and sensitive structures and archaeological foundations that are too important to intervene and Georgian terrace houses with tight spaces where the visitors do not have lift access to the
upper floors and to compensate the lack of vertical access, a video presentation or interactive virtual tour would be set up at the accessible ground level.

"The following factors from the DDA Code of Practice might be taken into account when considering whether the adjustment is reasonable: whether taking any particular steps would be effective in overcoming the difficulty that disabled people face in accessing the services in question; the extent to which it is practicable for the service provider to take steps; the financial and other costs of making the adjustment; the extent of any disruption which taking the steps would cause; the extent of the service provider's financial and other resources; the amount of any resources already spent on making adjustments; the availability of financial or other assistance" (CADW, 2002). The language of reasonableness was commonly found in all policy guidance on conservation, as illustrated and quoted by CADW.

Attempts were made to rectify this with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Amendment) 2005 Regulations, making it compulsory for the applicant to acknowledge the main issues of access to the building, as the 2005 regulations added, "(4) (d) explain how any specific issues which might affect access to the building have been addressed; and (e) explain how features which ensure access to the building will be maintained."

4.4.2 Access Planning Process (English Heritage)

Based on the English Heritage's 2004 publication, the Access Planning Process framework was discussed under the section on "determining reasonableness", including all the five main mechanisms. The APP provided guidance for those involved in building conservation work in the light of the Disability Discrimination Act, and as the editor confirmed was designed especially with the architect and/or conservation architect in mind. Earlier English Heritage's guidance in 1995, had incorporated a checklist to achieve accessibility. The idea of the Access Plan first developed in the 1995 version, but
emerged in 2003 to address the development process in earnest and finally resulted in a more comprehensive framework in the 2004 version.

Is the idea of proposing an Access Plan to be the main document of reference for the development of listed buildings to complement the existing mechanisms required in obtaining the Listed Building Consent? Is the Access Plan a precursor to the development of the Access Statement? These questions will be developed further in Chapters Four and Five.

The way that it was presented, the Access Plan was foreseen to ensure the continuity of the objectives in achieving accessibility throughout the project until completion. Whether or not the Access Plan could be translated or linked to the Access Statement for listed building projects will depend upon how the practice of conservation develops, and/or is currently being debated by the policy-makers and the Government to find the best way to take forward the Access Planning Process in line with the aspirations expressed in the reviews and reports on the state of planning for the historic environment.

There were no attempts to date to analyse the Access Planning Process with the other examples of best practice and guidance on non-listed buildings, or new building processes. It is assumed that although the argument is to find similarities between listed buildings and non-listed buildings undergoing refurbishment, the conservation aspects were too specialized to do so. An attempt was made by the Royal Institute of British Architects in producing the Model Project Access Method Statement as part of a document called RIBA Inclusion and Access Policy, prepared from a seminar in 2005. Using the RIBA Plan of Work Stages as a reference point, the mechanisms in the development process were listed as “process and inputs”, “practice outputs” and “controls”, highlighting the different mechanism corresponding with different RIBA Work Stages. The inclusion of non-listed buildings for refurbishment was evident as the use of “access audits” was included. Other models that could be analyzed with the APP would be DPTAC’s Inclusive Projects and RIBA Plan of Work Stages, purely from a listed building perspective.
4.5. Summary

Access Strategy was defined differently by two important bodies, the English Heritage and the HLF, that needed to work together in the historic environment. Access Audit could be better utilised in the Access Planning Process and be considered even very early on in the Access Strategy stage as budgetary constraints are often decided form the very beginning. Access Plan is considered the ultimate target document in the 2004 English Heritage’s version of the Access Planning Process.

Consultation with the users, in precise terminology, Access Advisory Groups, should be a mechanism on its own and expanded in definition to work in the proactive process to be financed by the developer.

Conservation Assessment was recommended by English Heritage (2004), to be done corresponding with the access audits, hence, the coming together of both the audit and the conservation aspects at this early stage, right after Access Strategy would juxtapose the main issues and potential conflicts pertaining to the conservation project.

Reasonable Adjustments point of departure focused on the physical access first and when that is not possible, an alternative access that compensates the physical access could be acceptable based on the legality implications of the act, but not necessarily satisfying the visitor or user.

The Access Statement a mechanism proposed in the reactive process would either follow or correspond with the Access Strategy and Access Plan, both mechanisms proposed in the proactive process.
CHAPTER 5
Preliminary Studies

5.1 Introduction

In addition to the summaries from the literature review, findings from the preliminary studies were used to design the research (Figure 1.1) As mentioned earlier in Chapter 1, the main reason for the preliminary studies was due to very little literature available on the research subjects of Accessibility and Conservation together. Research on accessibility published from the view of conservationists and conservation architects is almost non-existent. The DDA 1995’s impact could be more apparent after 2004, hence literature review on conservation and accessibility combined are based on recent official publications by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), Department of Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS), English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments from the year 2000 to 2004 (Hobson, 2004), and as discussed in Chapter 2 (Table 2.1).

Apart from these recent official publications, most of the previous research focused on the development process in general, such as the attitudes of developers, institutions and disabled people, as in research by Imrie et al. (1998, 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b), and Gleeson (2001). The topic of design and control was suggested by Imrie and Hall’s book in 2004, and other articles, Imrie et al. (1998, 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b), concentrated mostly on the development process and the role of the developer, including the architect’s perceptions in design. Although these publications were not focused on the historic environment, some aspects on the attitudes of architects and the development processes, including the use of regulatory controls are useful for this research.

At the time when this research started in October 2002, the effect of DDA 1995 was only recently felt and the term of reasonable adjustment was not yet enforced in anticipation of the enforcement in 2004, particularly on the duties of service providers. Hence the decision was to interview experts in the subject area to find opinions on the current
practice and how effective was the development control processes in respect to the overall development process.

5.2. Preliminary Studies

For the preliminary studies, the author consistently used the main research question as a line of inquiry: Does the importance of Conservation take precedence over the importance of Accessibility in the process of developing a Historic and Listed Public Building, from the design stage until completion and post-occupancy?

The need to add some primary evidence and data to strengthen the research hypothesis instigated the following preliminary research activities conducted between December 2002 and December 2003 and ran concurrent with the Literature Review period. Three research activities were conducted simultaneously in order to formulate a more comprehensive research strategy that would inform the choice of research methods (Figure 5.2)

1. Experts interviews

The expert interviews were conducted with individuals who had dealt with the issue of accessibility and inclusive design in general, and who sat in a working committee of a government elected body, an access consultant, an access officer working in the local authority and an architect. All of those interviewed had dealt with historic listed buildings in their working and advisory capacity. The group of experts consisted of:

i. Peter Barker OBE (Senior Adviser of Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee);

ii. Pippa Jackson (Access Officer, City of London Corporation);

iii. Andrew Walker (Access Consultant, Architect);

iv. Edward Jones (Architect, Dixon Jones Architects)
2. **Pilot Case Study**

The Manchester City Art Gallery (MCAG) was chosen as a preliminary case study as it was a listed public building, in this case with a Grade 1 and Grade 2* combined and was completed in 2002. It had undergone the process of planning approval after the introduction of the DDA 1995, as MCAG started building works in 1996. Open interviews were done with the architect, the building control officer, the conservation officer, planning officer, access officer and disabled users. Using the detached observation method guided by using a Centre for Accessible Environment checklist, the author conducted an Access Audit. The author used a wheelchair at all floors and recorded observations. Apart from that, records of the drawing submission were obtained from the architect. Articles on the building were obtained from the web and online journals. A case study with the multi-method approach would provide for much evidence at this stage to expand on the research questions and hypothesis.

3. **Group Interview of a Focus Group**

The group interview consisted of a focus group-style meeting and a visit to a Grade 1 listed museum with a group of individuals from the People First organization in Liverpool. The group consisted of disabled people of different needs and disabilities, including people with multiple disabilities and people needing assistance to interpret speech.
5.3. Research Hypothesis based on Preliminary Studies Findings

5.3.1. Experts Interview

When interviewing the individuals, there were three general questions posed to them. These questions were asked to ascertain what direction this research could take and were used as references for the literature review and this chapter to build up the theoretical framework.
The first question referred back to the basic line of inquiry whether Conservation was
given more emphasis and importance than Accessibility in general. The second question
was inquiring about the development control process and how important was the
processes' mechanisms in achieving accessibility to historic buildings. The third question
referred to the interviewees' involvement with the issue of accessibility and historic
buildings and their individual work and what are the areas that they were most concerned
about (Table 5.1).
Table 5.1: Findings from the expert interviews in the preliminary studies stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peter Barker OBE (Senior Adviser of DPTAC) | The important thing in the English Heritage 1995 document was what they were saying about the access plan as you can have clearly defined responsibilities. You should ensure somebody is responsible for access and when you want to get a design done, you must make sure that the design has proven competence in introducing access features.  

The **access statement**, the purpose of that was to bring out into the open all the issues in the proposed design which were not complied with the Approved Doc. M or BS 8300.  

I would prefer a more positive approach in BS 8300 or Part M, rather than just the minimum standard. Really we should try to do better than the minimum. They were always thought to be a reasonable compromise.  

Because access is not just about the physical design of the building. It’s about the **information systems**, associated with Part M and standards: Minimum standard and reasonable compromise | Access Plan                                      | Access Statement                                 | Services and information systems               |
the building. It’s providing services, selling something.

Another aspect is the management of the training of those who work in the building. I think there were cases where the inadequacies of a badly designed building can be reduced by excellent staff service.

We can’t make it fully inclusive. Now that is regrettable but we should try very hard to do it and put aside prejudices and use our flair and imagination, technology when its appropriate and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pippa Jackson (Access Officer)</th>
<th>Management and training of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We looked at the access at the site with the building owner and architect, as it’s going for a dual listed and planning approval at the same time. And we looked at all the problems and negotiate.</td>
<td>Innovative and appropriate solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because we (access officers) were involved in the pre-application stage we are able to sort out these issues with EH before it starts to becoming a planning application and the problems occur here in the City we built up quite a good</td>
<td>Role of access officer - negotiating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of access officer
relationship with EH. So it works out quite well. We tend to
deal with the listed building through the planning process at
that stage but people know they can come directly to us to
look at access at that early stage so that they don't have to do it
through the planning process.

We only deal with the planner. The planner is the access liaison
and in between. Occasionally we will meet with the person in
the authority who deals with the listed building at the planning
stage. I have sat a couple of times and how can we improve
access, if it's not going to be Part M standard, and we sit
together and try to reach a compromise between issues to
get the best that you can.

Planners have to know so much about so many things, but it is
okay when it's straightforward and a new building but when it
requires sort of a minute detail that is going away outside of
Part M and yet making it accessible, very important that access
officer's involved. We help run the access group, the local
access group that we fully fund and support. And we could out
to them for advice and come back in again.

During a meeting for a listed building we want the access statement to show that they fully considered providing access at the front main entrance for disabled people, and they could prove to us without any doubt that the access at the main entrance not possible for disabled people cause that would be ideal.

They are relying on things like EVAC chairs, and EVAC chairs isn’t the answer. If you deal at the planning stage you could had emergency evacuation lifts, which everybody gets confused with the fire evacuation lifts. They are different things and people don’t understand that. You consider wheelchair access and nothing else so... The access statements mean that they consider all these things.

We tend to address at the planning stage we comment on the Part M bits but we will also comment something that will be DDA compliant. We are making it clear to them that we are
commenting on both sides. It’s very hard because there is no case gone through yet. But it will be sensible to address such and such issue, otherwise you will have a DDA conflict in a few years time. Particularly they are office buildings and there will be disabled employee. So there are these kind of issues.

| Andrew Walker  
| (Access Consultant) | **Access statements** is something that is designed to be going for planning and building regulations, at the same time it is a statement about building regulations and planning issues. It goes at the very beginning of planning applications. That relates immediately to what we wanted all the time. Regulation is all thought as one entity. It also means something that is at the start of the procedure. Documents should be modified as the project continues. It is a very useful document for courts and everything else. | Access statements |

**Access statements** – it does give the architect and the client an opportunity. When I mentioned to the client and the architect on this project, the need to have an access statement, it is something to be agreed by the architect, client and access

Access statements
consultant at least. They are part of a team. It’s really super because it is where everybody agrees on something.

I think about things as the architect, I kept thinking about finding solutions to problems providing they have the right information. They can go into finding **positive design solutions**.

I am very interested in EH, what they did there, how accessible it really is. It’s totally important to me. I think if it’s not brilliant it’s an opportunity loss.

There appears to be in the photograph some very fine modern architecture within the old structure.

That’s to do with the building, isn’t it? It has a strategy and it works for several years I suppose. It’s **time based**, **cost based**...As for access issues, it’s something that they should be in consultation with the local users.

Why do they get this ridiculous decision that is so basic...no landing at the door is so basic you can’t understand it...the

| Best practice |
| Conservation Plan |
| Best practice / Part M |
Edward Jones  
(Architect)  

We are more concerned with the concept of ‘democratic’ space and access is a crucial aspect to that. We recognized this in our practice for a long time dealing with public buildings and museums, we should make it very accessible to everyone. It should be non condescending.

For the National Gallery at Trafalgar square, we managed to find a solution where everyone could come in through at ground level from the square rather than the big set of stairs in the middle. It is meant to be a side entrance, where you come to a space and you could access the cloakroom and toilets easily (Figure 5.3).

What happened was the decision with the conservation officer that it would be a reversible solution in having the stone steps relocated elsewhere in the building and then build a slight

| Edward Jones (Architect) | We are more concerned with the concept of ‘democratic’ space and access is a crucial aspect to that. We recognized this in our practice for a long time dealing with public buildings and museums, we should make it very accessible to everyone. It should be non condescending. For the National Gallery at Trafalgar square, we managed to find a solution where everyone could come in through at ground level from the square rather than the big set of stairs in the middle. It is meant to be a side entrance, where you come to a space and you could access the cloakroom and toilets easily (Figure 5.3). What happened was the decision with the conservation officer that it would be a reversible solution in having the stone steps relocated elsewhere in the building and then build a slight | Best practice (innovation) | Best practice (innovation) | Best practice (innovation) |
sloping ramp right into the building, coming right up from the square to get the length (Figures 5.4 and 5.5).

Architects would also be set up with these challenges. We had to deal with the space internally as well using the lower ground floor, although the ceiling was low, it was just a vestibule. Like small hall before going to the main space, so aesthetically we managed to get it right.

The idea of modern architects such as Le Corbusier, with the idea of ramp, pilotis and lifts are rooted in an open plan and barrier-free. For example, Villa Savoye.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best practice (innovation)</th>
<th>Best practice (innovation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Figure 5.3: The plan diagram, indicating the new Getty Entrance designed by Dixon Jones, making it physically accessible on street level entrance, which is in relation to other ancillary facilities at Level 0 of the National Gallery. Source: The National Gallery Website; http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/plan/floorplan_lower.htm
Figure 5.4: The new Getty Entrance, where it provides a direct access without change of level from the street. The steps have been removed into the building.

Figure 5.5: The original steps had been preserved on the other side.
5.3.2. Pilot Case Study

Manchester City Art Gallery (MCAG) was designed by the architectural firm, Michael Hopkins and Partners, in 1999-2002 as part of the City Art Gallery. The conservation work consisted of Sir Charles Barry’s design of originally the Royal Manchester Institution (1829-35) on Mosley Street which is a Grade 1 listed building and Barry’s Athenaeum (1836-39) on Princess Street, which is a Grade 2* building. A new addition was added in between the two historic buildings. The building is owned by Manchester Corporation who took over the Grade 1 building, which was already the City Art Gallery in 1882 and acquired the Athenaeum in 1938 (Manchester City Gallery, website, 2005).

“The new building unites the City Art Gallery with the adjacent Athenaeum and the overall development forms a single Gallery precinct, using a glazed foyer space to create a cross axis, connecting the new and old buildings [Figure 5.9], while allowing them to retain their individual integrity… A footbridge crosses over the glazed link to the new extension, with its own grand staircase and free standing lift towers.”

(Michael Hopkins, website, 2005)

The building was selected as a case study as it was completed in 2002 when this PhD study started, built after DDA commenced in 1995, consisted of listed buildings being altered and restored and most importantly a public building. The building was not chosen for the main data collection as a more recently to be completed building in 2005 was needed for that, which will be discussed in Chapter 9.

Open interviews were conducted with the participants involved in the proactive process before and after development control and the reactive process of development control (Table 5.2). A general question concerning disabled access was put forward to those interviewed along with questions concerning their roles in the project. Thereafter, the interview questions were expanded upon to lead up to other paths of inquiry in an hour.
long interview, conducted once. Summaries from the interviews will be concluded in Table 5.4.

5.3.2.1 Interviews with participants to the development process of the Manchester City Art Gallery

Table 5.2: Quotes from the participants interviewed on the Manchester City Art Gallery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons interviewed</th>
<th>Designation and/or role</th>
<th>Key words and quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren Marshall</td>
<td>Urban Design and Conservation Officer, Manchester City Council (MCC)</td>
<td>Conservation Practice Retaining the symmetry of the Sir Charles Barry's Neo-Classical building (Grade 1 listed) was consciously felt by the architects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th February 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of Access Officer / Part M The architects themselves were not aware of the accessibility issue that well. The criticism is that there should be a more concerted effort to be done together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville Strowger</td>
<td>Access Officer, MCC / Wheelchair user</td>
<td>Part M Many problems such as entrance door and ramp at door; fire escape; ramp on the first floor. (Was not involved in the development control process of MCAG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th April 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Ward</td>
<td>Access Officer, MCC / Wheelchair User</td>
<td>Part M (Commented same as N. Strowger and was also not involved in the development control process of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th April 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Rogers</td>
<td>Building Control Surveyor, MCC.</td>
<td>(His involvement with the MCAG project is to vet the building submission plans including the means of escape and the idea of using EVAC chairs, for disabled person’s escape.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Rutherford</td>
<td>Planning Officer, MCC</td>
<td>Role of Access Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Knight</td>
<td>Architect, Michael Hopkins and Partners</td>
<td>Part M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservation Practice
English Heritage was involved with local planning because it is a MCC building. EH had a lot to say to the alteration of the building.

Conservation Practice / Part M
Problem of the back façade, at the first floor level, influencing the construction and design of the ramped access (footbridge).
(Figures 5.7, 5.10 and 5.11)

Role of Access Officer
The access officer was seldom involved with the building development process as the issue of conservation and many interested high-profile conservation scholars highlighted conservation issues.

Part M
MCC gave the architects the guideline / brief and they worked towards that.
It seems that the guideline is above Part M and the standards on accessibility. (The same comment was also quoted by N. Strowger /J. Rutherford/F. Harris).

Conservation Practice
Just as we got the commission, we
went 'headlong into the issues of conservation'.

Access Audit / Part M
An access audit was conducted on the building. The front entrance ramp followed Part M. Also need to consider other issues about an historic building such as environmentally.

Conservation Practice
Prof David Walker, a conservation specialist was fighting for scholarly purposes. Heritage Lottery Fund puts conditions for art work. There many interested parties about the art pieces, how much space etc.

Conservation Practice /
Reasonable Adjustment
Earlier on it was decided to have the first floor on one level, i.e. leveled with Atheneum’s first floor. This was a philosophical issue. There were a lot of reasons why they do not want too many ramps, and also the issue of the fire requirements, and security and that also means less ramps. The architects need to do a balancing
Conservation Practice
Symmetry was an issue and a compelling argument. Any asymmetrical solutions had been argued to the architect.

Conservation Practice
A lot of decision-making with heritage groups, such as Warren Marshall, who acts as a ‘filter’ and do make some decisions, especially in the later stages, via the English Heritage. The big decisions were done especially at Stage D, where there were the approval plus conditions, such as ‘how exactly are you going to make the hole on the wall’, details to achieve ‘integrity’. (Figures 5.7, 5. 10 and 5.11 on the back elevation wall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flick Harris</th>
<th>Access Advisory Group Manchester / Physically Disabled User</th>
<th>Part M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th June 2003</td>
<td>(Commented same as N. Strowger and was also not involved in the development control process of MCAG).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pippa Jackson</th>
<th>Partially-sighted User</th>
<th>Part M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10th June 2003</td>
<td>Use of glass as a material for stairs, ramp and light boxes makes it not accessible as people like me feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that there is a ‘hole in the floor’.  
(Figures 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8)

5.3.2.2 The Detached Observation using Access Audit checklist conducted on Manchester City Art Gallery on 15th November 2002:

An access audit conducted by the author using the Centre for Accessible Environment checklist was completed (Table 5.3) and three basic problems in access were revealed:

1. Main entrance door and landing before the main entrance is difficult to negotiate by people using wheelchairs, and generally tight spaces such as in toilet, lift car and corridors.

2. Facilities for partially-sighted people were lacking and poorly designed, such as using glass material for flooring, staircases and ramp (Figures 5.6 and 5.7). The ramped access (footbridge) that connects the new built ancillary space to the back of the Grade 1 listed building is not sloped according to Part M requirements (no landing and steep gradient).

Hence, Part M access requirements were not fully complied and the lack of best practice solutions made it necessary for disabled people in wheelchairs and partially-sighted people to need assistance in negotiating some building elements. Summaries from the detached observation findings are shown in Table 5.4.

Table 5.3: Main problems on Accessibility identified based on the Access Audit done on the Manchester City Art Gallery on 15th November 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items audited</th>
<th>Main Problems Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach, routes and street furniture</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External ramps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External steps</td>
<td>No guidance for non-sighted people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items audited</td>
<td>Main Problems Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrances</td>
<td>Main entrance has tight circulation in front of door due to slight ramp up and difficult for independent negotiation by wheelchair users. (Figure 5.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception areas and lobbies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors</td>
<td>Problem with width for some wheelchair users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal doors</td>
<td>( problem same as corridors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal ramps</td>
<td>Ramp on 1st floor from lift area to gallery area has safety problems as there is no landing before entering the Grade 1 back elevation. Slope of the ramp may not have complied with Part M Building Regulations and the corresponding standards. Ramp is made of toughened glass which is not accessible for partially-sighted people. (Figure 5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal stairs</td>
<td>Stairs made of toughened glass which is not accessible for partially-sighted people. (Figure 5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts</td>
<td>Tight turning radius inside lift car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform lifts and stairlifts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCs: general provision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCs: wheelchair users</td>
<td>Very tight space inside. Difficult to lock and unlock door independently by wheelchair user. Fittings such as door’s horizontal bar are not available. Difficult to identify toilet as signage and logo is too small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items audited</td>
<td>Main Problems Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal surfaces</td>
<td>Lack of contrast for partially-sighted people. Light boxes used for the flooring makes it difficult for partially-sighted people to use. (Figure 5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of escape</td>
<td>EVAC chairs are provided but many disabled people are not confident of their use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.6: The glass light box floor feature that is used to highlight and accentuate the back of the Grade 1 listed building by Sir Charles Barry on the right.

Figure 5.7: The 1st floor ramped access (footbridge) that links the new built ancillary spaces to the back of the Grade 1 listed building.
Figure 5.8: The main staircase made of steel and glass threads. (Source: Michael Hopkins, 2007).

Figure 5.9: The space between the Grade 1 and Grade 2* listed buildings which accommodate the main vertical circulation to the galleries. (Source: Michael Hopkins, 2007).
Figure 5.10: The first floor plan of the Manchester Art Gallery. The rendered central space is where the main vertical circulation accommodation is located which links to all the galleries. Between the two building blocks (top is the Grade 1 building; bottom is the Grade 2* building), there is a ramped footbridge.

Figure 5.11: The part facing the back elevation of the Grade 1 Listed Building. The section cuts at the ramp and central void area.
5.3.3. Focus Group

The focus group interview and observation’s main objective is to identify the problems that disabled people have on accessibility to historic public buildings. Findings on how disabled people use and visit historic public buildings would be “used as a supplementary source of data” (Morgan, 1997) to complement the other two research activities (expert interviews and pilot case study) for the preliminary studies findings.

The focus group’s main purpose is to determine the problems encountered by disabled persons when using historic public buildings in particular, and finding information that
clearly shows that building regulations have not been followed, have been compromised or ignored. This evidence would be analysed with the other two methods’ findings.

**The following main criteria were determined to find disabled persons who are users and or visitors to historic public buildings with the following characteristics:**

- Resides in the council or city concerned
- Use public buildings in the council or city area frequently, if not regularly
- Have interest in accessibility issues
- Have interest in historic public buildings accessibility issues

People First Liverpool is a self advocacy group that agreed to participate. The group’s main role is in assisting people mainly with learning difficulties and helping them to acquire skills by involving them in meetings and discussions, involving them in office activities and participating in self-improvement training. The group has conducted visits to places of interest in Liverpool and in February 2003 visited and attended a play at the Playhouse Theatre in Liverpool.

A focus group meeting was conducted where the author asked questions to a group, who called themselves the Equal People Group, consisting of 8 disabled persons with varying disabilities and their carers, with the help of the tutor. The first meeting was at People’s First Liverpool centre, on the 30th September 2003 from 10 am to 12 pm and was part of a bigger meeting session (an hour session). On the 14th of October, six of the group members visited the Maritime Museum at Albert Docks, which is a Grade I listed historic building. The author recorded the proceedings and interviewed the individuals in the group while we toured the building together.

In the first meeting, the group was shown the objectives of the session and photos of historic buildings mounted on a large board were distributed around. The photos included the Unity Theatre (behind Hardman Street), Everyman Theatre, Philharmonic Hall, Main Entrance and Side Entrance of 24, Hardman Street, Maritime Museum at the Albert Street.
Docks, Playhouse Theatre, City Council Offices at Dale Street, Walker Gallery, Liverpool Museum, Liverpool Library, Metropolitan Roman Catholic Cathedral, Anglican Cathedral, The Royal Liver Building, The Cunard Building and the Port of Liverpool Building. I asked each and everyone whether they have visited any of the buildings shown. The group members were encouraged to describe their experiences.

The following were the series of questions that were asked with the help of the tutor:
1. Tell us your name, where do you live and how often you visit Liverpool city.
2. Public buildings include art galleries, museums, libraries, town-halls, council offices, tourist offices. Many are historic buildings with significant cultural and heritage value. List public buildings that you have visited or use in Liverpool.
3. What is the nature of business that you do when using or visiting these buildings that you have listed?
4. What are the helpful things that you encounter when you use or visit these buildings?
5. What are the problems that you encountered when you use and visit these buildings?
   What was particularly frustrating about these buildings?
6. Which buildings are most accessible and least accessible? Historic public buildings of significance; old public buildings that are extensively renovated; newly-built public buildings; or any other types of public buildings.
7. List examples of the most accessible and least accessible public buildings according to an order.
8. How to improve the public buildings, especially the ones that you found problematic.
9. Is there anything that we missed? Is there anything that you came wanting to say that you didn’t get a chance to say?

5.3.3.1 Summary of findings

- Most of the disabled people interviewed find it hard to identify with the buildings in the picture.
- As a group they visited the Playhouse Theatre. One carer of a lady in wheelchair explained that 'you get disappointed when there is a set of staircase in front of the
building’ and did not find the historic environment in Liverpool accessible.

- Other things that were discussed were about 24, Hardman Street where the People First office is. There are problems with deliveries, not delivered to the side entrance but the main entrance which has no ramp and no railings. They have stayed there for 8 years but only recently did the building management installed the new railings at the main entrance.

- They usually go to the Everyman Theatre, which has ‘accessibility problems, including wc problems, although staff was helpful’.

- The Unity Theatre nearby is more accessible.

- Speke Hall is definitely not accessible as one of the group members explained on her recent trip with her sister in a wheelchair.

- During the building visit, the Maritime Museum had exhibitions at the basement, which is below ground level but there was no evacuation lift installed so the group was not able to access the exhibition.

- The Albert Docks listed warehouse area maintained cobbled pathways which were difficult for many of the wheelchair users to negotiate.

- Some of the displays were not readable to some group members as there were flashing displays or too high or too low.

The findings above determined the investigation of the building regulations, conservation practice and best practices.

The main objective of ‘determining the problems encountered by disabled persons when using historic public buildings’ in a city in England and Wales for a preliminary study was fulfilled as all the findings suggested that the issues of conservation and accessibility are conflicting. Although some places were accessible to enter, the services were not satisfactory as the disabled users and visitors from People First were not able to experience the whole historical and educational facilities being served compared to a non disabled person. The findings will be compared and analysed with the other two preliminary studies findings in the next section. (Table 5.4)
5.4 Summaries from preliminary studies combined

Table 5.4: Summaries from the preliminary studies focusing on the mechanisms and justifications for further investigation in this PhD study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Plan</td>
<td>The Access Plan is an important mechanism where it is a process rather than a set procedure based on a regulation. However the information gained can be used in an Access Statement. An Access Plan is adaptable as quoted in the English Heritage and by Barker who said “you can have clearly defined responsibilities. You should ensure somebody is responsible for access and when you want to get a design done, you must make sure that the design has proven competence in introducing access features.” An Access Plan could do for the proactive process, what the Access Statement could achieve in a reactive process. Access Strategy, Access Audit and Access Plan are always viewed under the same processes in the APP (Figure 4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice – innovation</td>
<td>Innovation in best practice was quoted 5 times in the expert interviews. It was strongly suggested by Jones where “we managed to find a solution where everyone could come in through at ground level from the square rather than the big set of stairs in the middle,” whereby the best practice architect knows when and what to use at the right time and keeping close to the objectives of social inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Adjustments</td>
<td>The term is not that popular to deal with but because it is a process embedded in the DDA 1995, it needs to be addressed. Jackson remarked, “We tend to address at the planning stage we comment on the Part M bits but we will also comment something that will be DDA compliant. We are making it clear to them that we are commenting on both sides,” where two important references were needed to emphasized to the applicant for planning approval and listed building consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice – guidance</td>
<td>The main concept in best practice when relating to guidance is the ‘leadership’ and ‘impetus’ for change translated and to be interpreted from the guidance by English Heritage and CADW. What change is needed and how to make such a change is the prerogative of the statutory bodies that leads the change. Walker, an architect, access consultant and disabled person sums the importance of best guidance when he said, “I think about things as the architect, I kept thinking about finding solutions to problems providing they have the right information. They can go into finding positive design solutions. I am very interested in English Heritage, what they did there, how accessible it really is. It’s totally important to me. I think if it’s not brilliant it’s an opportunity loss.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD Part M Building Regulation</td>
<td>Part M’s importance as a regulatory mechanism, has been the main reference point for the local authority. Part M is always a guide, and not yet a procedure, unless interpreted via documentation and procedure. The negotiation between local authority officers and the consultants would depend on Part M’s clarity in its guidance and the ease in its interpretation. The preliminary case study interviewee quoted that, “The architects themselves were not aware of the accessibility issue that well. The criticism is that there should be a more concerted effort to be done together,” shows Part M’s weakness in the overall process. However, Part M could be more influential when coupled with other mechanisms, especially in the regulatory framework processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Access Officer</td>
<td>In order for regulation to work, the interpretation done by a person in the decision making and negotiation process is most important, and more so the function of the Access Officer in his/her role to at least make aware in a telling manner. A lot of comments on the role of the access officer were made, where in both the case study and expert interviews, the issue of training and negotiating skills was pointed out. The access officer would really have to deal with complex issues. Jackson stated, “We looked at the access at the site with the building owner and architect, as its going for a dual listed and planning approval at the same time. And we looked at all the problems and negotiate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with users</td>
<td>From the case study and the focus group, the use of consultation with the users would have been very useful in order to find out the problems with regards to detailed design and locality issues where it is not found in any guidance or policy documents. For example, the focus group studied insisted in going to the same theatre which has &quot;accessibility problems, including wc problems, although staff was helpful,&quot; clearly shows the importance of getting first-hand information from the users group, what is the most important thing to consider from their point of view in the local context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Assessment</td>
<td>Conservation practice's objectives are interpreted in the Conservation Assessment, either called Conservation Plan or Statement or Management Plan, where it is a set procedure to document the planning and process for action in achieving conservation objectives. The importance of this procedural approach created a sense of ownership in the process. Since it is a procedure with documentation, it is always referred to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Not all access officers were involved in the development control process and not all local authorities have access officers. In the case study, with a highly specialized subject like the listed building concern, an access consultant who specialized in historic buildings could have assisted in a rather closed conference with historians and scholars, rather than not considering access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Statement</td>
<td>Access Statement is a procedure and document that would interpret Part M’s access requirements and would create that ‘ownership’ of the process and if successful would instigate best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
Research Methodology

6.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the rationale behind the thesis's Research Methodology, describing the theory and analysis of how the research should proceed (Harding, 1991). Earlier in Chapter 1, research questions and hypothesis were introduced to explain this thesis study.

Theoretical assumptions were formed from the literature review Chapters 2, 3 and 4 and combined with the findings from the preliminary studies in Chapter 5, which then developed the research hypothesis into research objectives, thus proposing what research methods were to be employed (Figure 6.1). This chapter describes the research design of the thesis framework, analyzing the methods to be used and how these methods would be used to prove the hypothesis.

Figure 6.1: The related constituents that informed the thesis framework which in turn influenced the Research Methods to be used.
Literature review on the combined subject of Accessibility and Conservation were very few at the early stages of this study and it became necessary to investigate to obtain primary data before the main data collection stage, in order to create viable research objectives. The review was not extensive enough to ascertain the complete set of mechanisms in the development process of historic and listed public buildings. "Qualitative data collected from the preliminary stage helped shape the research to explore non apparent issues and provided sufficient data to generate and revise conceptual frameworks," (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The theoretical development of this research hinged on the establishment of the right mechanisms to be studied and examined in the main data collection stage.

The preliminary studies, explained in detail in this chapter included open interviews that were conducted with participants to the development process. Firstly, experts on Accessibility were interviewed personally. Secondly, a case study of the alteration and extension to a listed and historic public building was made where interviews were conducted with the architect, the building control officer, the conservation officer, planning officer, access officer and disabled users. Finally, a focus group interview was conducted with a group of disabled persons by having a group meeting and a field visit to a listed and historic public building. These were the three main components of the preliminary study which assisted the development of the hypothesis by providing primary data to confirm the research methods.

6.2. Research Hypothesis based on Literature Review

The literature review summarized and presented in this section is to explain the research hypothesis and identify key points in the literature. The mechanisms identified will be used as variables to be tested in the main data collection stage.
6.2.1. Hypothesis 1

The policies and practice of conservation influence the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales.

The following assumptions (in italics) and summaries obtained from the literature review explain the reasoning behind the mechanisms identified:

(i) *Heritage Lottery Fund provided the much needed financial resource for building conservation and at the same time influencing the accessibility and inclusive design agenda by insisting on the applicants for funding to include Access Plan.*

Conservation practice was affected by changes in policy and the Government’s review on the historic environment since the year 2002 to pursue sustainable development, targeting social equity and economic viability objectives by providing better access. One such initiative that had influenced the practice of conservation significantly was the establishment of the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) by Parliament since 1994 providing for the much needed funding and impetus for the restoration of listed public buildings and spearhead urban regeneration as a whole. HLF created the precedence for creating inclusive public places in many British cities and towns (HLF, 2002).

(ii) *Conservation architects and architects were rethinking and redefining accessibility solutions to create a balance by providing accessibility, yet maintaining the conservation ideal and principles which has led to Best Practice and provided for some much needed innovative ideas.*

Policies and guidance on the historic environment were being revised in keeping with the UK Government’s objectives to make the development control processes more transparent. Principles of conservation - reversibility and minimum intervention were regarded to be most vulnerable to impacts made from
accessibility regulation, were explored and even innovated upon by conservation practitioners, even for grade 1 and 2* listed buildings, which suggested that accessibility and inclusive design could be incorporated together with historic building conservation principles (Jones, 2003; Noble and Lord, 2004).

(iii) The Disability Discrimination Act 1995’s impact on disabled people’s access in the historic environment had not been forthcoming due to the issue of reasonable adjustment.

Reasonable adjustment is subjected to interpretation and the DDA was deemed not to be having enough impact by allowing “loopholes” to occur. Disabled people are still not satisfied with the DDA, as for example, not being able to access upper floors of historic listed buildings due to building owners and service providers able to cite “reasonable adjustments” (Barker, 2003; Walker, 2003).

(iv) Key policy-makers and statutory bodies, such as the English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments are instrumental in providing best practice in the form of guidance and knowledge on how to provide a more accessible historical environment.

The DDA had made significant impact to disabled people’s rights to access and services in the historic environment, creating impetus on the heritage industry to provide guidance to the various stakeholders and provide ideas on how to improve on accessibility. Ever since DDA emerged in 1995, the policy-makers such as English Heritage (1995, 2004) and CADW (2002) had produced guidance for access to historic properties. The guidance at first was published for all the stakeholders responsible with the development of listed buildings, and the most recent guidance (English Heritage, 2004) focused more on clarifying the development process to designers and architects.
Research Objective for Hypothesis 1 will be:

1 To examine the practice of conservation and the recent policy changes involving the accessibility and inclusive agenda governing historic buildings, hence the research method would need to find evidence of how effective are the mechanisms in the legislative framework and the interpretation of the mechanisms. At the same time the practice of conservation by the consultants who are dealing with building conservation in the context of Heritage Lottery Fund’s insistence on producing access plans will be investigated.

2 To investigate the impact of both the conservation and accessibility legislation and policies on disabled people’s rights to access and services of historic and listed public buildings the research method will be designed to examine the impact of the DDA 1995, regulatory framework and the mechanisms related to the access and services of historic and listed public buildings.

6.2.2. Hypothesis 2

The planning control and building control processes influence accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales.

The following assumptions (in italics) and summaries obtained from the literature review explain the reasoning behind the mechanisms identified:

(i) **Access Statements** would assist in reducing discrepancies between and existing in the Planning Control and Building Control processes to ensure that accessibility needs are included.

Building control was first presented with ensuring access to buildings since 1984, however with the review of the planning system, planning control and listed building control had been introduced with policies to include accessibility needs.
However, the system has yet to be implemented fully and would need to create a mechanism to ensure the continuity as suggested by having access statements in every control process. For building control, it is assumed that it is not enough to just refer to Part M for listed buildings, hence the need for the Access Statement (Barker, 2003; Jackson, 2003; Walker, 2003).

(ii) *Part M Building Regulation* was not used as much as it should when dealing with listed buildings in the control system.

Part M Building Regulations provided the guidance, and is embedded as an important mechanism in the reactive process but it is assumed when it comes to building control for listed buildings, Part M is referred to but not necessarily followed (Adams, 2004).

(iii) The use of *Part M* depended on the subjective interpretation of the local authority officer concerned.

The building control officer or access officer may insist on a requirement in Part M to be met by the applicant, but may use other mechanisms in conjunction with the advice, such as access groups’ consultation. Not all of the access requirements need to be followed and the applicant may be granted building control approval without following any requirement in Part M, especially when it comes to listed buildings, as many requirements may be exempted due to conservation legislation (Barker, 2003; Walker, 2003).

(iv) Access officers were not playing an instrumental role in the decision making process but a more supportive and advisory role.

There seems to be indecision by many local authorities, for example 1/3 of local authorities in London, do not have access officers, which does not help to
facilitate the integration of accessibility agendas in the planning and building
control process (GLA, 2003).

Research objectives for Hypothesis 2 will be:

1 To examine the planning control and building control processes, identifying the
strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms that enforce the regulatory framework
that deals with accessibility and conservation combined and the effectiveness of the
implementation of these mechanisms embedded in the process needs to be examined.

2 To investigate the role of officers in planning control and building control process
when addressing the access needs of disabled people, in local authorities in England
and Wales. Additionally the roles need to be investigated and the opinions of the
decision-makers in the process be examined.

Although Access Statements were also identified, there was no evidence to be collected
as the use of them started in 2006, although questions on access statements were
addressed to the participants of the research. This will be explained further in this
chapter.

6.2.3. Hypothesis 3

The processes to implement accessibility are effective within the practice of
conservation.

The following assumptions (in italics) and summaries obtained from the literature review
explain the reasoning behind the mechanisms identified:

(i) Access Strategy was defined differently by two important bodies, English
Heritage and the Heritage Lottery Fund and the importance of this mechanism is
being addressed by the key policy-makers.
Access Strategy defined by English Heritage as a statutory body was compared to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) a funding body. The two different definitions were: (i) English Heritage implied the interpretation to be expanded by the service provider, stating generally that the Access Strategy is, “the strategic commitment at an organization’s high level; and making the service more inclusive through design and/or management measures,” (English Heritage, 2004) whereas, (ii) HLF provided a detailed wish-list as stated that the Access Strategy should include information on, “(i) access to services and facilities; (ii) access to programmes and products; (iii) consultation with users, non-users, staff and other stakeholders; (iv) including relevant groups in developing the policy; (v) the role of your own processes such as training and recruitment; (vi) how you will monitor, evaluate and review the policy; and (vii) the relationship of the access policy to your other policies and documents such as conservation plan” (HLF, 2002).

(ii) **Access Audit** could be better utilised in the Access Planning Process and be considered even very early on as planning constraints are often decided form the very beginning and before Conservation Statements are done for Listed Building Consent.

Access audit would be the first step to list out the accessibility requirements in detail, and would prove more effective in being detailed earlier on the project, to be compared with the needs of conservation, used against the Conservation Assessment. The Access Audit could also be useful where there is a direct implication from auditing to forming Access Statements, which are considered to be relevant in the Access Planning Process (Figure 4.1) as suggested that “details of any professional advice – such as access audits or design appraisal” (Dickinson, 2005) hence the relevance of the access audits in the planning and control processes, via the client applicant, in order to provide a clearer picture of the intention of managing change, which is a crucial point in applying for the Listed Building Consent.
(iii) **Access Plan** is considered the ultimate target document in the 2004 English Heritage’s version of the Access Planning Process.

It is argued that all considerations regarding accessibility to historic listed buildings are encapsulated within the requirements of the Access Plan as outlined in HLF’s requirements to obtain the HLF grants. Further more, the issue of linking the Access Plan with the Conservation Assessment (in English Heritage’s 2004 version), was mentioned by Adams, 2003, when he stated that, “access plans should reflect a workable reconciliation of needs established by the Access Statement with the conservation needs of the building, possibly in form of Conservation Statement.”

(iv) **Consultation with the users or Access Advisory Group** should be a mechanism established on its own and expanded in definition to work in the proactive process rather than be a voluntary mechanism.

HLF had insisted on the applicant to provide an “evidence of consultation with a wide range of relevant individuals and interest groups” (HLF, 2005a) which is highly indicative to confirming the relevance of the Access Planning Process by the funding body, emphasizing on the role of the user group. However, not all the stakeholders placed the utmost importance on the user group consultation as it was not considered to be the main mechanism for the Access Planning Process by English Heritage (2004), only being mentioned in the APP diagram and not discussed at length in the publication.

(v) **Conservation Assessment** was recommended by English Heritage, 2004, to be done correspondingly with the access audits, hence, the coming together of both the audit and the conservation aspects at this early stage, right after Access Strategy would juxtapose the main issues and potential conflicts pertaining to the conservation project.
The Access Planning Process works in tandem with conservation aspects, and this is emphasized by HLF that “you produce an access plan from your access policy and your access audit. The audit sets out the access arrangements you currently have in place and identifies ways of improving these. It will also be closely linked with the conservation and management plans for your site,” and emphasised further the close relationship of both the Conservation Assessment with the Access Plan by stating the need to have, “a description of your heritage site including maps, plans and photographs” (HLF, 2005).

(vi) **Reasonable Adjustments** point of departure focused on the physical access first and when that is not possible, an alternative access that compensates the physical access could be acceptable based on the legality implications of the act, but not necessarily satisfying the visitor or user.

Managing heritage properties to please the disabled user is a critical aspect to compensate for lack of design attention to cater for accessibility to listed buildings. Part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act makes it unlawful for service providers to discriminate against disabled people by failing to make reasonable adjustments. “From 1st October 2004 this will include considering reasonable adjustments to the physical features of your premises so that goods, services and facilities are accessible for disabled people” (DRC, 2005). Hence, ‘reasonable adjustments’ is a critical term and process in interpreting how solutions should be made.

(vii) **The Access Consultant** in the absence of the access officer is needed when using a user group or without using the group, in order to provide for a useful moderating role.

Further discussions with experts indicated that the use of the user group to be kept to a minimum (Bonnett, 2005). The usefulness of such a group is apparent but a
skilful moderator, usually in the form of the access officer and/or access consultant would be crucial in steering the discussions to a fruitful conclusion. As mentioned by Dickinson (2005), the user group should not be used as a substitute for technical advice and guidance, but to advice on issues that is particular to the project to aid in decision-making for the consultants.

Research objectives on Hypothesis 3 will be:

1. To investigate the Access Planning Process existing in a development process of a historic and listed public building in England or Wales, hence the mechanisms within the processes needed to be examined and investigated.

2. To examine the policies and guidance published by English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments developed to incorporate access for disabled people, hence the recommendations in the guidance needed to be examined.

The Access Planning Process (APP) is used here to describe a process that objectifies the inclusion of access requirements in historic buildings development as proposed by English Heritage (English Heritage, 2004; Chapter 4). The mechanisms of the process, which are Access Strategy, Access Audit and Access Plan were reviewed apart from existing procedures such as Conservation Assessment and the function of users in consultation is included in the APP. From the review, the following mechanisms and processes were identified:

- Access Strategy
- Access Audit
- Access Plan
- Consultation with the users
- Conservation Assessment
- Reasonable Adjustment
- Access Consultant
- Role of Access Officers
6.3 Theoretical Framework

The mechanisms to be investigated in this thesis research are varied and of different nature and characteristics, however there are similar patterns where these mechanisms need to be investigated in terms of the effectiveness and influence that they have in making the process of including accessibility and inclusive design better.

The mechanisms summarized in the literature review and preliminary research findings in the last section are the variables that will be examined. These mechanisms are either: (i) procedure, (ii) process, (iii) guide, or (iv) function, which describes the basic characteristics of the variables (Table 6.1).

The assertion suggests that in order for implementation of a mechanism to be effective, it must relate to other mechanisms that have different characteristics and this will be explained in Chapter 10. The ‘process’ is fluid and could exist in either or both reactive and proactive processes, such as the Access Plan, that is prepared by the architect before development control and could be used later in the Design and Access Statement. The ‘guide’ is a set of recommendations, such as Part M Building Regulations and Reasonable Adjustments, which needs a ‘function’ to operate the guide mechanism. The function is an officer or a consultant which negotiates and makes decision in either the reactive or proactive process. A ‘procedure’ is a requirement that is usually mandatory such as the Conservation Assessment, which needs to be a submission requirement for Listed Building Consent to the local authority.

The nature of the variable will be explained further in Chapter 10, the conclusion chapter. At this point, the assumption is made that these mechanisms will be examined as the
variables in the data collection stages. The mechanisms are perceived to be connected with each other in some way that could make the whole process work.

Some of the mechanisms are process driven such as Access Plan which requires a set of steps in order to produce the final document. Access Strategy and Access Audit are needed to be done before Access Plan is produced. Access Plan is an outcome based on a process and could be changed further. It is the same with Reasonable Adjustments, where the process leads to an outcome. Best Practice also deals with a set of tasks or steps to arrive, hence a process.

Part M and Best Practice on Guidance are two sets of guide. Guide is considered static and needs to be operational, which refers to function. Access Officers, Access Consultant and Consultation of the users are functions as these mechanisms will make the policies work by enforcing the access requirements or best practice in the decision-making process.

Procedure has legal implications, for example, Conservation Assessment has a form which states what the applicant intend to do and would need to be rectified if deviated from what is stated earlier. Procedure is bureaucratic in nature but is necessary to refer to when something goes wrong and the document could be legal-binding.

**Access Statement** was officially conducted from 10 August 2006 (CABE, 2006) for England and 30 June 2007 (Carmarthenshire County Council, 2008) for Wales, hence there were no data collected for this possible variable for this PhD thesis as the data collection research was done for more than two years from mid 2003 to end of 2005. Although participants in the research mentioned of Access Statement, they had not used the mechanism at that time. However, Access Statement will be addressed when making summaries and conclusions.
Table 6.1: The list of mechanisms investigated in this PhD study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of mechanisms to be investigated in the research method</th>
<th>Emphasis of mechanism in the preliminary studies and literature review</th>
<th>Nature of mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Plan</td>
<td>Access Planning Process</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice – innovation</td>
<td>Best practice – innovation</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice – guidance</td>
<td>Best practice – guidance</td>
<td>Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD Part M Building Regulation</td>
<td>AD Part M Building Regulation / Regulatory guide</td>
<td>Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Access Officer</td>
<td>Role of Access Officer</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Strategy</td>
<td>Access Planning Process</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Audit</td>
<td>Access Planning Process</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with users</td>
<td>Consultation with users</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Assessment</td>
<td>Conservation Assessment</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Interchangeable role with access officers</td>
<td>Function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The nature of the variable was determined to give focus to the research objectives when designing the research design. "A distinctive feature which differentiates it from purely theoretical research is a focus on actionable factors (or variables) either in addition to, or in preferences to, theoretical constructs," (Hakim, 2000). In this research which is considered not 'purely theoretical', the use of the case study method rather than other research strategies because there was a need to find out the 'how and why' based on the formation of the research question; as there was no control for the researcher over actual behavioral events and the degree of focus is on contemporary events (Yin, 1994).

The case study's main objective is to corroborate evidence with the Delphi study and the Interviews' evidence. Corroboration involves evidence which strengthens, adds to, or confirms already existing evidence. Kerr (2001) suggested "establishing best practice can be difficult in areas where statistical or 'hard' evidence is lacking", hence the local authority officers were considered to be the experts in the field, making possible the "most reliable consensus amongst a group of experts by a series of questionnaires interspersed with controlled feedback" (Kerr, 2001). The Delphi Method provided opinions to forecast a lot of the issues that was still being developed such as the DDA's 'reasonable adjustments' in 2004, during the time this research was conducted. Further more, the Delphi study was dealing with conflicting and debatable issues which proceeds from the main research question of conservation against accessibility. This method suited with the lack of literature review on the subject with issues just being brought into play, such as DDA 1995 which had only been recently introduced and making an impact, at the same time the research was being conducted. Additionally, this method was used to predict the future from the participants' views to assist with the design of the interviews on the proactive process and eventually the case study, hence "to corroborate the findings between the differing methods used; a technique known as triangulation" (Robson, 1993).
The qualitative research methods used were the Delphi Method, Semi-Structured Interviews and a Single Case Study, which encompassed very much a context bound, using collaborative findings and defining of concepts approach. Using a triangulation of these individual methods it will help to reinforce the findings. In this research, findings from both the Delphi Method and the Survey Method using Interviews will be summarised together and will be validated by the Single Case Study (Figure 1.1; Figure 6.2)

The case study will show that the implementation of the processes’ mechanisms in both the reactive and proactive, that would allow for accessibility and inclusive design to be implemented resulting in a historic building being able to operate and provide services that would be accessible for people with disabilities, hence proving the hypotheses.

![Diagram: Delphi Method (Reactive Process) + Interviews (Proactive Process) → Case Study](image)

Figure 6.2: The Delphi Method and Interviews provide for the first set of data which will be tested by a case study which will analyse from proactive to reactive and back to proactive. (author)

### 6.4. Research Methods

In this section the rationale, background, objectives, study design, respondent, and description of the questionnaire, will be explained.
Data Collection Stage (2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} year of PhD research from October 2003 to November 2005):

1. **Delphi Technique Process** – 3 rounds of questions with 29 participants from planning control and building control departments of different councils and boroughs for a period of time. The Delphi Method will engage participants from the local authorities to provide the data for investigating the reactive process. Although there are regulatory frameworks (in the reactive process) to help control the practice of building conservation, in practice we find that the decision-making relies on judgment and the use of the mechanisms in the process, and this method will directly examine those involved in that decision-making as well as those processes. The participants in the Delphi Method will be the experts in the field, in this case, the four groups of local authority officers; conservation, access, building control and planning officers, working in development control. This is to validate the hypothesis in this research with regards to the reactive processes influence.

2. **Interview experts (Semi Structured)** – For the proactive processes that include investigations of the design and management aspects of a historic listed public building, the architects, conservation architects and access consultants were interviewed using a Semi Structured Interview Method.

3. **Single Case Study** – National Waterfront Museum Swansea, with interviews of the client / service provider, architect, urban designer and architect in the conservation department, access officer, building control officer, access consultant and the access advisory group representatives. The Single Case Study method was used to further corroborate the findings from the Delphi Method and the Semi Structured Interviews (both reactive and proactive processes). A case study was used where the human experiences will be examined through the detailed descriptions of the people being studied. A method in which the procedure involves studying a small number of subjects through extensive and
prolonged engagement to develop patterns and relationships of meanings (Soy, 1996).

6.4.1. Delphi Method

6.4.1.1. Justification

The Delphi Method was used to collect opinions from four groups of local authority officers, including conservation, access, building control and planning officers, working in development control in England and Wales from December 2003 to March 2005. "The Delphi is a non face-to-face procedure for aggregating group members' opinions," (Dalkey and Helmer, 1963). The method was also employed to capitalise on the aspect of anonymity which suited the purpose for debate and differing of opinions. The participants knew that other groups of local authority officers were involved, but did not know exactly who they were.

All were considered experts in their designation and role as access officers, building control officers, planning officers and conservation officers, and were also stakeholders to the process being investigated in the research.

As a method to obtain opinions of a group of people, it is in fact in some studies the statistics is based on the consensus of opinions, regarding for example 'quality of life' (Dalkey, 1973). The main idea is that the participants could change their opinion during the set time of the study in the subsequent rounds. Thus they could be affected by other members' opinions in their final decision. It is a form of group or collective decision-making. Ever since the Rand Corporation used the Delphi Method for the use of forecasting, which became a common acceptance (Gordon and Helmer, 1964).

The opinions of the different groups of local authority officers in this Delphi study would be compared to each other, where it is a collective opinion. This gave more strength to an
argument or debate which the main research question focused on between conservation and accessibility.

6.4.1.2. History

The Delphi Method was a year and three months long investigation with local authority officers as participants. A series of questionnaires were sent in cycles or 'rounds' from the month of December 2003 to March 2005, whereby each questionnaire is made up of questions and the feedback and points of conflict arising from the previous questionnaires. (Appendix A) However, not all the officers participate until the end as shown below:


All the different categories of officers were represented throughout the three rounds. The Round 1 of the Delphi method questionnaire consisted of eight questions where most of the questions were more of what they do and what they know and two key questions to find conflicting opinions about whether Accessibility and Inclusive Design (AID) objectives was more important then Historic Building Conservation (HBC) objectives. The last two questions were focused around the role of the access officer.

The Delphi Method that was employed for this research had to be changed to suit the participants' knowledge in the area. Although in the original Delphi, consensus was important for the overall findings, in this case, consensus among the group, say Access Officers, needed to be achieved and the findings were used to compare with the consensus achieved in another group on the same question. This modification differs from the original where there is no overall consensus but group consensus instead. This focused more on the arguments made by the participants as the idea was to corroborate further with the other research methods' findings.
There were different topics and questions posed from the beginning of the Delphi study to find out what were the main concerns, where eventually a pattern emerged to reveal what the subsequent questions should focus on. These were explained by summarizing the findings from Round 1 to either or both - Round 2 and/or Round 3, depending on whether the particular topic needed to be explored further. Questions in Round 2 and 3 were also designed based on the previous round's feedback, where else Round 1 questions were designed based on the preliminary study and literature review conducted earlier. This provides opportunity for the participants to revise their original responses in the light of the analysis of the previous round and the next round's questionnaire to have benefited from the knowledge gained from such analysis (Ormerod, 2003).

The responses to Round 1 were summarized and presented along with Round 2 questions. Round 2 questions started to pick on the mechanisms and details of the planning control and building control processes. The first questioned was on the DDA 1995 and Part M, and subsequently the other questions would focus on what the officer's knew about the mechanisms in the process. Last two questions focused on Round 1 summary.

There was a 10 months gap between Round 2 (February - December 2004) and Round 3 (commenced January 2005) before Round 3 questions were sent off to the participants. The reasons for the longer time period is due to the lateness of responses, the new Part M revealed in May 2004 – giving the participants some time to comment on the Part M questions plus questions on DDA 1995 and the late interview with one of the experts, John Adams, the author of the Access Planning Process (English Heritage) who was interviewed on the 8th December 2004. These factors influenced the final set of questions that were sent in Round 3.

Although the Access Planning Process (APP) was more of a proactive process, which Adams (2004) stated was for the consultants, it provided an important framework that could influence the reactive process and conservation practice. The APP was included in the Round 3 questionnaire along with the Access Groups question, the DDA 1995, Part M and the idea was to tie-in the loose ends and react to the previous rounds' summaries.
6.4.1.3. Objectives of study design

The Delphi Method was used to test the second research hypothesis: The planning control and building control processes influence accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales.

Two main objectives of using the Delphi Method was, firstly, to arrive at a consensus of opinions from four different groups of officers involved in planning control and building control and secondly, to find points of conflict in the officer's opinion regarding specifically to:

- AD Part M Building Regulation
- Role of Access Officer

The second objectives were to examine the other mechanisms outside regulatory control on how these would affect based on the research objectives from Hypothesis 2 explained earlier (Table 6.2).

The research design involved the 3 activities of collecting, analyzing and presenting the data, which will be explained henceforth. Delphi Method was specifically chosen to fulfil the research objectives which are:

1. Examining the Planning and Building Control process by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms engaged with accessibility and conservation aspects combined and examining the effectiveness of the implementation of these mechanisms; and

2. Investigating the role of officers in Planning and Building Control process and the different officers' decision-making process and related mechanisms when dealing with the access needs of disabled people, within local authorities in England and Wales.
The study was designed in a way to facilitate the group’s conflicting opinions. The group is actually made up with officers from the development control departments, planning control, building control and listed building control from England and Wales. It was important to analyse the data by group as the characteristics of the group differs, as explained in Section 6.4.1.2. Access officers’ function is directly connected with disabled people’s needs and so is building control as a secondary function. They serve the council in a variety of ways, and they are considered to be experts in their professions and roles. The research was designed in order to facilitate their areas of expertise. The issues need to be designed carefully linking with each other, for example in Round 1, issues of the Access Officer is connected with Part M and the development control mechanisms were needed to be established first (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2: The Research Design – Delphi Method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Round 1 Questionnaire</th>
<th>Round 2 Questionnaire</th>
<th>Round 3 Questionnaire</th>
<th>Final Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactive (Development Control)</td>
<td>Role of Access Officers</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>Role of Access Officers</td>
<td>Role of Access Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part M (regulation)</td>
<td>Part M (regulation)</td>
<td>Part M (regulation)</td>
<td>Part M (regulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>Consultation with users</td>
<td>Consultation with users</td>
<td>Consultation with users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>Conservation Assessment</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>Conservation Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive (Non development Control)</td>
<td>Reasonable Adjustments (DDA)</td>
<td>Reasonable Adjustments (DDA)</td>
<td>Reasonable Adjustments (DDA)</td>
<td>Reasonable Adjustments (DDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none-</td>
<td>Best Practice guidance</td>
<td>none-</td>
<td>Best Practice guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.1.5. Respondent

Round 1 of the Delphi study produced responses from 29 local authority officers. In Round 2, 21 officers continued their participation and in the final round or Round 3, only 15 officers persisted. Out of the original 29, 7 were access officers, 9 were building control officers and surveyors, 7 were planning officers and 6 were conservation officers (Table 6.3).

Table 6.3: Participation in the Delphi study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant group</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access officers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building control officers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation officers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning officers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.1.6. Questionnaire
The questionnaires for the different rounds (Appendix A) were designed to facilitate the process in a way as to gain an insight into the reactive process and also how the proactive process would influence the outcome of the accessibility of an historic building.

Firstly, the questionnaire needs to answer the research objective on whether local authority officers' decisions in planning and building control affect the degree of accessibility into historic and listed public buildings. Secondly, the officers were influenced by factors other than the regulative process, such as the DDA, 1995, 'reasonable adjustments' and conservation practice, including best practice.

There were a mix of quantitative data and qualitative data obtained in Round 1.

6.4.2. Interviews

6.4.2.1. Justification

For the proactive process, we need to explore the topics and decide on a less structured approach of getting data. All qualitative interviews share three pivotal characteristics that distinguish them from other forms of data gathering. First, qualitative interviews are modifications or extensions of ordinary conversations but with important distinctions. Second, qualitative interviewers are more interested in the understanding, knowledge and insights of the interviewees than in categorizing people or events in terms of academic theories. Third, the content of the interview, as well as the flow and choice of topics, changes to match the interviewee knows and feels (Rubin and Rubin, 1995).

The Interview method allowed for a fluid and explorative investigation of the proactive process whereas a structured approach, i.e. the Delphi study, was used for the reactive process.

6.4.2.2. History

The interviews were conducted from December 2004 to October 2005. It started with the interview with John Adams, an advisor to English Heritage and working with Lisa Foster.
as access consultants to English Heritage and he was the author of the Access Planning Process and he had with Lisa Foster just finished with the publication of English Heritage's 2004 edition. The following interviews were done throughout 2005 ending with the Access Consultant of the case study project, Cassie Herschel-Shorland of Centre for Accessible Environments.

6.4.2.3. Objectives of study design
The interviews were undertaken to find out whether the architects had managed to reconcile the need for access with the need for conservation, which was stressed throughout the interview. The access consultants were asked in a third party context although all the access consultants were involved in historic buildings in a designing and advisory capacity.

The method used in the interviews was semi-structured interviews. The interviewees were invited to participate and upon their agreement, a set of questionnaire was sent to them. They were asked to refer to buildings and projects that they had been involved with, in one or two specific questions. Interviews were done personally with audio-recording to transcribe and approached in a laid-back manner by referring to a set of questions but they were not forced to answer these questions. The questions can be found in the enclosed extra appendices in the CD/DVD in the documents back pocket.

6.4.2.4. Respondent

The first round of invitation were initially asked from 10 conservation architects, 6 architects and 6 access consultants. Those involved in a recently completed refurbishment of a building project that involves a listed building from 1996 were sought after. The idea was to combine both the conservation architect and the architect as to get a more broad perspective, especially architects would be involved in more adaptive reuse complementing historic buildings rather than working on conservation principles only. Eventually, those who were interviewed were 2 conservation architects, 2 architects and 4 access consultants, where all except one were trained as architects.
6.4.2.5. Questions

The first point of contact was to ask formally the interviewee ‘to incorporate your views and opinions on the research topic’ with reference to the architectural work that the interviewee had done with any listed buildings.

They were asked on their opinion and views:

- As a Consultant in dealing with the Planning and Building Control function of the respective local authorities, with regards to conservation projects.
- On the use of Access Statements, Access Advisory Groups and Access Planning Audit, with regards to building conservation projects.
- On Approved Document M Building Regulations and other regulative aspects relating to access to historic public buildings.
- And comments on the following guidance framework:

The follow-up was to interview them personally in a place of their own choosing. Using the setting out questions stated above, the author focused on the main questions which had been prepared earlier to establish the links of Part M, Access Statements, Access Officers, Consultation with Users, Reasonable Adjustments (DDA), Access Planning Process (leading to Access Plan and Access Audit), Access Consultant and Conservation Plan.

6.4.3. Case Study

6.4.3.1. Justification

The thesis is based on the Single Case Study and the rationale here is the “representative or typical case”, whereby, “the objective is to capture the circumstances and conditions of an everyday or commonplace situation,” (Yin, 2003) in this case a typical alteration,
extension and demolition of a listed building being added with a new design intervention during the period of transition for DDA 1996 to 2004, typical of many listed buildings in regenerated areas throughout England and Wales. It is envisaged that the lessons learned from this case study “are assumed to be informative about the experiences of the” (Yin, 2003) average listed building developed at this time, in England and Wales.

The case to be studied is a ‘building’, in this particular case a group of structures, including a listed structure and accommodation, functioning as a museum, open to the public for educational and leisure consumption.

The choice of a public building as oppose to non-public buildings such as domestic buildings is because of the relative progress made in that area because of the Heritage Lottery Fund since 1995, and the conditions associated with the fund. Also many listed public buildings converted to museums and there is a case for heritage aims of conservation to retain the historic and listed building by conversion to museum if it’s not already. This reflected in Cave, 2005, “if you have decided to make a historic building a museum or art gallery and you want as many people to use it as possible so there’s a real incentive then to make it very accessible in the broadest sense of the term, to encourage everybody to come there”, which argues the use for public building, which also “helps in the long term sustainability of the building” (Cave, 2005) Much of the work instigated in this area of Accessibility to Historic Buildings are public buildings which were funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund (Bonnett, 2005).

The ‘listing factor’ created the need to analyse a typical listed building in England or Wales to find out the outcome of how accessibility is being achieved. This factor differentiate non-listed buildings from listed buildings and have proven to be the main issue that needed to be addressed by legislation, policies and the implementation of mechanisms in the development process.

6.4.3.2. History
The tourism potential of the case study as a significant building in England and Wales, added to the value in Maritime and Industrial Heritage. The National Waterfront Museum, Swansea relates to this heritage in a significant location at the docks, with a high-profile regeneration area and typical of many issues regarding listed buildings in England and Wales.

The case study should be a grade II listed building rather than a grade I or II * listed building because of the issues concerning the listing factor where 94% of listed buildings are grade 2, and issues surrounding grade 1 and 2 * conducted in the preliminary studies on Manchester Art Gallery revealed the need to analyse listed buildings and the factors that influence accessibility which is in the broader aspects of conservation practice, such as adaptive reuse, conceptual design and signature design, as shown in the pilot study.

In finding a listed building for a case study the building should receive the HLF fund, just started to be built after 1996 and should ideally be completed by 2004 in time to be completed for my data collection stage. *(However, the NWMS was completed in 2005.)* NWMS commenced work on site in 2002 and completed in 2005 fit the above criteria plus the fact that it is in a regenerated area. Wilkinson Eyre is a practice that places importance on quality and their 'signature' similar to Michael Hopkins' Manchester City Art Gallery, discussed earlier. "It was something we’re very pleased with," Wilkinson said, “The building is also a slight departure for the practice, but it still looks like it’s coming out of our office" (Blackler, 2003).

### 6.4.3.3. Objectives of study design

A case study depends on these conditions (Yin, 2003):

(i) the type of research questions (the how and why questions)
(ii) the control an investigator has over actual behavioral events
(iii) the focus on contemporary as opposed to historical phenomenon
The 'how and why' questions were posed as the choice of case study over other ways of doing research such as experiments, surveys, histories and the analysis of archival information was due to the type of research questions, where there are basically the how and the why questions. There was no control over the events and there need to be an investigation of the phenomenon as a ‘building’ and ‘accessibility factor of the building’. It is a contemporary phenomenon with real life context.

The case study method is used to investigate real life event and in this case ‘development processes’ by focusing on the how and why the building has come to be accessible or not.

Case study is a research tool using both the descriptive or explanatory approach. In the beginning to provide for a theoretical framework, an exploratory method was used by the use of the method of interviews was prevalent with experts, a pilot case study and the focus group study. These initial preliminary studies explored the “what” questions to further form the research questions. This is to ascertain a position of inquiry.

“With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, see precisely which events led to which consequences, and derive fruitful explanations” (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Hence, the case study was appropriate to be used for the study of a project that involved many actors and spanned for a number of years.

The single case study of the National Waterfront Museum Swansea relied on the use of multiple sources of evidence from: (i) the direct observation of the phenomenon by examining the completed NWMS building; (ii) the documentation of access audits report and drawings published and; (iii) interviews conducted with the different actors and stakeholders of the project.

The case study protocol was an essential detailed plan to conduct the case study in a systematic and comprehensive manner ensuring the breadth and depth of the study was being made. The one year and six months long planning, conducting and analyzing the case study involved the case study protocol consisting of: (i) an overview of the case
study project; (ii) field procedures; (iii) case study questions; (iv) a guide for the case study report (Gillham, 2000).

Field procedures include the credentials and access to the case study ‘sites’, general sources of information, and procedural reminders. Case study questions include the specific questions that the case study investigator must keep in mind in collecting data, tables for specific arrays of data, and the potential sources of information for answering each question. A guide for the case study report include the outline, format for the narrative, and specification of any bibliographical information and other documentation which will be explained with the other protocols in Chapter 9, and the case study questions explained in the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Reactive</th>
<th>Proactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-planning</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Post-control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-development control</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Non-development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development control</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.4: Diagram showing the reactive and proactive processes in relation to development and non-development control: Pre-planning; Planning, Building and Construction; and Post-control.

6.4.3.4. Respondent

After determining which project to examine, the author made first contact with the various people involved in the project, including the client, architect, access consultant, access group, conservation officer, planning officer, access officer and building control officer. The author also contacted the Access Advisory Group and observed a meeting
conducted in 30 June 2004, which was conducted by the Access Consultant. The following day, interviews for Stage 1 were conducted with the Architect/Urban Designer Officer in the conservation department, the Building Control Officer, the Access Officer and the Planning Officer. Subsequently in the following week, interviews for Stage 1 were conducted with the Architect together with the Access Consultant.

Interviews for Stage 2 were conducted after the building was completed in November 2005 and a meeting with the Access Consultant concluded the research on the case study. The author also conducted a detached observation using Access Audit checklist in November 2005.

6.4.3.5. Questionnaire

There were specific and common questions asked of the interviewees in Interview for Stage 1 in June/July 2004.

The following were common questions which will be analysed in Chapter 9:

- Indication whether the measures: Access Statement, Access Advisory Group, Access Officer, Access Plan / Audit were being used and also whether they were involved in preparing it and/or consulted with them.
- Listing any other measures for achieving access that had been used or will be using in the future, for planning and building control processes, which had not been listed here, for the National Waterfront Museum Swansea project.
- Indication whether the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) was being considered by the interviewee when dealing with the project
- Indication on other legislative measures that were considered by you to achieve accessibility for this project?
- Indication on the Part M Approved Document Building Regulations used by the interviewee
- Indication other regulative measures or guidelines were considered
The interviewees were also asked of whether they were involved in the stages from Pre-Planning Advice right to Post Occupancy. Finally, for Stage 1 interviews, they were asked to relate whether they were involved in any of the Access Planning Processes, using the diagram by English Heritage.

Stage 2 interviews in November 2005 used two types of questioning – structured and open interviews where only 4 people were interviewed.

CHAPTER 7
Delphi Method Study: The Implementation of the Development Control Process for Accessibility to Historic Buildings

7.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and discussion of the results and findings from the Delphi Method explained in the previous chapter. The findings from this Delphi study will be corroborated later with the interview findings in Chapter 8, and subsequently validated with the case study findings in Chapter 9, which will in turn conclude in Chapter 10.

The study focused on the mechanisms embedded in the planning control and building control processes executed by the local authority and the extent accessibility was achieved in historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales. Other non development control mechanisms running parallel or concurrent to development control were also investigated in the Delphi study.

The Delphi study, similar to the other research methods used in this research, examined how each mechanism that were implemented (based on legislation, regulations or
practice), and operated as either (i) procedure, (ii) process, (iii) guide, or (iv) function, by focusing on the role of the local authority officers involved and the mechanisms used within the reactive process of the development control system (see Chapters 3 and 4).

Mechanisms that will be analysed and discussed within the reactive process of development control include:
1. Role of Access Officers
2. AD Part M of the Building Regulations
3. Consultation with User
4. Conservation Assessment

Mechanisms that will be analysed and discussed within the proactive process of non-development control include:
1. Access Strategy
2. Access Audit
3. Access Plan
4. Reasonable Adjustments
5. Best Practice (innovation)
6. Best Practice (guidance)
7. Access Consultant

Results will determine the degree of effectiveness in implementing accessibility to historic and listed public buildings by illustrating the strengths and weakness in development control. This investigation will answer research question and hypothesis 2 in particular as explained in Chapter 5 and 6. The reactive process is the result of how control is being used to implement accessibility as was explained in the literature review in Chapter 3.

Based on this research objective, the role of the local authority officers, in particular, (i) the Access Officer’s function and; (ii) the influence of Part M Building Regulations (Part M) – were the two main subjects identified earlier for exploration. The impact of the
Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) and the local authority officers opinion on Conservation Practice and Accessibility were the other two areas to be explored, even though these two aspects are not part of the regulatory mechanisms, nevertheless these seemingly outside factors influenced the process and mechanisms in planning and building control.

Conservation Practice from the point of view of local authority officers would provide opinions on the proactive processes participants, such as architects, access consultants and other consultants acting on behalf of the client or those involved in processes outside of planning control and building control. Even though the reactive process participants in the local authority would play an important role in 'enforcing' access requirements in the control regime, inevitably they are involved in the bigger picture of conservation, by challenging or agreeing with the proactive participants on the issue of Accessibility to Historic Buildings. Hence, questions on Conservation Practice were asked of the local authority officers in the Delphi study.

Forming the crux of the research objective and the basis of the research questions and hypothesis, the 'conservation practice versus accessibility' argument presides in a macro perspective and theoretical framework of the study. Hence the findings from the local authority officers would be eventually corroborated with the findings from the other participants in subsequent findings in Chapters 8 and 9, to eventually come to a conclusion.

The following three sections (7.2, 7.3 and 7.4) focus on the analysis and discussion of the findings obtained in the three rounds from a year and three month long investigation (December 2003 to March 2005). Along with the findings in each section, or round, of the Delphi study the discussion summarized in that round will expand further on how it implicates on the next round. Thus eventually this will highlight the patterns emerging from the data. The chapter's conclusion will explain what patterns of findings will be discussed in the corroborative summaries later. Delphi study questionnaires could be referred to in Appendix A.
7.2. Analysis and discussion of findings: Delphi Round 1

7.2.1 Local Authority Officers Role in the Organisation

The Access Officer's function was included in the development control process as the need to have a liaison person with disabled people's organisations and the local access group, apart from advising on Part M and the DDA. The specific tasks assigned to access officers depended on the individual council. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the access officer is the "first contact point involving consultation with user groups" to "providing technical guidance to the local authority on the needs of disabled people" (Fleck, no date). However, not all local authorities in England and Wales have an access officer working in the council, and there are many instances when there is an access officer, but their role is limited to customer services or/and social services and may not be involved in development control (Jackson, 2004; GLA, 2003).

Responses to the first question of Round 1 of the Delphi study showed that in councils where there were no access officers, the building control officers were designated to deal with accessibility issues in particular Part M, in addition to being the liaison officer to local access group and advising on the DDA. The access officer and the building control officer are the only two roles involved directly with the implementation of Part M (Table 7.1). Access officers fulfilled their advisory roles in an in-house capacity with regards to vetting submitted plans and reports. In councils and boroughs that employed access officers, similar roles handled by the building control officers were sometimes handled by the access officers, but the access officers were not trained as a building surveyor nor were they trained in similar professions, hence the access officers were employed in an advisory capacity or operate in a liaison capacity with Building Control rather than enforcement.

All of the access officers' functions focused specifically on accessibility issues, where as the building control officers were given a few direct roles and the planning officers...
have one direct role but there were no direct involvement for the conservation officers on accessibility issues. Planning officers especially those in the bigger councils are increasingly being asked to provide guidance in access.

7.2.2 Most responsible role in dealing with accessibility in the officer’s organisation

Access officers were considered to be the least important role when dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings, with the planning officers and building control officers being regarded to have more responsibility and the conservation officers, as most responsible role. When comparing the roles and designation listed by the participants (Table 7.1), the access officers provided the most direct link to implement mechanisms and procedures on whether a building will be accessible for disabled persons, but in contrast, were regarded the least responsible, even amongst the access officers who responded.

Three out of four groups of officers put the conservation officers as the most responsible and three out of four placed access officers as least responsible, including the access officers group themselves. This finding which will be pursued further in the Delphi study confirmed that access officers were regarded as having a periphery role in the Planning Control and Building Control process and an even reduced role in the Listed Building Consent.

7.2.3 Officers’ involvement in the process of planning approval and/or building control for historic public buildings in the officer’s organisation

All conservation officers were involved and most planning officers were involved in the process for listed building consent for historic public buildings in their organisation. Almost all building control officers were not involved and half of the access officers were involved (Table 7.2).
These stages would be crucial in assisting the decision-making process to include access requirements in the various early procedures. Building control is regarded as the stage where it may be too late to influence access in many respects especially with regards to historic and listed public buildings where important decisions were made in the Planning Approval and Listed Building Consent stages.

7.2.4. Participant's knowledge whether there is an access officer in their organisation

20 of the 29 officers knew of an access officer working in their organisation. However, 5 officers stated either 'do not know' or 'not sure' (Figure 7.1). This finding suggests that the function of an access officer may not be necessarily clear or apparent to everyone.

![Figure 7.1: Knowledge of the existence of an access officer in their organisation.](image)

7.2.5 Frequency of the access officer's involvement in the listed building consent
The degree of involvement by their access officers in the Listed Building Consent (LBC) investigated showed results that out of seventeen participants who stated that their access officers were involved in the LBC, four gave indication of full participation of the access officers in the LBC processes. Another four concluded that access officers would be included in discussions when available. Three would only refer to access officers when there were difficulties in solving technical and design issues. Five would only seek the services of access officers in their organisation when it is very necessary to do (Figure 7.2).

Conclusively, out of the 29 Delphi study participants, only four officers suggested that the access officers in their organisation were made to be fully involved with the meetings and decision-making process of the Listed Building Consent. The argument also followed that in the decision-making process the insistence to include access requirements may be overlooked unless the building control officer is included in the LBC process to advice in Part M as mentioned earlier.

It is clear that access officers’ main function included giving advice on Part M building regulations and the DDA and not necessarily be involved in an advisory capacity in the LBC. Other evidence suggested that conservation and planning officers were not directly involved with Part M or the DDA, although they may be required to consider these.
7.2.6 Role of access officers in the organisation

During Round 1, a list of functions of an Access Officer (Figure 7.3), were given to the Delphi study participants to choose from. As mentioned earlier, five out of the twenty-nine participants either said they ‘did not know’ or ‘not sure’ when asked whether access officers were found in their organisation. The rest of the participants chose what they thought their access officer’s role(s) were and more than half of the answers chosen were related to ‘handling complaints by disabled customers, general advisory services or that they ‘did not know’’. The number of respondents does not correspond to the number of participants as they were allowed to choose as many answers in this instance.

Almost equal in answers, the participants regarded access officers ‘were developing access policies in the planning department, gave advice in building control meetings and gave advice in the Listed Building Consent meetings’. This further reinforced the
suggestion that access officers were regarded as having a reduced role in the Listed Building Consent as previously indicated.

Figure 7.3: Frequency of the functions chosen by the Delphi study participants on the Function of the Access Officer

7.2.7. Part M and the standards whether should be used in the listed building consent application process

During Round 1 and 2 of the Delphi study, the local authority officers were still referring to the 1999 version of Part M and were anticipating the new version to emerge in May 2004. Part M, as the main regulatory reference was used as the basis to impose access requirements and often read in conjunction with the related building standards BS8300: 2002 and the previous related standards as discussed in Chapter 3.

In Round 1, a question was asked whether ‘building regulations and standards such as Part M and BS 8300 should be used in the listed building consent application process for historic public buildings’ and three choices or options were given that described to what extent that impact might be. Five participants consisting of two conservation officers, two planning officers and one building control officer did not agree with the question,
whereby the rest of the twenty-four participants responded although two participants did not agree entirely with the choices given (Table 7.4).

Sixteen participants, which is more than half, stated in general for 'more compromise' and six of the sixteen participants proposed that Part M's influence to be the 'maximum' by suggesting equal services for disabled people implying for inevitable change and 'damage' to the historic fabric. The contentious issue of how much change and how much damage by using Part M's influence was further explored in Round 2 and 3, to be explained in the following sections respectively.

![Bar chart](Figure 7.4: The number of participants that agreed on Part M and BS8300 influencing the Listed Building Consent against the choices given on how much influence should be given.

### 7.2.8. Whether conservation issues given more emphasis than access issues in the listed building consent application

There emerged a pattern of issues for officers who agreed with the opinion 'conservation issues were given more emphasis' (Table 7.4) which showed that:

**Consultation issues:**
There are evidence of ‘inflexible and non negotiable attitude’ and ‘lack of consultation’ where it was quoted that ‘the inflexibility by some conservation and planning officers making the task of including access difficult’ and also quoted that ‘the needs of disabled people are little understood and the authorities will not comprehend.’

**Guidance and best practice issues:**

There emerged the evidence of ‘lack of design expertise’ and ‘building aesthetics more important’ where it was quoted that ‘training should be made on how to make buildings accessible without ruining it’ and ‘the excessive use of ramps will spoil the appearance of some listed buildings’.

**Legislation issues:**

The evidence is apparent with ‘historical preservation more important’ and ‘weak enforcement of accessibility legislation’ where it was quoted that “conservation has a greater argument as it concerns historical preservation” and “listing a building is a valid excuse for not including disabled people’s needs or the very minimum provision is made”.

Those were the condensed opinion of seven officers where all were either from the access officers or building control officers. The key points addressed were legislation, guidance and best practice and consultation issues which will be investigated further in Round 2 and 3.

On the other side of the argument, where officers were of the opinion that ‘conservation issues were not given more emphasis’ (Table 7.4), the key points made were:

**Guidance and best practice issues:**

The emerging evidence is for ‘balanced solution’ and ‘reasonable compromise’ where it was quoted that ‘maintain a balance or provide good balance between conservation and access’, ‘both issues need to be reasonable with
compromises made on both sides', 'ensure that the access provision is a reasonable compromise,' and 'text book approaches to solving problems do not always work well on historic buildings where flexibility in the approach is needed'.

**Legislation issues:**

There is considerable evidence with 'conservation is more important' and 'negative impact of accessibility' where it was quoted that 'too much emphasis is put on alterations for disabled visitors it will detrimentally alter the building', 'listed buildings cannot be treated in the same way as other buildings', 'historic buildings should remain as they were originally created, irrespective of access or any other issues', 'conservation is important and access can be managed to fit around it', and 'planning and listed building legislation allows a strong line to be taken'.

These points were summarised from 15 officers, namely from conservation and planning group, and relatively few from access and building control. The key points were of again, legislation and guidance and best practice issues, and the patterns emerging would be further investigated in Round 2 and 3.

The officers who felt that conservation neither was given more emphasis, nor less emphasis, (Table 7.4) described the following key points:

**Guidance and best practice issues:**

All the issues were focused on 'balanced solution' and 'reasonable adjustment' where it was quoted that 'We all might have ideas of what might be 'reasonable' as it's about good design, and imaginative solutions,' 'English Heritage is more open to giving disabled people access to listed buildings although there is still a way to go,' 'depends on the impact on the historic architectural form of each building and application made on it, 'design guidance and training on access issues needed,' and 'the delicate question of balance.'
7.2.9. Summary of Round 1

The opinions were by 5 officers where the issue of guidance and best practice was raised again and this would be explored in Round 2 and 3. In summary, the following evidence was identified as:

(i) the lack of influence the Access Officer have in their function in the development control process;
(ii) the issues of best practice and guidance and legislation such as the DDA, in particular, reasonable adjustments;
(iii) the issues of balance, compromise and the consultation process; and
(iv) the issue of using Part M for historic buildings.
Table 7.1: Roles of the participants in the Delphi study in their organization and whether it relates directly, indirectly or not at all to function that are specifically to do with Access for Disabled Persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Direct link to Access for Disabled Persons</th>
<th>Indirect link</th>
<th>Not linked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>(i) Advise their own council on access improvements within the council’s premises and services.</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>-none-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Support and maintain links with disabled people’s group/organisations and/or access group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Advise on planning applications and/or liaise with building control on the approval process with regards to Part M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Manage and advise the council’s own access programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Give DDA advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Advise on access and local access group.</td>
<td>(v) Plan vetting and site inspections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Officers</th>
<th>(iii) Carrying out DDA related activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-none-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Involve in the listed building consents and conservation area applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Advise on planning applications and planning appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Provide, advise and prepare guidance on design, planning and development control with reference to the historic environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
<th>(i) Assisting in the preparation of supplementary planning guidance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Processing planning applications, listed building consent and conservation area applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Dealing with planning appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Dealing with enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Providing pre-application advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Managing planning and development control section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- none-
Table 7.2: Extent of involvement of each group of officers in the stages of: (i) pre-planning approval; (ii) during planning approval and; (iii) building control application for historic buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Pre-Planning Application / Approval</th>
<th>Planning Approval for Historic Buildings</th>
<th>Building Control for Historic Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>(i) Advise prior to approval.</td>
<td>(i) Support technical and specialist advice to planning control.</td>
<td>-none-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Meet and liaise with architects and planners, prior to submission of application.</td>
<td>(ii) Formally consulted on planning and listed building applications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Consult local organizations of disabled people about the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Surveyors / Officers</td>
<td>(i) Deal with access enquiries from the public.</td>
<td>(i) Advise colleagues in conservation on issues relating to Part M.</td>
<td>(i) Ensure compliance with the building regulations (Part M which relates to access.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Administering and enforcing the building regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Plan vetting and site inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Managing the building control function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>(i) Comment on the implication of the proposal.</td>
<td>(i) Close liaison with building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Officers | proposals if the building is listed.  
(ii) Advise on how the various projects need to comply with planning legislation relating to historic buildings (guidance).  
(iii) Liaising with CADW (Welsh Historic Monument).  
(iv) Deal with the conservation aspects of alterations through listed building consent and planning permission in conservation areas. | control staff if issues arise that need a joint assessment and conclusions. |
| Planning Officers | (i) Provide basic pre-application advice.  
(ii) Deal with planning applications.  
(iii) Provide advice on planning matters involved in development (control).  
(iv) Deal with caseload of applications.  
(v) Deal with listed building consents and conservation area consents.  
(v) Managing a town planning development control team. | -none- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Listed Building Consent for historic buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>Formally consulted about planning and listed building applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Securing planning conditions where appropriate, along with accessibility amendments to the submitted scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consult local organisations of disabled people about the proposed scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meet with those giving listed building consent to agree on how to improve access whilst maintaining nature of buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support technical and specialist advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advice on our own listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>Provide solutions to buildings identified as in need of public access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaise with the listed buildings officer for acceptable solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officers</td>
<td>Comment on the implication of the proposals if the building is listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advise on how the various projects need to comply with planning legislation relating to historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaising with CADW (Welsh Historic Monument).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Negotiating a solution to the issue of access improvements but would generally be involved in most alterations to a historic public building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning Officers | • Deal with listed building consent applications as case officer, in consultation with the council’s conservation officer.  
• Deal with planning applications and listed building consents.  
• Providing basic pre-application advice.  
• Manage and monitor comments from the Access Officer(s) on proposals that may affect access to historic buildings.  
• Give advice to owners and applicants. |
Table 7.4: Response whether too much emphasis is given to conservation issues rather than access issues in the listed building consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Yes, conservation more emphasis</th>
<th>No, conservation not given more emphasis</th>
<th>Both given equal emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Watts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a very difficult balance to be struck. The DDA promotes the concept (of) ‘reasonable adjustments’, but we all might have ideas of what might be ‘reasonable’. Buildings of historic importance have been altered and changed over hundreds of years, (so) why should that process stop now. It’s about good design, and imaginative solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think in the past the answer would have been ‘yes’ but now I feel groups like English Heritage are more open to giving disabled people access to listed buildings although there is still a way to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jackson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer (Johnson, H.)</td>
<td>I hope we maintain a balance. Only extreme circumstances where disabled access comes second.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer (Monk)</td>
<td>There is a good balance that is struck between conservation issues and the optional solutions for access and use of historic buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer (Austin)</td>
<td>Yes ( did not give reason)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer (Gregory)</td>
<td>Disabled people have the same right to access to listed buildings as anyone else. Society created these barriers to access when the building was first erected and by imposing such stringent restriction, continues to deny equal access. Innovative and well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thought out solutions can be devised, but the inflexibility of some Conservation and Planning Officers make the task harder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Officer (Gwynne)</th>
<th>I think that more training is needed for everyone working on listed buildings. The training should be on how to make them accessible without ruining the building, its heritage, history and culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Rogers) | In many instances listed buildings have to remain at a certain point in time. Many of these buildings are historic because of their development through time, which is now prohibited by their listing. There is a greater argument for preserving as a 'snap shot
building’ where particular events happened in history, however.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (McKenzie)</th>
<th>There are ‘millions’ of new buildings erected each year where access issues can be addressed. There are relatively few historic buildings, which in my opinion should remain as they were originally created, irrespective of access or any other issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Browning)</td>
<td>Excessive use of ramps can spoil the appearance of some listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Nield)</td>
<td>Conservation is important and access can be managed to fit around it, and comply with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Dalzell)</td>
<td>DDA Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Giles)</td>
<td>I believe that the needs of disabled people are little understood and with very little understanding, the authorities that administer regulation will not comprehend the need to create an accessible built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Young)</td>
<td>I believe that we are generally able to achieve, through discussion, a balance between the need for access and the desire not to destroy listed building features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer / Surveyor (Fowler)</td>
<td>The fact that a building is ‘listed’ is more often than not used as an excuse to either not include disabled (people’s needs) provisions or at best include minimal provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officer / Surveyor (Rule)</td>
<td>Access should not damage the character of the building otherwise the reason for it being historic is weakened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officer (Marshall)</td>
<td>Depends on the impact on the historic architectural form of each building and application made on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officer (Barnes)</td>
<td>In our organization there is a clear respect for the historic fabric of the listed building and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officer (Mordan)</td>
<td>Text book approaches to solving problems do not always work well on historic buildings and where conflicts arise the tendency is to force the building conservation issues to compromise. Flexibility in the approach to meeting specialist needs is the key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officer (Roberts)</td>
<td>Both issues need to be applied sensibly and reasonably with compromises made on both sides. DDA requires that 'all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Officer (Nightingale)</strong></td>
<td>reasonable measures’ are taken to remove barriers to accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Officer (Nightingale)</strong></td>
<td>The balance will vary from local authority to local authority. In Bury, there can be pressure to give disability issues overriding importance. However, planning and listed building legislation allows a strong line to be taken and a quality design solution can sometimes meet all requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Officer (Waddington)</strong></td>
<td>It is finding a balance. People who have access issues appreciate the historic environment. However it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer (Chadwick)</td>
<td>important that these structures are accessible to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer (Eadle)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer (Rutherford)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer (Ashton)</td>
<td>Listed buildings are important for their original features and character. This is what listed building consents try to protect. If too much emphasis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is put on alterations for disabled visitors it will detrimentally alter the building. Access is important but listed buildings cannot be treated in the same way as other buildings.

Planning Officer (Johnson, S.)

I think that a reasonable balance is usually found between the character of listed buildings and conservation areas and providing necessary access.

Planning Officer (Stothard)

In the city, we have a good balance. In appropriate cases, listed building consent has not been granted for works that would be detrimental to the special interest of listed buildings and often other
| Planning Officer (Butler) | solutions have been negotiated. Normally access needs have been met whilst protecting the special interest. | Both are important, but to provide the 'ideal' means of access in all cases (ie ramps, wider doorways etc) can be very harmful to (the) historic character of buildings. It is a delicate question of balance. |
7.3. **Analysis and discussion of findings: Round 2**

In Round 2, the analysis and discussion on the findings investigated further by questioning the officers on the: (i) the lack of influence that the Access Officer have in their function in the development control process; (ii) issues of best practice and guidance and legislation such as the DDA, in particular, reasonable adjustments; (iii) issues of balance, compromise and the consultation process; and (iv) the issue of using Part M for historic buildings.

7.3.1. **Disability Discrimination Act 1995 influence on accessibility to historic buildings since 1995; after October 2004; and the term Reasonable Adjustment**

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 influences in a different manner to Part M which is a regulative mechanism. As a rights-based legislative mechanism the DDA and its constituent codes of practices, act beyond the reactive processes, with a more all encompassing influence, focusing on ‘equal services’ rather than just the physical changes to historic properties. This section deals with the local authority officers’ perceptions to the impact of the DDA 1995.

The ‘equal services’ objective in the DDA interprets how it will be implemented in the term ‘reasonable adjustments’:

> Part 3 of the Disability Discrimination Act makes it unlawful for service providers to discriminate against disabled people by failing to make reasonable adjustments. **From 1\textsuperscript{st} October 2004** this will include considering reasonable adjustments to the physical features of your premises so that goods, services and facilities are accessible for disabled people.

(DRC, 2005)
The Round 2 questions were sent to the participants on February 2004 and were returned by December 2004. Although October 2004 (new duties with regards to reasonable adjustments) occurred in the middle of Round 2 period, the opinions of the officers were needed, especially when the term ‘reasonable adjustments’ were recently introduced.

“The Delphi Method has been widely used to generate forecasts,” (Cornish, 1977), hence in determining opinions about the DDA, the opinions of the officers were solicited.

The different groups of officers’ responses were aggregated and resulted in the following (see also Table 7.5 and Table 7.6):

**Access Officers** as a group did not think there was much influence by DDA 1995 since its inception, as one quoted that ‘I don’t think most building managers are aware of the parts of the DDA and how they should be providing alternative service.’ However, the view after October 2004 the DDA’s outlook was slightly upbeat as was quoted that the DDA ‘would give more weight’, although ‘not likely having a stronger effect’ and depended on ‘how much information and support will be given to the building managers.’ The overall negative view were further underlined with the access officers opinions on ‘reasonable adjustments’, where they quoted, ‘very difficult to define’, ‘the cause of the greatest arguments’, ‘as yet undefined’, and also that ‘no determination or definition has yet been provided.’

**Building Control Officers’** group opinion reflected similar opinions by the access officers with quotes indicating DDA 1995 influence is ‘very little it seems’ and ‘causes major arguments’. However, after October 2004, there will be a ‘big impact’ and ‘the major arguments will be extensive between interested parties.’ Reasonable adjustment is thought to be a ‘minimum requirement for access to be included’, with other quotes not being opinions but statements.

**Conservation Officers’** gave opinions that the DDA 1995 do influence by the quote ‘only influenced our work in the last two/three years and has primarily focused on level entry provision’ and ‘increased awareness.’ After October 2004, the opinions were
quoted as ‘greater pressure which needs to be carefully managed’ and ‘expect a panic rush of applications for listed building consent later this year’. On reasonable adjustments, the view is quoted as ‘improve access without compromising the architectural quality of the historic building’ and ‘alteration that have little or no negative impact on character of property’, hence a view that generally accepts DDA and reasonable adjustment.

Planning Officers mostly did not know or not aware of the pressures that the DDA could impose on the planning control regime, except one quote that DDA ‘created more pressure for alterations to historic buildings, which have access difficulties’ and after October 2004, it will ‘make situation more acute’. Reasonable adjustment is not commonly known and only one officer quoted that it is ‘providing special measures rather than a common answer.’

When compared to the analysis made earlier in Round 1 with regards to ‘legislation’, where the concerns were on the ‘negative impact of accessibility’, there are similar responses in Round 2 as shown in bold.

7.3.2. Part M Building Regulations influence on accessibility to historic public buildings after May 2004

This section deals with the previous round’s reactions to the issue of using Part M for historic buildings (Summary in 7.2.9) and that five officers, consisting of two conservation officers, two planning officers and one building control officer did not agree with the question (Part M influence in 7.2.7) and did not answer the question.

The new 2004 version of Part M included a section on Historic Buildings, where the cooperation of the different parties involved were stressed upon as quoted:

• In arriving at an appropriate balance between historic building conservation and accessibility, it would be appropriate to take into account the advice of the local
authority's conservation and access officers, and English Heritage or CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments, as well as the views of local access groups, in order to make the building as accessible as possible (Part M, 2004).

Part M, 2004 clearly reinforced the finding in the previous section on the importance of both the advice of the conservation and access officers together. It further added the importance of local access groups, which will be discussed in this section and in other analysis chapters.

Access Officers in general sustained their interest in Part M introduced in May 2004, where they quoted 'early consultation with the Conservation Officer needed,' 'more improvement work', 'encourage a more carefully documented commentary where standard solutions to physical access do not apply', 'most influenced by 'Access Statements' as part of a building control submission,' and 'encourage access statements to explain'. However, some officers were quoted negatively that Part M's influence after May 2004 'depends on a proactive building manager', and 'fear that it will have little impact on listed buildings due to uncertainty of what is deemed 'reasonable'. This issue of reasonableness will be explained further in paragraphs 7.3.10. and in Section 7.4.

Building Control Officers responses were more negative or mixed. One officer felt that Part M will influence 'where a material alteration occurs'. Three officers underlined that Part M will again cause conflict, 'create the destruction of historic fabric and appearance', only apply to the new extension parts of developing the historic building. One officer stressed on that only in authorities that have 'strong 'access cultures' will tend to use it as a 'stick' to improve facilities'.

Conservation Officers are considered to be the main point of reference in the Listed Building Consent, and it is up to the conservation officer to interpret Part M in their work. Conservation officers responded either not knowing or reluctant with Part M's influence, where 'historic buildings require a less than perfect solution'. One officer conceded that 'historic buildings will have to comply in some form'.
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Planning Officers mostly responded not knowing of the new Part M with only one cited it will ‘create more pressure for alterations involving access’.
Table 7.5: Response on influence of DDA after 1995 and possible influence after October 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Influence of DDA after 1995</th>
<th>Possible influence after October 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>1. Not at all (Nobody has bothered to give it consideration)</td>
<td>1. Reasonable access will have to be provided – without ruining any special features. (DRC and users will have to agree with a reasonable solution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Don’t know</td>
<td>2. Should not really change public buildings. Should be now made accessible. May have more weight come Oct 04.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I don’t think most building managers are aware of the parts of the DDA that came in 1999 and how they should be providing alternative service, different formats etc.</td>
<td>3. It will depend on how much information and support will be given to the building managers. It will also depend on test cases. Nor have many prepared for Oct. 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The DDA has an important effect because alterations to historic buildings affect the potential for re-use of buildings and DDA additional strand in this listing planning process.</td>
<td>4. Not likely to have a stronger effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. We have been involved in pre-planning / audit</td>
<td>5. I think it will affect local authorities and churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>The DDA has generated awareness but are only just starting to generate change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Building Regulation applications have been received for ramped access and disabled toilets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been necessary to consider alternatives to gain access rather than turning round and coming up with an excuse of 'it’s a listed building and nothing can be done'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By legally requiring owners of historic public buildings to improve accessibility. By bringing the issue to the attention of owners and their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The DDA will be enforceable and therefore physical features in buildings that cause barriers will need to be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I suspect more work will be done on access and toilet facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In Rochdale we will consider whether a service can be provided from elsewhere with more accessibility rather than looking at an alteration that may not be necessary to a listed building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>By legally requiring owners of historic public buildings to improve accessibility. By bringing the issue to the attention of owners and their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. English Heritage has softened their approach over the past few years, but this softening has not filtered through to Planning Officers or Conservation Officers in some areas.

6. In my own authority it has, being brutally honest, made little difference.

6. Hopefully access will improve.

work on a number of historic public buildings looking to improve access especially churches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Very little it seems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unsure – would assume has some impact and causes major arguments between interested parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I think it will have a big impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Same as above but to a greater extent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Awareness of the need to provide disabled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increasing number of request to facilitate disabled access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Many more applications for works to alter listed buildings internally and externally. DDA cited as a prime justification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Only influenced our work in the last two/three years and has primarily focused on level entry provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most research has been produced on access to historic buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Similar demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. As compliance with DDA becomes bedded in the number of applications will remain high. I expect a panic rush of applications for listed building consent later this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There will be greater pressure which needs to be carefully managed in the 1st year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not familiar with the provisions of the DDA, so I cannot truthfully give any reliable answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. do not know or have an opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not familiar with the provisions of the DDA, so I cannot truthfully give any reliable answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. do not know or have an opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. I do not know it is something we have been made
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I was not in Planning prior to 1995 and therefore am not aware of changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Created more pressure for alterations to historic buildings, which have access difficulties. Issue is balancing DDA with impact on historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aware in planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Make situation more acute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.6: Responses on the term “Reasonable Adjustments”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access Officers</strong></td>
<td>• Very difficult to define. Subjective – Man on top of the Clapham Omnibus (obviously not disabled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving service for staff, i.e. fitting induction loop. Changing job description slightly for a disabled person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The cause of the greatest arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjustments to service and or service building to prevent disabled people being denied or receiving lesser service or access to service buildings or to service information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As yet undefined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No determination or definition has yet been provided to explain what ‘reasonable’ might be. The final arbitor of this would be the courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjustments reasonable in the circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The minimum necessary to gain access without the destruction of historic fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The legal requirements of the DDA to provide access to employment, training, goods and services etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case specific. What is reasonable in one case would be totally inappropriate in another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conservation Officers | - I do not know.  
|                       | - Amendments to standard requirements for access to accommodate peculiarities of a listed building.  
|                       | - Those which improve access without compromising the architectural quality of the historic building.  
|                       | - Alteration that have little or no negative impact on character of property whilst achieving meaningful improvements in access to property.  
| Planning Officers     | - I do not know.  
|                       | - The means by which buildings or activities can be adapted to provide any disabled person with access to the service. This may mean providing special measures rather than a common answer for all people.  
|                       | - Adjustments to a building that can be made to accommodate accessibility for disabled persons ‘significantly’ injuring the historic fabric.  
|                       | - I do not know.  
|                       | - I do not know.  
|
Table 7.7: Responses on whether Part M influences accessibility to historic public buildings after May 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Responses on Part M influence after May 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access Officers       | • Paragraph 0.18 of the new Part M advises early consultation with the Conservation Officer. And much discussion and some guidance needed  
                        • More improvement work will no doubt be needed  
                        • Depends on a proactive building manager as they will not speak to a building control officer unless they have decided to try to improve the access.  
                        • If they only depend on Building Regulations they will miss some issues that are not covered by the regulations which are just the basics.  
                        • Will encourage a more carefully documented commentary where standard solutions to physical access do not apply. Part M will be most influenced by building control and approved inspectors requiring ‘Access Statements’ as part of a building control submission.  
                        • Encourage access statements to explain why access cannot be provided in a different way. Will no longer be able to say can’t provide access with no justification.  
                        • Part M will have a beneficial effect on new buildings and buildings which are not listed or (not) within conservation areas. However, I fear that it will have little impact on listed buildings or those within conservation areas as the Building Control Officers are left with the uncertainty of what is deemed ‘reasonable’. |
| Building Control Officers | • Part M could influence accessibility and in particular where a material alteration occurs |
| **Conservation Officer** | • It may require changes to the existing parts if new extensions etc rely on the existing parts for access or sanitary facilities.  
• Again consideration of providing services or the need for alterations that are unnecessary on listed buildings will create the destruction of historic fabric and appearance.  
• By being enforced.  
• I think the response will be mixed. Part M will depend on the relative strengths of opinion / influence within each Local Authority. Those with strong 'access cultures' will tend to use it as a 'stick' to improve facilities. Those without that culture will tend to only do as much as they need to in order to fulfil their responsibilities. Building owners will quickly see which culture applies and will then proceed accordingly.  
• Will affect such buildings if they are altered, extended etc. Again will cause conflict.  

| **Conservation Officer** | • I do not know, I have not seen a copy of Part M yet.  
• Unknown  
• As compliance with DDA becomes bedded in the number of applications will remain high. I expect a panic rush of applications for listed building consent later this year. What is required is specific guidance on the issue that Access Officers / Building Inspectors (sign up to it) / Conservation Officers flexibility in approach. As time goes by, it is hoped that owners, legislators and their agents understand that some times |
| Planning Officers | historic buildings require a less than perfect solution.  
|                  | - Historic buildings will have to comply in some form.  
|                  | - Not familiar with building regulations.  
|                  | - I do not know or have an opinion  
|                  | - I do not know it is something we have been made aware in planning.  
|                  | - Don't know  
|                  | - Create more pressure for alterations involving access, etc.  

7.3.3. Access Statement

In Round 2, when asked about Access Statements which had been raised earlier in Round 1 when describing about Part M, all the participants except for one conservation officer and one planning officer attempted to describe what it is (Table 7.8).

Part M which is a building regulation that is enforceable by the local authority may not in different circumstances be met or complied with satisfactorily, and the Access Statement is a document to explain why the applicant had not met the access requirements stipulated in Part M.

Access Officers as a group were more consistent in describing the Access Statement, as a 'statement or document to be submitted to planning control or building control' based on 'Part M and the standards' giving 'reason or commitment or details how' buildings will be made accessible. The comments made by access officers on Reasonable Adjustments of the DDA (in this section) were not precise and concise as these. Although this research could not obtain data on the effectiveness of Access Statements, the responses provided evidence of the positive stance that access officers have with the mechanism.

Building Control Officers comments showed that 3 of the 6 officers were more accurate with their responses, reflecting the same as the access officers, in linking the statement with the Part M. However, for the Conservation Officers and Planning Officers, all their comments did not link the statement to Part M Building Regulations.

The perspective and evidential knowledge that the Access Statement is part of the development control process rather than a legislative mechanism, is crucial as this would determine the influence of the mechanism in the system.
Table 7.8: Definition of Access Statement by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• The reason why a building cannot fully comply with Part M – in the opinion of the applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To show your commitment to being accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A statement by the developer as to how they will make the premises / facilities accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A document submitted for planning or building control to support proposals to improve or alter access to existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A statement which explains why access has not been provided, or why access has been provided in a way other than Part M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A statement which gives details of how the building will be made accessible for use by disabled people and indicate what standards will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officers</td>
<td>• When the prescriptive requirements of Part M (2004) will not be followed. An access statement is required to justify and support a scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A document supporting the part M to explain any deviation from the guidance document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The requirements for accessibility to a particular premise for public or employees. Both being quite different in the need for general conditions to conform with DDA or specific requirements for an employee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A statement indicating the approach to inclusive design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know – indeed, we are currently trying to establish this before May. Any pointers to good documents would be welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A statement submitted with a Building Regs. Application indicating how reasonably standards have been reached, but not necessarily complying with Part M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Conservation Officers** | • I don’t know  
• Statement about current conditions and opportunities to increase / facilitate access  
• A study or report that sets out all of the issues that need to be resolved to ensure compliance with DDA on a particular building – including issues such as listed status.  
• A statement of access policy for a property |
| **Planning Officers** | • Not sure (is it a document setting out developer’s / applicant’s proposal for access?)  
• A statement of actions to be taken to achieve access for all, or of actions that can be taken and reasons why certain groups may still be disadvantaged despite endeavours to overcome any problems that have been identified.  
• A statement put together by a local authority in conjunction with its access group articulating its commitment to providing accessibility wherever possible and setting out minimum standards.  
• I do not know  
• Document setting out the accessibility of a building / development for all concerned. |
7.3.4. Access Plan

The Access Plan is an instrument that will facilitate the implementation of access requirements more effectively. It is not a procedure in the planning and building control process but it was suggested in the guidance by English Heritage. Based on the Access Planning Process Workflow diagram (see Figure 4.1) in the guidance, an audit on the building is needed to prepare and complete the access plan.

Both Access Officers and Building Control Officers did not relate the Access Plan to the Access Planning Process (APP) workflow recommended by English Heritage or stated whether they know of it (in the case of Welsh officers) as the comments were general in nature. However, the pattern of the comments gave 'improvements to a building' using 'plans, proposals, schemes or projection' as the method, which showed some consistency of the basic concept of an Access Plan. Only one, who is a building control officer, had correctly associated the plan based on the result of the audit.

Conservation Officers also did not relate Access Plan to APP, although they managed to describe about 'proposals or plan' to do with access provision for access. However, 4 out of 5 Planning Officers did not know what an Access Plan is (Table 7.9).

Table 7.9: Definition of Access Plan by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>• How improvements are proposed to a building in order to meet the spirit of DDA and its Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan of improvement works to be carried out to improve accessibility can include building works as well as staff training etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A scheme to improve a number of service buildings or a building in stages over a period of years. May include staff training and introduction of new access arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Building Control Officers** | - Not known although I would hazard a guess and say that an access plan could be an organisation’s commitment to promoting accessible and inclusive building.  
- A plan of work to be done to comply with the DDA.  
- The result of the audit and the considered points to make the premise suitable for public or individual employee.  
- The development of the access statement to state priorities and timescales for improvements.  
- I do not know – indeed, we are currently trying to establish this before May. Any pointers to good documents would be welcomed.  
- Unsure - assume a plan which lays down the requirements and methods to end up with an accessible building. |
| **Conservation Officers** | - A plan to establish the most feasible access within a building. Indicating positive and negative issues and providing different options for access.  
- Proposals for Access in the light of construction / architectural character  
- Following on from the statement – A set of proposals costed / time tabled to ensure the implementation of any works to ensure compliance with DDA and other statutory.  
- A plan addressing how access will be achieved and improved |
over time.

| Planning Officers | • I do not know  
| • I do not know  
| • I do not know  
| • I do not know  
| • Document setting out how access to a building / development can be improved |

7.3.5. Access Groups

Access advice could be in the form of a group that meets regularly during the course of a project consisting of individuals who are disabled people, often referred to as the Local Access Group or Access Advisory Group. The group is formed when someone often the access officer in planning and building control or within the local authority is designated to manage and facilitate the access groups and often the individuals are volunteers to the consultative process.

Two out of six Access Officers mentioned that access groups could be involved in the planning applications. All the Building Control Officers made comments with varying emphasis on their function and scope, where one officer defined an access group having links with the planning application process, although one control officer mentioned about the access group in a negative light. The evidence show that the building control officers were aware of access groups but were not involved in dealing with them. It seems that access groups are not in the purview of building control officers compared to access officers as explained earlier.

Two of the Conservation Officers and two of the Planning Officers also linked the access groups to planning application or planning control. One planning officer defined the most succinct stating all possible roles of access groups including 'provide guidance on all accessibility issues', 'made up of disabled persons from the community and council
representatives’, ‘some authorities set up regular meetings between access groups and planning officers to discuss recently submitted applicants and the accessibility issues involved’.

All of the officers were able to offer a definition, where most did not link access groups to the development control process. None of the officers suggested that access groups should be giving input after the planning application process during the detailed working drawing stages in the building control processes. Where access officers mentioned access groups to be involved with the local authority, it was clearly defined to be in the planning application stage. All access groups definitions were quoted as either as an informal or volunteer group rather than part of the procedure or instrument necessary to the process (Table 7.10).

Table 7.10: Definitions of an Access group by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• In my case is a group of individuals representing various disabilities, and professionals in a local authority who consider and comment on disabled access in a certain locality or municipal area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Used as an advisory group in getting access right for disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A group of volunteers who promote better access and can give their opinions on access issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A group of disabled people who campaign for improve access to the environment in new areas, or in an area to which they have a common intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A group made up of local disabled people and hopefully includes local authority access advisor. Many roles including influencing council procedure and advising on planning applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Control Officers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conservation Officers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • A group of people, mainly disabled people but not exclusively, who have an interest in access issues. These groups sometimes assist in the consultation process for planning applications etc. | • Access group formed from a number of representatives, e.g. disabled groups, local community, planning / building control officer that discuss issues related to access. Some make comments on planning applications in order to ensure that there is ‘Access for All’.
<p>| | • Reps. of various organisations to advise or facilitate access into buildings and public areas. |
| | • Users of facilities in a group to focus in on issues related to access. Owners / employees / public etc. All conflicting views balanced and taken into account. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
<th>A voluntary group normally that provides advice on access issues normally relating to a specific form of disability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A selection of interested parties who makes comments upon issues rising out of access to buildings for people with mobility problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A group of people which meets to give advice, lobby, etc. for the achievement of a fully inclusive environment. Such a group would contain representatives of different disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A group set up to provide guidance on all accessibility issues, normally made up of disabled persons from the community and council representatives. Some authorities set up regular meetings between access groups and planning officers to discuss recently submitted applicants and the accessibility issues involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss planning applications and request accessibility improvements as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A group of people in charge with producing a statement / plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3.6. Access Consultant

An Access Consultant must be a registered member of the National Register of Access Consultants in the UK. They should have expertise in identifying access problems and give general advice on solutions. Two most important function of the access consultant is (i) comprehensively identifying and reporting on access issues as developed in the client brief. These may be audits or appraisals, and may include general advice on solutions; and (ii) providing access related policy/strategy advice, including design appraisals, development of Access Statements, access plans, access related strategies and policies
(NRAC, 2007). An access consultant differed with an access auditor (also registered with the NRAC) when they 'can make recommendations and provide solutions of a technical and policy nature and possess a greater degree of construction knowledge' (NRAC, 2007).

Both Access Officers and Building Control Officers gave responses which basically describes the access consultant dealing with 'access' and making reports, however only two access officers and two building control officers mentioned 'audit or appraisal' as well, as this is an important function.

None of the Conservation Officers and Planning Officers mentioned about 'audit or appraisal', also they made comments about 'advising on access' and the comments were general in nature.

Table 7.11: Definitions of an Access Consultant by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• Owner appointed consultant to deal with matters regarding access, working with the other consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultant on access issues working with council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NRAC registered professional who deals with access and comes up with reports for the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A consultant being appointed by the developer who does access audit and reports on appraising buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trained expert to provide access audit reports, engaged by the developer or client. AC surveys the building and make recommendations on access problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Building Control Officers | - A specialist on access who is paid to come up with building appraisals, audit and recommends specifications for accessibility needs.  
- A consultant who specialises on access issues.  
- A registered advisor from the NRAC who is brought to do access audit, appraisals and access plan for the client, and sometimes involved with the access group and council meetings.  
- A consultant who would advise on access issues.  
- I would imagine think it is a consultant that was brought in to advise on access issues.  
- An expert on access who deals with access problems and make recommendations |
| Conservation Officers | - Access Consultant deals with access issues and sometimes work with the council when the situation arises in dealing with aspects of conflict between conservation and access.  
- Professional dealing with access issues brought by the client / developer.  
- A registered professional working with the project in dealing with access issues and could also work with access group.  
- An individual who is registered to investigate access issues in a building. |
| Planning Officers | - Persons dealing with access issues in a professional capacity.  
- A consultant who advises the client on access issues, often having to produce a report.  
- Individual who might be involved with access groups and accessibility issues. |
7.3.7. Access officers work in (i) pre-application stage of planning approval; (ii) pre-application stage of listed building consent; (iii) pre-application stage of conservation area consents

As a follow up investigation on a Round 1 summary about ‘the lack of influence that the Access Officer have in their function in the development control process’, the question posed on what all the officers would expect the Access Officers function would be in the pre-application stage of Planning Approval, Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent.

The perception would either confirm or negate the function of the Access Officer in these stages and at the same time confirm the basic functions of the Access Officer, in terms of local authority officers’ views.

Access Officers responses suggested in detail what their function might be at the different stages, consisting of involvement in ‘access audit’, ‘access statement’, ‘access solution’, identifying access problems’, ‘draw attention’, and ‘discussion with planning and conservation officers’.

Building Control Officers responses were divided where half of the officers (3 out of 6) did not respond at all or was not specific to the question. Coming up with ‘access solution’ has only been quoted by only one building control officer. There were general views on access officers involved in ‘comments’, ‘review’ and ‘involved’ on access issues.
Conservation Officers responded but did not specify the function specifically. Only 1 out of 4 mentioned about the function in general. Planning Officers also gave general functions, including ‘assessing the problem’, ‘best practice’, ‘make aware’ and ‘advice on the constraints’.

Generally, other than the access officers, other officers thought that access officers should not be given a specific function such as doing access audit, recommending access solutions and doing access statement, but more of advice or reviews or comments or make aware of access problems during meetings and discussions. Further investigation regarding the access officer will be posed in Round 3.
Table 7.12: The local authority officers’ opinions on what work should the Access Officer undertake during Pre-Application Stages in each of the Planning Processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Participants’ department in the local authority</th>
<th>Pre-application stage of planning approval</th>
<th>Pre-application stage of listed building consent</th>
<th>Pre-application stage of conservation area consents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>Building Control Department</td>
<td>Desktop access audit and advice given</td>
<td>Desktop study of scheme and access statement and advice there on</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think that they should be involved in all of this</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with other appropriate officers and applicant to find access solutions.</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access external to the planning site including planning; Site and building levels; Building content and internal facilities</td>
<td>Access consequences of different options for alterations</td>
<td>Detectable fencing and design of ramps and steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draw attention to Part M, BS</td>
<td>-same as in the column left</td>
<td>-same as in the column left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>8300 and other good practice guides. Also draw attention to areas of potential access problems and suggest improvements</td>
<td>of this column-</td>
<td>of this column-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Department?</td>
<td>To be included in the discussions with the Planning Officers and the client as to the level of access and the standards which might be applied</td>
<td>To be invited to discussions with the Planning Officers, Conservation Officers and client on how best to provide access without compromising the status of the building</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officers</td>
<td>Reviewing inclusive design for public buildings and housing developments</td>
<td>Advising consultation officers on solutions to access where alterations to historic buildings are made</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>Comment on access issues</td>
<td>Comment on minimum requirements</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>Only insist on any alterations are considered when there</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>are no alternative methods of access</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>Fully involved in principles of access</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Officers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning Department</strong></td>
<td>1. Access in and out of the building 2. Circulation around the building 3. Facilities e.g. Kitchens / bathrooms [Ensuring a high standard in design and materials]</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Access officer should be involved through all stages</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not necessary CAC is for demolition in conservation areas only. Not for alterations or new build.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- CAC = Conservation Area Certificate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th>Finalise details of Access Requirements</th>
<th>Consult with conservation and finalise details of Access Requirements</th>
<th>-same as in the column left of this column-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officers</td>
<td>Site visit and assessment of problem and how best it might be overcome (or ameliorated)</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Advise all parties on best practice and consider implications of any problems with the particular proposal. May involve meeting relevant council officers without the developer and site meetings with any or all</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highly unlikely to raise DDA issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>parties</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advice on best practice – to make the building as accessible as possible.</td>
<td>As above but talking to conservation officer to be aware of constraints of historic fabric.</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Make potential applicants aware of requirements</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Advice on issues / constraints / options</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
<td>-same as in the column left of this column-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.8. Conservation Plan

The Conservation Plan is a standard report for plan of action that is essential in Conservation Practice. There are several variants of it, namely the Conservation Statement and the Conservation Management Plan, regardless there must be a statement where the 'impact' or 'damage' to the historic building will be highlighted when it underwent for restoration and alteration. This document is being referred to as an instrument in the LBC. Access issues could be dealt with in this document.

Access Officers were all not able to define what a Conservation Plan is although one officer replied in a general manner. Only one of the Building Control Officers was able to define it in more precise terms.

Conservation Officers were all able to define the term, where the important elements were 'identifying the historic and architectural significance of a building / site', 'highlights constraints'.

Planning Officers were also all not able to define and only one defined although in a general manner.

Conservation Plan is argued as an unfamiliar document to many of the officers who may not know the significance of this document in relation to the LBC. The conservation officer is the one responsible to oversee this document which is prepared in conjunction with the LBC by the owner and the consultant, hence were expectedly able to define conservation plans, but none highlighted 'access' as a possible major conflict that the plan could identify and deal with at an early stage. The investigation of Conservation Plan will be addressed in Chapter 8.
Table 7.13: Definition of Conservation Plan by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• Do not know the term unless it is the recommendation of a local authority with respect to buildings in a conservation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• -none-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The plan of how the listed building will be preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officers</td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A document which sets out what is significant and valuable in a place and what action is required and appropriate to ensure that significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officers</td>
<td>• Identifies the historic and architectural significance of a building / site. This also highlights constraints and policies that need to be taken into consideration when making any proposals to extend, alter or demolish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan for future treatment of a listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A comprehensive document which collates all information relating to a historic building – history, construction, condition, importance; use pattern; access, energy etc;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning Officers | maintenance / management now and in future.  
|                  | • An assessment of all conservation issues relating to property and a strategy to restore them.  
|                  | • I do not know  
|                  | • I do not know  
|                  | • Plan setting out policies how they will be implemented, relevant historical background, who the stakeholders are and what their role will be in moving forward.  
|                  | • I do not know  
|                  | • I do not know  

### 7.3.9. English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monument guidance

In Round 2, the question was asked to the participants about guidance created by English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Monuments on Access to Historic Properties, which was explained in Chapter 4. The English version illustrated the Access Planning Process and suggested the use of Access Plan in the 1995 version. A new and updated workflow diagram on the Access Planning Process (APP) were illustrated and published in the 2004 version. The guidance and APP included aspects that involved the Local Authority although the author stated that the guidance and APP workflow was done for the consultant and client. The purpose of questioning the local authority officers is to ascertain whether they are aware of the guidance and workflow. The local authority officers generally gave short replies in a general manner, regarding the guidance, as they quoted ‘good practice guide on making historic buildings
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accessible,’ ‘a guide to ways in which listed buildings be made accessible for disabled people,’ ‘guide that has the intention of ‘balancing’ conservation and access requirements’ and ‘guidance notes on access issues in historic properties’

Access Officers responded that most of them knew of the guidance, although two officers did not. Building Control Officers mostly did not know of the guidance except for two officers. All the Conservation Officers knew of the guidance and none of the Planning Officers either knew of the guidance or have read it (Table 7.14).

Table 7.14: Guidance comments by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• I do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• -none-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A guide that was only put in place because of the pressure of the DDA. The CADW guide was not put in place with enthusiasm or great knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A good practice guide on making historic buildings accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This is a guide to ways in which listed buildings and the like might be made accessible for disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officers</td>
<td>• A guide that has the intention of ‘balancing’ conservation and access requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A guide to improving the accessibility of historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officers</td>
<td>Planning Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I wish not to comment (I have a copy but have not read it for awhile)</td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English Heritage’s guide</td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Overcoming the Barriers: Providing physical access to Historic Buildings’.</td>
<td>• I have not read it but presumably this is a guidance for developers and officers as to how to reach solutions in difficult situation that have worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guidance notes on access issues in historic properties</td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I do not know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.10. Issues of ‘minimal provisions’, ‘compromise’, ‘negotiation’ and ‘balance’

In Round 2, to further investigate the responses in section 7.2.8. (Table 7.4) on ‘whether too much emphasis is given to conservation issues rather than access issues in the listed building consent’, the officers were asked further regarding responses stating ‘minimal provisions’, ‘compromise’, ‘negotiation’ and ‘balance’. The question is also based on section 7.3.1 regarding the DDA and ‘reasonable adjustments’.

Access Officers responded in general against those terms used as quoted that, ‘these words will always need to be used where legislation is non-prescriptive and the word ‘reasonable’ is used’, ‘access gets considered too late and so all too often a compromise is being looked for,’ ‘developers only want to do the minimum necessary to provide access,’ and ‘as this term is not defined and would probably determined on a case-by-case basis, it is highly unlikely that it will ever be a clear case of something being required or not.’
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Building Control Officers echoed access officers' opinions being against the terms as quoted that, 'not keen on the word 'compromise'. I prefer the word 'reasonable' as this word suggest that the aesthetic should not jeopardise access to buildings,' 'the words used indicate that the concept of reasonableness is going to be the main debate regarding access to historic buildings', and 'minimal provision is a euphemism for 'none, or as close to it as possible' in many cases'.

Conservation Officers reinforced the importance of these terms by stating that, 'compromise – a balance between obtaining an adequate access and impact on the historic building' and 'negotiate – discussion for all parties involved with access and the historic environment.'

Planning Officers also defended these terms by stating that, 'planning is all about 'negotiating' to find 'balanced' compromise,' 'one should not be prescriptive as the significance of some buildings or features of a building may cause difficulties for some people and we have to live with that', 'it is unusual to find a solution where it is possible to have the best possible outcome for both the historic fabric and accessibility. That is why a balance must be reached', and 'should aim for more than 'minimal provisions' as 'balance' is a key word'.

Table 7.15: Key findings for Section 7.3.10 regarding reasonable adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For reasonable adjustment</th>
<th>Against reasonable adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>should not be prescriptive</td>
<td>legislation is non-prescriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance must be reached</td>
<td>minimal provision is a euphemism (for doing little)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept of reasonableness</td>
<td>term is not defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The key points from the findings are as follows:

**Prescriptive versus Non-prescriptive**
There are officers who have difficulties with accepting reasonable adjustment and preferred a tougher legislation to counter the conservation legislation. They would prefer a prescriptive mechanism with regards to access requirements and solutions with historic buildings. On the other hand, there are those who do not believe in a prescriptive approach and welcomed the DDA’s mechanism.

**Balance versus Minimal Provision**
There are officers who are not accepting the terms ‘compromise’ and ‘balance’, even though arguably these would be better than ‘minimal provision’, which some of these officers would argue will actually be the outcome of implementing access in historic buildings. Additionally, the term ‘negotiate’ is also not acceptable, although it is a common practice in planning control.

**Concept of Reasonableness**
The concept is thought as being vague and the term reasonable adjustment is not defined and left to interpretation. The issue of implementing access requirements in historic buildings is left to an interpretive concept, where for some is not acceptable.

This argument for or against reasonable adjustments (as stated in 7.1.8.) is based on the debate between ‘conservation versus accessibility’ which was the main research question explained in Chapter 1. Those for conservation welcomed the term as it gave a chance to provide for alternative means of access, whereby those for accessibility preferred a more ‘prescriptive’ mechanism. However, at this point, the term still needed to be explored in Round 3 and subsequent chapters.
7.3.11. Summary

The analytical discussion in 7.2.10 required further investigation into the idea of 'non-prescriptive legislation'. Under best practice and guidance, the issue of balance will be examined together with the 'concept of reasonableness'. The examination included the why and how these concepts and ideas would be translated into action via the existing mechanisms, which will be focusing on the bigger issue of the interpretation of legislation, best practice and guidance. Part M will also be examined in Round 3.

7.4. Analysis and discussion of findings: Round 3

Round 3 of the Delphi study commenced in January 2005 and lasted three months until March 2005 to obtain feedback from 15 officers.

As mentioned in the summary (Section 7.3.11), the questions were designed to examine further some findings that were not yet conclusive, which needed to be further validated in the single case study (Chapter 9).

Best practice and guidance was examined in paragraphs 7.4.1. Part M will also be examined in Section 7.4.1 Mechanisms associated with Part M and development control, such as local access groups were investigated in Section 7.4.2 and Part M's influence since May 2004 in 7.4.4.

In this round, the idea of 'non-prescriptive legislation' is being explored in paragraphs 7.4.3. with regards to the DDA.

One question was further developed from Round 1 (Section 7.2.9) where 'the lack of influence the Access Officer have in their function in the development control process summary', so in Section 7.4.5. the investigation was on 'officers that will be the most influential in dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings in the next five to ten years'.
Conclusively, paragraphs in 7.4.6 questioned on ‘major changes with the Local Authority’s Role or in the Development Process as a whole and example of best practice’.

7.4.1 Access Planning Process Workflow (English Heritage, 2004) and respondents comments on the stages involved

Best practice and guidance issues are being examined with this question that identifies the different stages with the officers’ function and opinion (Table 7.16). Taking all the groups’ different functions, the responses showed that the Access Planning Process workflow diagram reflected their functions in practice, as the responses showed that they were involved in all stages described in the APP, which was explained in Chapter 4.

Access Officers responses showed that the majority were involved with the Access Audit, Access Plan and Access Strategy, Consultation with Users and even Conservation Assessment. They also commented further to reinforce the APP workflow by emphasising that Access Strategy ‘need to state qualifications of the person to progress’ and for Consultation with users, they suggested that ‘user group request a more sustained involvement in the process, including discussion of management and strategies’. Another suggestion is to ‘add Conservation Officer and Access Officer liaising over acceptable access/conservation solutions as the conservation officer has to lead access improvements that meet everyone’s requirements’. Finally the Access Statement is a mechanism that should be included as ‘the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 will require an Access Statement to accompany planning applications’.

One Building Control Officer confirmed involvement in the APP and another said ‘no. The suggestion from this group was ‘Part M is having a major effect on the Planning Process in certain situations and may need to be considered earlier in the process’, citing the reason that ‘Development Control and Conservation would be similar in process.’
Conservation Officers responses confirmed the APP workflow by being involved in Conservation Assessment, Listed Building Consent, Planning Consent (Planning Approval) and Draft Access Strategy / Guidance Notes. Further suggestion by this group includes ‘Conservation Assessment and Design Guidance to be included in the consultation stage (Feasibility and Options studies)’, or even merging Conservation Assessment and Feasibility and Options studies as the ‘assessment would form part of a Feasibility’. They also added that, ‘Building Regulations / Legislation not mentioned and more strength should be given to this statement where it is only mentioned in passing as Access Requirements’.

Only two Planning Officers confirmed that they were involved in the Access Planning Process (APP), in the following mechanisms: Conservation Assessment, Feasibility & Option Studies, Impact Analysis, Test Reasonableness, Consultation, Decisions and Confirm Planning and Listed Building Consent required or not required. This group did not suggest anything further.

In summary, there are three suggestions for Part M to be represented in the APP workflow (see Figure 4.1), and this confirms the inclusion of the Access Statement into the APP workflow. Two suggestions confirm that Conservation Assessment should be done with other Feasibility and Options.

The APP workflow’s author reiterated that it was done ‘in very close consultation all the time’ where he ‘had about 30 versions of the workflow all getting better and better’ based on the numerous consultations that he had done (Adams, 2004). The workflow is used by English Heritage as the best practice suggestion and guidance to the process, recommended for architects and their clients. Hence the suggestion by the Delphi study participants indicated that the APP is a worthwhile process which could be more effective. This would argue for a reworking of the process and further development of the APP process workflow.
Table 7.15: Comments on the stages involved in the Access Planning Process workflow (shown in Figure 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access Officers            | • Access audit, Feasibility, Conservation Assessment  
• Agree strategic commitment via Councils’ access strategy  
• -not available-  
• Access Audit, Access Plan, Under 'feasibility and option studies' consultation with disability user groups  
• -not available- |
| Building Control Officers  | • -not available-  
• Yes  
• No |
| Conservation Officers      | • Conservation Assessment but this could be at the consultation stage (Feasibility and options studies). Design guidance could also be offered at this stage. Listed Building Consent. Conditions would be attached to permissions to ensure that works are of a high standard.  
• Conservation Assessment, Listed Building & Planning Consent  
• Conservation Assessment, Draft Access Strategy / Guidance Notes |
| Planning Officers          | • No  
• Conservation Assessment / Both Processes; Feasibility & Option Studies / Impact analysis; Test reasonableness; Consultation; Decisions / Confirm consent not required; Obtain (grant) listed building consent.  
• Confirm whether statutory consent required; Obtain Listed Building / Planning Consent  
• No |
7.4.2. Local Access Groups, its usefulness and the policy of the local authority on the use of this type of advice

In Round 3, the participants were further questioned on 'Local Access Groups and the officers’ experiences working with such groups', whether there are groups available to them and whether such groups were useful to them. The term ‘local’ could be meant available disabled people residing or working in their city or town who could be available to be consulted upon. This is in keeping with the idea of consultation with users, the people outside of the council rather than experts which may be available working in the council.

Access Officers mostly found them useful except for one officer who felt that the group ‘take to hostile a view’ and another who could not comment as there are no groups available. The policies that they adopted with the group, included the group giving ‘advise on all planning applications on non domestic including historic buildings’, ‘practical examples of inaccessible services and often suggest solutions.’ Additionally, the two of the officers attend access group monthly meetings and in one authority the group is invited to participate in corporate meetings.

Two Building Control Officers were able to respond, where one did not have the availability of the group but felt that they would be useful to ‘help provide an insight’ which is ‘the barriers as seen by the users’, and the other officer had no available group did not feel them useful.

Conservation Officers provided positive responses where two officers had experience in meetings, where they quoted the view that ‘they highlight issues that someone without a specific disability may not be aware of’, and ‘they provide an understanding of principles and detailed requirements.’ The officer that had no experience with an access group took advice for other officers dealing with building regulations.
Planning Officers held the view that an access group could be found or started within the council and not necessarily from the immediate local residents. One officer emphasized that they ‘do not consult ‘local groups’ within the authority area’, but consult a designated group for the whole of the city. Another officer quoted that the ‘Council has it’s own ‘ Access Group’, comprising disabled people who volunteer to meet every two weeks with one of the planners’. Two of the officers stressed on the approach of considering the access group’s advice and getting the balance right before taking decisions.

Table 7.16: Local Access Groups, its usefulness and the policy of the local authority on access groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access Officers | • Yes and they are useful. Advise on all planning applications – non domestic including historic buildings.  
• Yes. Give practical examples of inaccessible services and often suggest solutions. Officer attends access group monthly meetings. Group is invited to participate in corporate meetings.  
• No. Not currently – as access groups take to hostile a view. Respond and listen with attention to all inputs made.  
• Yes and they know of similar projects that have been successful, add weight to reasons for carrying out improvements. We have monthly meetings with the whole group and sub meetings on planning issues and on transport and highways issues for those interested in those areas. The group are also involved in the Considerate Contractor Scheme that we run in the authority and have a large role in the community strategy.  
• No and no Access Groups active in the area. So could not comment on policy. |
| Building Control Officers | • No. Yes as it is easy to identity how a building is used from your own perspective but it is more difficult to envisage the barriers as seen by the other users. The access group help provide this insight. The department does not appear to use the access formally.  
• No and I am not sure we currently have a L.A.G.  
• No. Only use them very occasionally – not that useful to me. |
| Conservation Officers | • Yes. Sometimes, they can be positive as they highlight issues that someone without a specific disability may not be aware of. Need to confer with the Planning Officers.  
• Yes. Provide an understanding of principles & detailed requirements. Please speak to our access officers. I am sure they happy to take such advice.  
• No. We mainly consult with Building Regulations as they are the only ones trained and up to date. Access groups are being contracted and links developed but slowly. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No. The Council has its own 'Access Group', comprising disabled people who volunteer to meet every two weeks with one of the planners to make comment on access issues on newly received planning applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yes. Yes - Architects, developers and planners get first hand experience of problems &amp; needs and are more likely to be sympathetic to planning officers' requests to meet access requirements. Access Groups can remind developers and planners of all disability issues and bring pressure to bear in circumstances when there are conflicting issues and pressure from different groups. To consult Access Group via the Corporation's Access Adviser. To consider and take any Access advice into account when taking decisions on listed buildings and town planning matters generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No. We do not consult 'local groups' within the authority area but do consult Manchester Disabled People Access Group. We have had training days on access issues with presentations from Manchester Disabled People Access Group. We do not consult 'local' groups however.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yes. Yes, but their involvement and issues need to be balanced with other matters. Local groups may become involved in the process, via consultation and comment, with their comments taken into account before a decision is made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.3. Disability Discrimination Act (that came into force October 2004) with reasonable adjustments

This question was posed in January 2005, three months after the Act came into force with 'reasonable adjustments' term being introduced and to be implemented. As a Delphi study, the officers were given the opportunity to at least comment further how they felt regarding the DDA.

Access Officers responded that not much has changed since they commented in Round 2. They further stressed with the quotes, 'architects, surveyors etc. have not been trained in DDA issues' and 'Urban designers, Conservation Officers and Planning Officers have very little experience of access for disabled people'.

Building Control Officers responded similarly with access officers where 'I don't think many people knew of requirement', however two of the officers stated that 'the prospect of being sued for not meeting physical access has improved access to Historic Building' and 'its impact will increase, as several more applications under building regulations since October 2004 as the DDA starts to 'bite'.

Conservation Officers either did not give any added response.

Planning Officers responded that they either have 'no training about the DDA' and 'do not understand the (Delphi) question.' One officer had training on DDA since (Table 7.17).
Table 7.17: Comments on previous statement made a year ago since Disability Discrimination Act (that came into force October 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments on previous statement made a year ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• Applicants are taking awhile now!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would like to add that external architects surveyors etc. have not been trained in DDA issues or inclusive design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This means that it is often not included in a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Swindon Council has now adopted a ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ document following prolonged public consultation, (so this is now a “material planning consideration” in conjunction with the statutory local development policies on access. This document describes the DDA requirements and need for “Access Statements”.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The situation remains as stated above. Urban designers, Conservation Officers and Planning Officers have very little experience of access for disabled people and, quite honestly, show no real interest in gaining this knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officers</td>
<td>• I have no information as to whether the employment prospects of disabled people have improved in historic buildings under the DDA. As for the provision of auxiliary aids for service providers – I don’t think many people knew of requirement and were concentrating on October 2004 and physical access. I think that the prospect of being sued for not meeting physical access has improved access to Historic Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I still feel that its impact will increase. Certainly we have seen several more applications under B. Regs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since Oct 04 as the DDA starts to ‘bite’.

- No further comment.

| Conservation Officers | No
| As stated previously.
| -not available- |

| Planning Officers | I have had no training about the DDA since that time about the precise requirements of the Act. I understand however that there is now a duty to improve access to buildings for the disabled.
| I do not understand the question and do not have a copy of my earlier reply. I certainly knew about the existence of the DDA1995 and have done so since it was published. As far as I am aware, there are no “enforcement” provisions in the DDA other than that individuals can take a person or company to court if they believe they have been discriminated against.
| In the last 10 months I have been made much more aware of the DDA through training seminars.
| No, I think that still summarises the situation. |
7.4.4. Part M Building Regulations (May 2004) whether it has been influential in accessibility to historic public buildings since Round 2 in early 2004

The question was given to the respondents in January 2005, hence, it was six months after the new Part M was introduced in May 2004.

Access Officers mostly felt that was no influence yet and one officer felt there was, but conceded that the ‘DDA is more powerful where services are provided’.

Two Building Control Officers responded that there was no influence yet and one of them felt that ‘definite resistance from historic building people to the provision of access at the expense of even the slightest changes to historic / listed buildings’. The other officer felt ‘whether it is being enforced or not is a good question, which needs to be determined.’

Conservation Officers responded not knowing about the influence except for one who noted that there is ‘consideration at planning appeals’.

All three Planning Officers felt that Part M have nothing to do with them and the fourth officer felt that Part M is ‘influential to a point but Listed Building legislation still important’.
Table 7.18: Responses on the Part M Building Regulations (May 2004) whether it had been influential since Round 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• No – only if alteration work was subject to the building regulations. We have dispensed with or relaxed the requirements on a number of occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• -not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No evidence yet. (Planning Application just submitted by specialist listed building architect showing an undersized lobby extension).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes but the DDA is more powerful where services are provided, this will especially become the case with the new disability bill when venues want wedding on entertainments licences from the local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control Officers</td>
<td>• Part M is a legal requirement and is applicable to Historic Buildings where they are changed or new facilities provided. Part M is influencing the access to Historic Environment when it is enforced. Whether it is being enforced or not is a good question, which needs to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not largely. We have not dealt with many historic buildings since then but there is a definite resistance from historic building people to the provision of access at the expense of even the slightest changes to historic / listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Officers</td>
<td>• Not to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes. Now and consideration at planning appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• -not available-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning Officers | • No, we do not use the building regs. in determining planning applications. We are not trained to use building regulations, although we have a partial understanding of some elements of Part M.  
• As I do not deal with Building Regulations I cannot comment on this question.  
• I have not personally dealt with accessibility to historic public buildings over the last 10 months, rather general buildings. We have a conservation officer who is the point of contact on historic buildings.  
• Influential to a point but Listed Building legislation still important. |
7.4.5. Officers that will be the most influential in dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings in the next five to ten years

After one year’s lapse, findings after Round 3 showed that the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 was more of a concern in conservation practice. When asked for the officers’ opinion on ‘which of the officers will be more influential in dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings in the next five to ten years’, an equal number of access and building control officers, which totalled to six officers placed either the conservation officers and/or planning officers as the most influential.

Access Officers responded by mostly suggesting that conservation officers would be most influential. One officer emphasized on the ‘joint working of conservation and access officers that holds the key to improvements’

Building Control Officers were mixed in their responses where planning, building control and conservation officers were mentioned. One officer further added that ‘if a conservation officer states that they do not want the proposed access solution whether guided by the DDA or Part M then building control and planning will not be able to override them.’

Two of the Conservation Officers responded that ‘all will have an input’, and ‘everyone should be working together’. One officer quoted that his/her council ‘have decided we don’t need an Access Officer’, stressing that building control and conservation should be working together and that planning to be opt out.

Two Planning Officers felt that all have a role to play, where as one officer felt that it is ‘fairly close between conservation and access’. The last respondent stated that conservation and planning officers were most influential.

From the replies provided, the overall impression emphasised further on the Conservation Officer as being the most influential officer with regards to providing accessibility in
historic and listed public buildings undergoing the LBC. Although the Access Officer was regarded to be the least influential, the findings showed that the Access Officer should be regarded as an important influencer in the process when collaborating closely with the Conservation Officer.

Table 7.19: Officer in local authority most influential in dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings in the next five to ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Access Officers             | • Conservation Officers  
|                             | • Planning Officers and Conservation Officers  
|                             | • It depends who has had adequate training  
|                             | • It will be the joint working of conservation and access officers that holds the key to improvements.  
|                             | • Conservation Officers  |
| Building Control Officers   | • Planning as they ‘get in first’ in the process.  
|                             | • Building control without a doubt  
|                             | • Conservation officer – if a conservation officer states that they do not want the proposed access solution whether guided by the DDA or Part M then building control and planning will not be able to override them. |
| Conservation Officers       | • I suspect all will have an input. Impossible to say which will be most influential.  
|                             | • Building Control / Conservation combined > Planning have opted out of the process and council have decided we don’t need an Access Officer!  
|                             | • All, everyone should be working together, enabling sensitive access for all to historic buildings. |
Planning Officers

- Fairly close between conservation and access. As this is where conflicts may arise.
- I do not believe that any one officer will be more influential any other. All have a role to play and are generally aiming at the same goal.
- Difficult to choose as all play a part in the process and if all perspectives can be incorporated into the final design and decision then the better.
- 1\textsuperscript{st} & 2\textsuperscript{nd} – conservation and planning officers; 3\textsuperscript{rd} – building control officers; 4\textsuperscript{th} – access officers
7.4.6 Major changes with the Local Authority’s Role or in the Development Process as a whole and example of best practice

Respondents (Table 7.20) gave their suggestions which will be examined further in the conclusion chapter. This question is general in nature and is more to do with the outlook and possibilities of this thesis topic.

Table 7.20: Major changes with the Local Authority’s Role or in the Development Process as a whole and example of best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Officers</td>
<td>• The public are more aware of their rights of access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not a lot due to lack of training of appropriate people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some clients (those that own or provide services in only a few buildings) will be coming forward with improvement proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We have a new good practice guide which I will post to you, it was written jointly between the access team and the conservation officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To be perfectly frank, access has not risen appreciably over the past 10 years. Admittedly Part M has had some influence, but overall the standard of access to historic buildings has not changed. If I could find a ‘good’ example I would be happy to comment. However, as previously stated, not too many historic buildings can make this claim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Building Control Officers | • The major changes that have taken place is that access to Historic Buildings is at the forefront of development and not merely an add on. The Manchester Art Gallery has been successful in achieving accessibility and inclusive design in that there was no access to the original two historic buildings and that there is now full access throughout even if it is not fully inclusive.  
• I see developers increasingly trying to demolish historic buildings in order to allow new building on sites. We have had experience of a number of these ‘accidents’ as developers find that altering the buildings too expensive.  
• No major changes in ‘last few years’, I expect there will be changes in the future. |
| Conservation Officers | • An awareness of accessibility has become an integral part of the development process rather than an after thought. Manchester City Art Gallery is a good example of successful accessibility and design.  
• An increased understanding of the need to provide access for all. Best practice examples - Entrance, but not interior of Central Reference Library and Town Hall in Manchester.  
• There have been little change in local authority’s role as Building Control still implement Part M, audits etc are all done externally. Conservation still assess the Access work in terms of its impact on LB as with all applications. Only difference is that application comes with Access Audit. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greater tension between aims of access officers (to improve access) and those of conservation / planning officers (to retain special character of listed building etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General understanding and acceptance of the need to include a range of access provisions. Access consultants have begun to be used by developers; Access Statements are becoming more common; Local Authorities have got a better understanding of what they can do; the roles of Planning and Building Control in access requirements are better understood but there is still confusion in the minds of others about where their respective roles stop or overlap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Much greater emphasis on finding compromise as it is a legal requirement to make reasonable efforts to make buildings accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater appreciation of the need to have good access to all buildings including historic buildings but these latter buildings have more constraints. None that I am aware of (best practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5. Summary

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the Delphi study examined the mechanisms that were implemented and based on legislation, regulations or practice, operate as either: (i) procedure; (ii) process; (ii) guide or (iv) function.

The Delphi procedure started by focusing on the role of the local authority officers' involvement and the mechanisms used within the reactive process of the development control system in Round 1. After Round 1, it was apparent that the regulative mechanisms needed to be investigated with the legislative and best practice mechanisms together.

These issues were explored in the subsequent rounds. Some findings were able to be examined further and found further findings. Some findings would need to be investigated in the interviews and/or case study.

The most significant findings that concerned the legislative, regulative and best practice/guidance were the following arguments:

- Prescriptive versus Non-prescriptive (DDA's reasonable adjustment and Part M)
- Balance versus Minimal Provision (Best practice)

These will be explained in depth below:

7.5.1. Research Question 1 findings

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the Practice of Conservation highly influenced the mechanisms of the reactive processes in development control.

Conservation was regarded as being more important where the DDA was regarded as having a weak enforcement of accessibility legislation where it was quoted that "conservation has a greater argument as it concerns historical preservation" and "listing a
building is a valid excuse for not including disabled people's needs or the very minimum provision is made” (Section 7.2.8).

There is a perception of importance regarding historic buildings to anything else as being secondary to the aesthetics and significance aspects, where the special interest of the building in of utmost importance. “Listed buildings cannot be treated in the same way as other buildings” and “historic buildings should remain as they were originally created, irrespective of access or any other issues”, “conservation is important and access can be managed to fit around it”, and “planning and listed building legislation allows a strong line to be taken” (Section 7.2.8) quoted to reinforce this perception. This attitude cannot be forced to change unless being challenged with a stronger legislation mechanism rather than reasonable adjustments.

7.5.2. Research Question 2 findings

7.5.2.1. Part M Building Regulations

The refusal of four officers to answer the question on Part M in Round 1 of the Delphi study gave an indication of possible conflicting opinions regarding the use of Part M to incorporate access requirements in historic buildings. In Section 7.4.4, it was conclusive that Part M's influence is not conclusive. It became apparent that the Access Statement was a very much sought after mechanism to assist in implementing access requirements with reference to Part M Building Regulations, which a number of access officers and building control officers had hoped for. Building regulations is not referred to in the Planning Control departments although planning and conservation officers generally anticipate Part M has to be discussed earlier in planning approval and listed building consent (Section 7.4.1). Access statement had been quoted often and regarded to be the 'missing' mechanism that could positively interpret Part M into the development control process. However, the research to examine the effectiveness of Access Statements could not be done due to the fact that it was used officially in 2006, which is four years after the start of this thesis.
The DDA 1995 was suggested to have more impact, with a quote that he/she "fears that Part M will have little impact on listed buildings due to uncertainty of what is deemed reasonable," which focused back to the argument of integrating Part M and DDA’s requirements together. Another side to the discussion is enhanced by the quote that, "Part M will depend on the relative strengths of opinion / influence within each local authority. Those with strong access cultures will tend to use it as a stick to improve facilities. Those without that culture will tend to only do as much as they need to in order to fulfill their responsibilities.” This pointed to the decision-making process using Part M and its lack of influence, which will be discussed in issue on the Role of the Access Officer.

7.5.2.2. Role of Access Officers

Role of officers in planning control and building control process when addressing the needs of disabled people in local authorities in England and Wales showed that the Conservation Officer to be the most important or equally important to the other officers, including the Access Officers (Sections 7.2.2 and 7.4.5). The role of the local authority officers and their many functions require making decisions and interpretation of the legislative and regulative mechanisms. One of the main research objectives is to review the local authority officers’ function, in particular, the Access Officer’s function. Although the Role of the Access Officer was specified to be tested, the role of the Conservation and Planning Officer becomes more important in implementing Accessibility in Historic Buildings as especially the former is the main point of reference in the Listed Building Control process.

Referring to Section 7.3.7, where other than the access officers, other officers thought that access officers should not be given a specific function such as doing access audit, recommending access solutions and doing access statement, but more of advice or reviews or comments or make aware of access problems during meetings and discussions. Access officers may articulate well in describing the problems on the implementation of access requirement and Part M, however they are not established in the decision-making process for listed buildings. All the access officers interviewed
stated that they are not more influential than the planning and conservation officers, so with this perception, the final decisions in the process would fall to the planning and conservation officers rather than the access officers and building control officers.

7.5.3. Research Question 3 findings

The main research question (Chapter 1) posed the question: Does the importance of Conservation take precedence over the importance of Accessibility in the process of developing a Historic and Listed Public Building, from the design stage until completion and post-occupancy? Hence, with the Delphi Method, it was meant to facilitate the discussion and conflicting opinions with regards to the ‘Conservation Practice versus Accessibility’.

How does the debate contribute to the understanding of the finding on the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms? The debate relates to the understanding of what building conservation is and the constituents that make a good building as oppose to a bad building. These constituents are the processes and mechanisms that is lacking as a result of a poorly designed or non accessible building.

The knowledge of the process or the Access Planning Process would be helpful for the local authority officers concern when dealing with applications for listed building consent, planning approval and building control approvals. The Delphi Method findings showed that when asked about the Access Plan, only one Building Control Officer could describe the access plan as a result of the audit. Amongst the access officers and building control officers, they were not able to make a connection between the Access Audit and Access Plan as in section 7.4.1, access officers responses showed that the majority were involved with the Access Audit, Access Plan and Access Strategy also emphasised that Access Strategy need to state qualifications of the person to progress, presumably with the application.
Although the officers mentioned about improvements to a building using plans, proposals, schemes or projection as the method, Access Planning is more than that. This ignorance of not knowing exactly was Access Planning is reflective in the findings where the officers articulated the problem of lack of consultation and mechanisms but could not really put a finger to it. The findings revealed the lack of design expertise and building aesthetics more important where it was quoted that “training should be made on how to make buildings accessible without ruining it” and “the excessive use of ramps will spoil the appearance of some listed buildings” (Section 7.2.8). Hence, the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms could either be due to the lack of knowledge and understanding regarding how the Access Audit could be integrated in the Access Plan or the lack of understanding how the Access Plan could be useful in the greater scheme of the conservation project.
CHAPTER 8
Proactive Processes in Achieving Accessibility to the Historic and Listed Public Buildings: Access Planning Process

8.1. Introduction

This chapter reveals the findings from interviews with participants of the proactive process and in particular discussed the Access Planning Process (APP) within the context of the development process, and how the APP would influence the development control process and vice-versa. This investigation will answer all three hypotheses as explained in Chapter 5 and 6. The findings will be further examined in a single case study in Chapter 9.

Access Planning Process (APP) was prescribed by English Heritage as a guided process framework to achieve better access for historic buildings (English Heritage 2004, 1995). The difference between the two is that the later version had included the codes of practice for the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and reasonable adjustments. Access strategy, access audit and access plan were identified as important early mechanisms of the process, (English Heritage 2004, 1995). Similarly, CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments (CADW, 2002) provided a guidance that stressed on the use of access audits before improvements to Welsh historic buildings are made (CADW, 2002).

The guidance was created to anticipate the strong anti-discrimination law of the UK Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and how the legislation would bear upon the development process of historic buildings in the United Kingdom. It was explained earlier in Chapter 3 on the reactive process. The proactive part of the development process includes everything except for the local authority’s function which commences before applying for planning approval at the Strategic Briefing stages (RIBA, 2005) during design and planning application.
Access Planning Process, along with Conservation Plan, which is also a document for a procedure was formalized in the guidance system by the English Heritage (DCMS, 2003) concerned, to streamline the process.

The Survey Method by Interview was used to investigate the research questions and the following variables were analysed from the data collected.

Mechanisms that will be analysed and discussed within the proactive process include:

1. Access Strategy
2. Access Audit
3. Access Plan
4. Reasonable Adjustments
5. Best Practice (innovation)
6. Best Practice (guidance)
7. Access Consultant

Mechanisms that will be analysed and discussed within the reactive process include:

1. Role of Access Officers
2. AD Part M of the Building Regulations
3. Consultation with User
4. Conservation Assessment

8.2. Interviews with Conservation Architects, Architects and Access Consultants

Interviews were conducted with 8 conservation architects, architects and access consultants who were involved in the process of restoring historic and listed public buildings. Interviews were made from December 2004 to August 2005 and the methods used were open and semi-structured interviews as mentioned in Section 6.5.2, where many general and specific issues on accessibility and historic buildings formed the interview questions. The qualitative data obtained from these interviews were analysed and key points or key phrases were identified and summarized in this chapter.
In carrying out the interviews, the following protocol was adhered to:

i. Participants were selected from conservation architects, architects and access consultants involved in a recently completed refurbishment of a building project that involves a listed building from 1996. Access consultants involved with historic buildings project.

ii. Reason for the study was to find out whether consultants had managed to reconcile the need for access with the need for conservation.

iii. Objective for the study was to ascertain the structures or mechanisms of the legislative and regulatory mechanisms that have shown to be helping the agenda of getting access needs and conservation needs sorted.

A. To describe something that has occurred; e.g., How do the local authority officers, access consultant and architect view the value of development control process use as a means to achieve balance in accessibility to historic public buildings?

B. To compare results to some standard (a normative study); e.g., Has the use of the development control systems matched the goals of the government and society aspects in terms of access to historic public buildings?

C. To determine if a procedural change has made a difference (a cause-and-effect study); e.g., Has the use of the legislative and regulative measures and the practice of conservation improved the accessibility of historic public buildings?
The procedures for the interviews are further described below:

An invitation to interviewee was sent, and after establishing contact, a pre-interview questionnaire was sent to provide guidance on questions to be asked while referring to buildings and projects that the interviewee have been involved with. The interview was undertaken personally by the author with audio-recording (transcribed later). (The questions and transcripts are available in the CD/DVD that is inserted in the back pocket of this thesis).

The interviews were approached in an informal manner referring to a set of guiding questions, but interviewees were not forced to any specific questions, thus the questions were designed to be open and semi-structured form, rather than structured. Often the answer is indirectly explained as it will be shown in the analysis section later, and this in turn is further analysed to form summaries of findings.

The interview questions were asked as follows:

1. Interviewee's opinion and views as a Consultant in dealing with the Planning Control and Building Control function of the respective local authorities, with regards to conservation projects.

2. Interviewee's opinion and views on the use of Access Advisory Groups, Access Planning and Access Audit, with regards to conservation projects.


4. Interviewee's opinion and views on Approved Document M Building Regulations, standards and other regulative aspects relating to access to historic public buildings.
5. Interviewee’s comments on the following guidance frameworks: The Access Planning Process (English Heritage, 2004) and the equivalent CADW version.

The questions listed below were for all interviewees. When an interviewee decided to go into detail, the focus on the subject matter would then be explored.

The following set of questions was mostly for the architects and conservation architects involved in conservation projects, however, it would be fair to note that the access consultants are trained as architects, apart from one interviewee who is trained as an interior and exhibition designer. Hence, the questions were also addressed to the access consultants. The questions according to each category are as follows:

1. Conservation versus Accessibility
   In meeting the access needs of disabled people for Listed Building Consent application and Planning Approval, do you think that too much emphasis is given to conservation issues rather than accessibility issues?
   In your opinion, please elaborate the reason why you answered ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

2. Access Consultant
   Based on the case study, is it possible to know, why are Access Consultants not been introduced early in the Development Process, often after the Conceptual Design and Feasibility stage are done and more often after Planning Approval has been sought?

3. Access Officers
   Based on my interviews with the local authority officers, we find that the Access Officer also got into the Development Process later, usually at Building Control stage or at least after Planning Approval have been sought. Why is that?
   Do you find Access Officers helpful in advising the project’s needs?
Do you think that Access Officers should be involved in the overall process of planning application for historic buildings and/or listed building consents in the first place?

If you had answered 'yes' to the question above, please elaborate your reasons.

4. Approved Document Part M Building Regulation and the related standards
With regards to conservation projects, is it true that Part M is hardly used at all and BS 8300 is used in a minimal and cursory way. For example, retaining original door widths and features, which are not accessible for many of disabled users?

5. Conservation Philosophy
What is your conservation philosophy?
Do you try to include disabled people's needs as much as you can in your design?
How do you do so?

6. Conservation Plan / Listed Building Consent
Do you think that there should be more information and discussion on Accessibility done in Conservation Plan and Listed Building Consent processes?
Has Conservation Assessment contradicted with Accessibility requirements?

7. Access Statements
Have you done an Access Statement for a conservation project before this one?
Do you think that you could incorporate that in the Conservation Plan and/or the Listed Building Consent process?

What are your opinion and views on the impact of the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) and policies relating to "inclusion" on projects relating to historic public buildings?
9. Access Planning Process

With regards to “The Access Planning Process (English Heritage, 2004)” enclosed the diagram separately in Figure 4.1, do you regard the framework to be conclusive and effective?

Please elaborate if you wish to comment or add or subtract anything from the diagram.

The following set of questions was asked with regards to a specific project that an interviewee had been involved with:

11. Access Audit
Is there an Access Audit done earlier in the Development Process?
Do you find that useful? Please give reasons why to why it is or is not useful.

12. Access Strategy
Was there an Access Strategy at the beginning of the Development Process?
Please elaborate on the Access Strategy employed.

13. Accessibility Issues
Did you generally find accessibility issues discussed earlier in the Development Process with planning and conservation officers?
How much into the project was it discussed?

14. Case Study
Would you care to share about a particular project that you have done based on your views on the Practice of Conservation with Accessibility issues in mind?
8.3. Analysis of the findings and discussion of the findings: Proactive Process

The mechanisms examined in the study were variables that had been identified earlier in chapter five, to be explored and examined in the research method.

Apart from the Access Consultant’s role and the term of Reasonableness or Reasonable Adjustment, that became more necessary with the emergence of the Disability Discrimination Act since 1995, the other components were in the broadest sense dealt within Conservation Practice.

The variable ‘Best Practice (innovation)’ suggests a trend or practice that was evident and crucial to describe the perception of how architects coped with having to comply to access requirements, by exploring how to reconcile both access and conservation together, in a more meaningful, innovative and balanced approach to design.

The rest of the variables: Access Strategy, Access Audit, Access Plan and Best Practice (guidance) referred specifically to English Heritage and CADW’s guidance and the existing practice, where these components were given due importance on how they could work with the rest of the proactive process and the reactive process of development control. (English Heritage, 2004; CADW, 2002).

The analysis consisted of quotes taken from the transcripts. These are further explained in the last column using a keyword or important phrases summarized from the quotes which have not been paraphrased for effect. This last column is then investigated in more detail and discussed and after each table.
Table 8.1: Access Strategy / Access Audit / Access Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>One gets a really complicated sequence of analyzing the history of the building, doing an access audit, identifying the problem, then coming up with the concept of doing something quite new, extend the new building and making it more accessible and then making the access and inclusive design within that context. All it takes a long time. I think you must have the access concept at the very early stage, otherwise it becomes an add-on.</td>
<td>Process driven; Step by step process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>And they (owner/service provider) now are looking for ways, to make changes to their building, through the Lottery process, but the Heritage Lottery Fund is saying, “If you want our money, one of the things you’ve got to do is improve accessibility. Not only intellectually, but physically.”</td>
<td>Access Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Herschel-Shorland</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>It is a subject that is now being covered in professional development for museum professionals. I find that more with the projects that CAE are now receiving much more considered briefs. Much clearer briefs, so that we are not to almost write our own brief, which we were a few years ago. And that shows that consideration.</td>
<td>Better project’s brief including strategy, audit and plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would be better would be how we are involved in many projects at the moment. The HLF process has changed as well. Now there being two very distinct stages, for an HLF project. For us (access consultants) to be involved in the initial planning stages...really important.

Well I think now the HLF is a really good example of a process because they would require an Access Plan, a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), an Audience Development Plan (ADP) to work together...they have to work together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would be better would be how we are involved in many projects at the moment. The HLF process has changed as well. Now there being two very distinct stages, for an HLF project. For us (access consultants) to be involved in the initial planning stages...really important.</th>
<th>Access Plan HLF with clear guidelines of involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well I think now the HLF is a really good example of a process because they would require an Access Plan, a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), an Audience Development Plan (ADP) to work together...they have to work together.</td>
<td>HLF enable different plans to work together - Access Plan; CMP and ADP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>English Heritage Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
together. There are also environmental and ecological studies. Because although access is not strictly conservation, but it should be in terms of the conservation impact assessment, when you bring together designs proposals and the conservation plan. Of course the access studies needs to be involved in it.

When proposals are made we would always include an access report (access audit) which comments on our design proposal. What is provided in the design proposals, how it is dealing with the problems that we find in the access report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KE Martin</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>An audit was done as we worked with a disability officer (Access officer), even a disabled staff (in wheelchair) who can use the building easily.</th>
<th>Access Audit and role of access officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Barton</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>You have to look at the building as a whole. You have to understand what the historic building’s about to be able to make any decisions whether it’s disabled access or putting in fire proofing. So we don’t see it as a conflict, that’s what we do. It’s the way getting round the problem.</td>
<td>Access just one of the decisions as a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We do our own access audit as part of our design philosophy, as part of our analysis of our way of working.

| Jamie Coath | Conservation Architect | Yes, because it is such a fundamental thing with the building, the approach to how people could get full access to that building. It had been an issue before I was involved. There has been an access audit by.... Yes, the access plan and the strategy to cope with the access of the building haven’t been done when I was doing my report. It may have subsequently been done, but such I felt fundamental issues that we should include in our approach of the conservation plan. And that’s general. We do that in most work. Not the fundamental planning. That was really decided by the client at a very early stage in management and unifying the building, the two sides there, which we had to unify. So the principle access planning was decided earlier on with the client and ourselves. That is one where we also incorporate the access plan with the conservation plan. |

| Access Audit as part of design philosophy | Access fundamental issue | Access Plan giving access and conservation to be done together | Need to plan at very early stage | Access Plan to be incorporate with conservation plan |
Table 8.2: Discussion on Access Strategy, Access Audit and Access Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Process</td>
<td>• Process driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Step by step process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Work together with different requirements</td>
<td>• Access Plan to be incorporate with conservation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HLF enable different plans to work together - Access Plan; CMP and ADP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access and conservation requirements brought together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Access to be addressed as part of the whole process of</td>
<td>• Access just one of the decision as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td>• Access audit as part of design philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access fundamental issue and need to plan at very early stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Access as part of project’s brief and guidelines</td>
<td>• Better project’s brief including strategy, audit and plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access Plan HLF with clear guidelines of involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Access Plan has to be process driven in order to work and is done step by step

There are two processes involved in the planning stages: (i) Developing strategies, and (ii) Developing the client’s brief or project’s brief stage. These processes are the access requirements identification and the conservation requirements identification, respectively. The procedures are detailed specifically, i.e. access with an Access Plan and conservation with a Conservation Plan, and need to be brought together, the access audit and access plan together with the conservation assessment at the stage before design, or similar to Stage A/B (RIBA Plan of Work Stages, 1999).

(ii) Work together with different requirements

Access and conservation requirements, which include the identification of potential conflicts and problems, would need to be brought together earlier in the process at some stage. One conservation architect even suggested incorporating the access plan with the conservation plan. Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) even insisted that the many requirements from the different plans and procedures to work together when applying for HLF grant. An example of how the different sets of requirements are brought together is shown by the Heritage Impact Assessment Report of the Doncaster Mansion House (Donald Insall Architects, Chester, 2005). With a new proposal of a ramp, the significance of the historic building is being addressed at the same time with the impact made by change of use and access needs. This is explained in the ‘Compliance / Mitigation’ column after the ‘Impact’ to the ‘Significance’ which has been determined (Table 8.3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Compliance/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New ramp and steps to front door</td>
<td>Outstanding elevation. Steps not original</td>
<td>Change of appearance. Alteration to historic railings</td>
<td>Major conflict – but some benefits… Consider one ramp in place of two to reduce alterations to railings. Explore use of external platform lift. Use the highest quality traditional materials. Full access to the main door is highly desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) **Access to be addressed as part of the whole process of conservation**

Access is part of the process of conservation, especially with regards to buildings with major renovation work. One conservation architect suggested that his office regards “Access audit as part of design philosophy”. The importance of integrating access in the whole process of conservation is reflected in all of the interviewees’ responses.

(iv) **Access as part of project’s brief and guidelines**

The idea that access could be better served and integrated also depended on how it is explained in the project’s brief or briefing stage. Added to that is the fact that guidelines outlining the requirements for access would make better planning strategies and included in the cost plan earlier.

suggested that the conservation assessment be part of the access plan, as it mentioned that “Draft access plan need to reconcile access and conservation needs.”

The incorporation of access in the Conservation Plan would make more sense as the ‘ownership’ of the process often lay with the conservation architect in the proactive side and the conservation officer in the reactive side. However, with the advent of the Access Statement, the requirements identified in the Access Plan can later be transferred into the former thus making the management of control easier for accessibility to be covered in the process by building control and Part M.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>One of the best ways of keeping a historic building in good condition is finding use for it, and one of the best use is museum or art gallery because you don’t have to alter the existing building very much to do that. Whereas if you try to convert it into offices or school or something like that you will make a much bigger intervention. When making changes to a historic building you really do need to understand the history of that building and if you really understand the history of the building it’s usually not all old and very important. Usually there are changes made over the centuries and over the decades and if you can find those areas where alteration were made in the 1930s that immediately becomes a ‘soft area’ where you can make further interventions and that’s happened on quite a lot of building.</td>
<td>Change of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>So now through in a sense forensic investigation, we can rebuild it, we can put a lift in there, stairs there, and we’re going to knock this out (drawing over the part where it can be changed), brand new entrance with lavatories. Make sure it all connects through the rest. Yes, that will do? Yes, it will. Problem solved.</td>
<td>Soft areas of historical building make possible intervention Identify areas for intervention where you need to put vertical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Herschel-Shorland</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>We usually address the project on individual merits. We know there are certain processes addressing access and projects. We don’t believe it’s entirely formulaic. We consider each project what would work best for each project. So it varies.</td>
<td>Different building have different issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| John Adams | English Heritage Consultant | So you are really talking about detail. I don’t think the use of glass and steel in itself should necessarily be unmanageable, as materials...I think its very difficult in this day and age to say, you can’t use glass and steel. It’s very much to do with the detail.

For St. George’s Hall in Liverpool by Purcell, Miller, Triton - they had to make a new entrance. It has been a horribly difficult thing to do and the building is a sacred cow, but it’s a very good example of how to use a historical drawing and research in order to find out something which is completely forgotten, that the original architect had planned an entrance low down, you know at the ground level and below the steps. Although it was never finally built that way, certainly on the plans, they have put in a new entrance now.

And I think what we have got now is a very elegant solution. It’s an interesting one because it does to the solution of the proportions of the building, part of the plinth, the basis of the Classical Order of it. The building is being reduced because the whole of the courtyard is being ramped up and it rise to a much higher point of the building. But it can take and they made an elegant solution with the ramp seen to the platform to the last level. That you arrive to the first level of the landing as it was naturally enough. | Finding a solution

Elegant solution
Natural solution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alan Stanton</th>
<th>Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now we are statutory obliged, so access can be seen as a positive force from our side in terms of trying to open up the creative potential and can sometimes help us in our arguments with the conservation of it. Finding interesting good solutions and for example, in Salisbury there we part of a justification of a new building is we can put in a new lift that can connect back to the old building and the new building opens up the existing building. Found this with the through lift and various connections and so on, we can open up the whole building to publicly accessible use to the existing 18th century building. In a way its part of a justification for building a new building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s quite often that you find within an existing building, listed building whatever, you try to shoehorn in lifts, ridges, ramps all these kinds of things, and you go against the nature of the building. Fighting the building. So there is an opportunity for building a new annexe or a new wing, quite often you can solve those problems externally and link very carefully back. And begin to open up the existing building. It worked in Compton Verney, it works to some extent back but also because of the environmental constraints unique for a contemporary art gallery, for example temperature, humidity and so on. So you build a new gallery because a new gallery can do all those things and the new building could connect back to the old building at another level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should not go against the nature of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better have an annexe or new wing instead to put new facilities in. Less demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KE Martin</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>DDA provides opportunity to negotiate and architects are able to create possibly new solutions that they don’t otherwise could earlier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tony Barton     | Conservation Architect | And it’s down to the design capabilities of the conservation architect. The answer is in the design…  
You know, bring that staircase somewhere else, you didn’t have to have a stair-lift in this big corridor, short stairs, it was one of the primary areas of the building, you can make a little room of it, put a little hoist in the room and come back into the existing door, so there will be no visual impact on the building at all. The lift, it was in a room, it was lest significant than in a corridor. |
| Jamie Coath     | Conservation Architect | There should not be a conflict (between access and conservation). There should be an approach that satisfies the requirement of the historic buildings as well as accessibility. As I say, if you start thinking of disabled access instead of thinking of making the building more accessible, you are on the wrong track. |
really. And there should be a fundamental requirement. Conservation is really about the repair of buildings in an appropriate way. And making it more usable, and more sustainable for the future. That keeps it useful as there is nothing worst than a historic building which is an unused shell. And absolute requirement for a historic building you make it accessible for people.
Table 8.5: Discussion on Best Practice (Innovation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Depending on the use of the building</td>
<td>• Different building have different issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Visual intrusion minimised</td>
<td>• Elegant solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No visual impact is better such as lift in a room rather in a corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Solution to add new facilities could be either placed in soft</td>
<td>• Soft areas of historical building make possible intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas where the intervention is not visually intrusive or create a</td>
<td>• Identify areas for intervention where you need to put vertical circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new wing and reconnect to the old building at another level.</td>
<td>and toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New building could connect back to the old building at another level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should not go against the nature of the building. Better have an annexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or new wing instead to put new facilities in. Less demands on the old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(i) Depending on the use of the building
Intervention to a building would depend on the change of use as different buildings have different issues to deal with. Conservation of buildings will have to contend with three parts of the DDA’s code of practice with regards to employment, service and schools. If a church would be converted to a school or a house be converted to an office, the impact on the change of use could be extensive.

(ii) Visual intrusion minimized
The best solution for a historic building invariably depends on how much visual intrusion to the original setting is being made. If possible the visual intrusion is negligible at the first instance and where the parts are more significant. The less significant parts like the back of the building or kitchen and service areas would be more ideal to have a lift or fire escape stairs installed.

(iii) Solution to add new facilities such as could be either placed in soft areas where the intervention is not visually intrusive or create a new wing
Another aspect to minimum intervention is finding solutions that will have the least impact at all levels to the extent that a new wing designed sympathetically with the old building or older parts of the building will be a more welcomed solution. This wing will be able to reconnect to the old building at another level. Identifying soft areas or area which is relatively new to the older parts and less significant would be the best place to add the extensive new facilities such as the café, cloakroom, toilets, lifts and stairs.
Table 8.5: Reasonable Adjustments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>The Captain Cook Museum is a tiny domestic house in Whitby where Captain Cook stayed when he was an apprentice and of course it’s a narrow building with many changes of level, so it’s quite difficult and they have put a lift just from the ground floor to the 1st floor and you can see most of the exhibits. It has an attic at the top which is difficult to get to and they have not tried to make access to that, so instead they have videos and CDs, so that is one example how you could do it. Yes, sometimes there is not the perfect solution. When that happens, the management solution is very important. We start to be able to give guidance for people to have indirect route and make sure that they can managed that. The arrangement is crucial once the building is finished…their job is buildings, they look after buildings.</td>
<td>Alternative means to services – virtual reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>The understanding of access in design terms is not transmitted very effectively to facilities management and building operations. And because these two aren’t fitting properly, that is when you get problems, sort of difficulties that are likely to end up in court under the DDA.</td>
<td>Design not fitting in with the facilities management and operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And there is this flux because in the end the DDA isn't a mandate for people to say all building should be accessible. It didn't say that. It said about service. Service to provide and it's about reasonable to avoid much disruption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service oriented as not all building will be accessible.</th>
<th>Service to provide and it's about reasonable to avoid much disruption.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Herschel-Shorland</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>English Heritage Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE Martin</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that is the responsibility of the 'project manager' on behalf of the client to challenge the architect.
Architects design buildings better than anyone else. And the legislation allows architects to negotiate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tony Barton</th>
<th>Conservation Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, the DDA has raised the profile of access without any shadow a doubt. It’s an intuitive idea based on our understanding of the site. And taking a good overall look again. We’ve done an access plan with others. You can maximize access to the whole of the building. Nearly the whole building because there is a bit, a tiny spiral stairs. It’s impossible. You have to do something else for it, a remote access or via camera or… everything had been done that can be done within the framework of protecting the significance of a historic building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jamie Coath | Conservation Architect | That issue has to be tackled to be able to get a reasonable solution to. I think the principle is still there. There is a policy in the conservation plan, they should, when they implement the scheme. They should push for a technical solution. 

But to reduce the compromise to the building to the minimum the impact of the building you need to implement technical solutions Having been done this before, we had a terrible experience at this before at Danson House in London, where I was involved in. And we got to the part where we agreed in principle for getting access to the top floor. But the technical solution that’s been implemented hasn’t done it in the right fashion, done it with visual intrusion and impact on the historic fabric, which shouldn’t have happened. |
|  |  | Technical solution the way but still may have visual impact. |
Table 8.6: Discussion on Reasonable Adjustments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) Historic buildings require both design and management solutions which needs to fit with one another | • Design not fitting in with the facilities management and operations.  
• Design and management aspects need to be addressed together. |
| (ii) Historic buildings that are small or with tight spaces may need alternative means to services rather than physical access. | • Alternative means to services – virtual reality.  
• Alternative means. |
| (iii) Management and services operations become more important when using a historic building. | • Management solution of indirect routes.  
• Service oriented as not all buildings will be accessible. |
| (iv) Technical solutions using equipment such as lifts and stair lifts may have visual impact. | • Technical solution the way but still may have visual impact. |
| (v) Reasonable adjustments help the conservation side by bringing in alternative means and negotiation in design solution. | • Problems of bad design and solution not appropriate and ugly.  
• Solution in detail; negotiable design. |
(i) **Historic buildings require both design and management solutions which needs to fit with one another**

An accepted reasonable adjustment is possible if design solutions are thought out together with management and operations solution. Sometimes design alone cannot provide the best solution. In an area where there are so many stakeholders, the best solution for a historic building may lie in disability awareness training for the staff. Hence, the final solution could be found by addressing and fitting in design and management and operations ideas together in the beginning.

(ii) **Historic buildings that are small or with tight spaces may need alternative means to services rather than physical access**

Instances where it is literally impossible to create physical access to all levels without leaving high visual intrusions, such as stair lifts in a small staircase, alternative means are more favourable such as using virtual reality accessible rooms and projections.

(iii) **Management and services operations become more important when using a historic building**

Reasonable adjustment is believed to be at variance with innovative best practice because the former focuses on management solutions rather than designed solutions. For historic public buildings, reasonable adjustment is arguably an appropriate mechanism where the reduction of conflicts is necessary.

(iv) **Technical solutions using equipment such as lifts and stair lifts may have visual impacts**

Solutions in design will have to be thought of in detail with a variety of solutions rather than just one. When using technical solutions, the visual intrusion need to be thought out carefully as the insertion requires space and material change.

(v) **Reasonable adjustments help the conservation side by bringing in alternative means and negotiation in design solution**
Managing change is the main activity of conservation where reasonable adjustment make possible negotiations to be made in the proactive and reactive process of development control.
Table 8.7: Access Consultants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>It would be sensible to appoint somebody with good experience of historic buildings where they do both the audit and identifying options improving it in ways that is sensitive to the solution of a listed building… Somebody has to come up with the concept which addresses all the issues about the building and if that concept really brings you inclusive design, for example, ideally all visitors will come in the same entrance and you get your reception, cloak room and coffee shops and main circulation. What you don’t want is an architect doing a design for the restoration of a building and then someone else comes and adding on the access for disabled people later. I think it’s entirely wrong that in the past a number of access consultants particular those representing an interest group, like partially-sighted people and they have been very doctrinaire and say you must have a yellow band and not only that it must be stuck on it, it must be three dimensional to actually need a metal or timber section on the glass all the way round at this height so that people can feel it as they won’t see it. I think that is entirely wrong to say you must do that. What you are trying to do is to make that particular building work.</td>
<td>Access consultant (AC) must have good experience of historic buildings. AC will need to come up with the access concept that addresses all the issues about the building. AC need to be flexible and must make building work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>And if you don’t demonstrate to us on how you are going to make your building accessible, you won’t get any money from the HLF. That is when our practice suddenly started to become very busy. Because we had to problem solve. We did at Tate Britain. We said, we won’t touch your steps at the front. We’ll make a new entrance around the side. A new main entrance. It’s where the shops will be, its where the café is. And now the gallery has two entrances. The old one where we keep the old steps and the new one around here. So it’s thinking outside the box. Trying to be imaginative on how you resolve the problems. And it needs a very good chairperson to control this process (consultation with users) because it can get hostile and you lost it. It’s got to be creative and informative. It’s good feeling all round if its going to work its best.</td>
<td>Thinking outside the box and be imaginative with solving problems. AC need to be able to control consultation with users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Herschel-Shorland</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Well, I think consultation is invaluable. It is really important. It is really difficult sometimes to manage. But in terms of managing it, it is even more difficult when you managed it remotely or actually representing a body. Rather than direct consultation.</td>
<td>AC need to do direct consultations to be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>You all have your own areas of expertise and the access consultant probably do</td>
<td>AC need to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>not have a great deal of knowledge in historic buildings and building conservation and wouldn’t necessarily have the same philosophical approach to resolving a problem and that’s why there’s a necessity to get the issues clear and start to reconcile them.</td>
<td>clear of the issues with the architect earlier on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td><strong>Architect</strong></td>
<td>We use access consultants quite a bit. Two things: one they help us with their experience in terms of the detail and they know exactly how to configure something and what the options are. They give some reassurance to the local authority. If there’s an access officer they’d like to know if there is an access consultant on board who is looking at it and monitoring the situation. If there’s no access officer, they will give some the assurance. I think it depends on the nature of the problem. Some complexity of it. We use access consultant in most of our, most of our dealing in historic buildings. If we deal with an office building its so straight forward. Part M is clear. Planning, fire regulation and so on. That’s why we use them more because the solutions tend to be custom-made solution. And to make custom made solution you need people with experience and skill and the intelligence. With the time and effort put in, trying to find the solutions, that’s what your effort is for. Sometimes you are almost asked to deal</td>
<td>AC helps with complex issues such as historic buildings and help with details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AC are experienced and helpful with details and could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the impossible. So you need that, although we have a bit of experience we
don’t have the breadth of that experience. And the detailed experience that an
access consultant would have. The refurbishment of the National Theatre, we
had an access consultant, long discussions about heights of counters, what’s
acceptable in the ergonomics. Because there are all sorts of conflicts even in
something as simple as a transaction across the desk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KE Martin</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>I deal mostly with local and small projects and have not engaged with access consultants before, but I reckon with the DDA and regulations, more engagement would be necessary.</th>
<th>More need for AC due to the DDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Barton</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>It was an access audit done by an external access consultant who didn’t know a listed building. He did the job as if it was a warehouse or something. No way is that the right thing to do for the historic building. He was just looking at that problem, that problem, that problem, in isolation and not looking at the whole building. So because we knew the building from the way we work, we analyze the whole issue and realize he didn’t have to do that.</td>
<td>AC may not know historic building needs and have to be careful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Coath</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>Generally we try and work from first principles with the consultant.</td>
<td>AC and architect should work out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An independent project manager and a consultant. Project liason officer, sort of for the client we directly deal with, and she's been very good at doing public consultation, and consultation with interested parties for all sides and she has been primarily the contact. And we also have these open meetings as well.</td>
<td>the first principles. AC need to be a good communicator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td>Key points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Access consultant involved in historic buildings should be</td>
<td>• Access consultant (AC) need to be flexible and must make building work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to assist in its complexities to solve access problems.</td>
<td>• Thinking outside the box and be imaginative with solving problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC must have good experience of historic buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC helps with complex issues such as historic buildings and help with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>details.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Consultation between access consultant and architect need to</td>
<td>• AC will need to come up with the access concept that addresses all the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start at conceptual level and communicate well.</td>
<td>issues about the building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC who may not know historic building needs and have to be careful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC and architect should work out the first principles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC needs to be clear of the issues with the architect earlier on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Access consultant needs good communication, problem solving</td>
<td>• AC needs to be able to control consultation with users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills and able to manage access groups well.</td>
<td>• AC needs to do direct consultations to be effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC needs to be a good communicator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AC is experienced and helpful with details and could solve conflicting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issues of access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More need for AC due to the DDA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Access consultant involved in historic buildings should be able to assist in its complexities to solve access problems.
Architects rely on the access consultants’ experience in dealing with access to historic buildings and expects them to be designing and thinking out solutions almost like the architect, in the same approach by complementing to the same conceptual objectives and able to accept imaginative solutions rather than be rigid or by the book.

(ii) Consultation between access consultant and architect need to start at conceptual level and communicate well.
Access consultants should be brought into the beginning of the design process in order to establish clear objectives with the architect and all the access issues raised earlier on, in a way providing an access concept to the design concept.

(iii) Access consultant needs good communication, problem solving skills and able to manage access groups well.
Architects expect the access consultant to be skillful in getting the consultation process contributing to the design process, bringing in the access groups into the discussion and facilitating discussions that could solve problems.
**Table 8.9: Best Practice (Guidance).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Now English Heritage has changed their views, and they are now very proactive in encouraging people to make the buildings more accessible. You can see it in their guide. This is going to bring more activity and more care into the building. That helps in the long term sustainability of the building. Yes, its really because of the DDA and the implications of the DDA and the publication of BS8300 in Oct. 2001. Its very important because it was the first time that there were measurable criteria for this issues concerning accessibility and its research based which gives you measurements or measurable criteria and by measurement I mean weights of door, sizes and dimensions. It has given a huge impetus to the development of good practice.</td>
<td>English Heritage’s proactive stance creates a sustainable effect. Good practice guide due to the DDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>Where you get an historic building, there is a limit on how much you can alter or modify, you place more reliance on the management and operations side. So this two have the potential of failure, (because) it is people...people are unreliable. A ramp doesn’t break down. But a platform lift does. A guidance to encompass both aspects helped tremendously.</td>
<td>Guidance should be for both design and management as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cassie Herschel-Shorland | Access Consultant | There again they just put in the Stage 1 bid, where we as the access consultants are working with the conservation architects, the architects and the exhibition designers in the interior, so there has been the dialogue that needs to be there, has been there. And then should move on to Stage 2. There is a guided process, and the process is emerging and working I think. Which is really quite positive what we’re doing and you get the results happening.

Access, for whom? You need to know your audience coming in order to provide perfect access. You need to know the environment and the issues involved in the building, what can and cannot be changed. They are linked and they have to understand and know each other to work. Cause you can’t have an Access Plan that is totally contradicting with the Conservation Management Plan or completely contradicting the audience development. This may not be apparent and some research was done and published as guidance by English Heritage. | Guided process necessary. |
<p>| John Adams | English Heritage Consultant | The English Heritage’s guidance was drawn up by an architect, or being devised by an architect in very close consultation all the time …I had about 30 versions of this diagram all getting better and better. | Both access plan and conservation plan must be complementing with another and not conflicting. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alan Stanton</th>
<th>Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I think as a structure it seems pretty sensible to me... hopefully as a guide, its something that people can follow and if they end up going through all these stages, they might say, we can't get it to work because the conservation officer didn't understand anything about access and he wasn't able to help us. You might get into a situation where you have an architect who is not interested in what a conservation officer has to say. But then again the guidance should provide the way.

I think that we said very clearly in the guideline was it is one of the tenets of all work on historic buildings that each building has to be analysed in its character and merits and value. And its something that a lot of modern architects are not trained to do.

Guidance to provide the best way possible for different parties to meet.

Guidance put tenets of conservation first.

My personal worry is all of these process needs to be taken in a way of how the building will be managed because what I see of architects and people say this as well, that it all very well, boxes are ticked, and planning permissions given and building being built, architects worry about it and engineers worry about it... everybody worries about it, then hand it over to management, the facilities management, they have not a clue what this is all about, have not been trained.

Very well that guidance is provided for the beginning stages but need to provide guidance.
| KE Martin  | Architect | Both projects, architect did not really need to ‘negotiate’ much. As long as the architect will comply to the letter (with regards to accommodating the minimum requirement, which is the lift for Liverpool Playhouse and Conservation Centre). Architects – Have to be good. There are some that are ‘avant-garde’ and that is the responsibility of the ‘project manager’ on behalf of the client to challenge the architect. This should be seen clearly in the process. | Guidance could be better designed with role of project manager to provide check and balances to the process. |
| Tony Barton | Conservation Architect | How we normally work is we just don’t do a listed proposal and send them for LBC. We will meet the people there before we start designing and talk about the problems and the issues. And providing full access is just one of those. And if we have to do something major with a historic building, we have to do in consultation, we have to listen to other people. Especially English Heritage and the conservation officers. And the access officers as well. And the process works as far as I am concern. | Guidance has pointed rightly to consultation with conservation and access officers. |
| Jamie Coath | Conservation Architect | And one of those issues has always been perceived to be the requirements of the DDA. I would like to think it is not an issue where it is likely to damage it. As an opportunity there to incorporate accessibility measures into whatever work that you do into the building in a proper manner rather than tagging it on as an issue. It is a negative thing. It needs to be considered as a positive thing to the building in many ways.

It's not just disabled access, it's access generally. Making the building more welcoming to people. So if you can do it in that kind of way. Then its far more valuable and far more positive than just saying, oh dear, we've got to do this and we've got to make this building accessible, and isn't it going to damage it, it's the wrong attitude. And should be thinking this building deserves to be accessible for all kinds of people in all kinds of ways...to be completely integral to what you are doing to the building. |
| --- | --- | Guidance referred to the DDA and suggested proper manner to conduct consultants. |
Table 8.10: Discussion on Best Practice (Guidance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) Guidance for best practice requires access issues be consulted by various parties to the process of Access Planning. | • Both access plan and conservation plan must be complementing with another and not conflicting.  
• Guidance to provide the best way possible for different parties to meet.  
• Guidance has pointed rightly to consultation with conservation and access officers.  
• Guidance need to be consulted by the industry’s players. |
| (ii) English Heritage and CADW as the authors of guidance for best practice is the proper bodies of reference to ensure conservation tenets are upheld. | • Guidance put tenets of conservation first.  
• English Heritage’s proactive stance creates a sustainable effect.  
• Good practice guide due to the DDA.  
• Guided process necessary. |
| (iii) Guidance should encompass all the stages in the design process including management and operations issues after building completion. | • Very well that guidance is provided for the beginning stages but need to provide guidance for the facilities management.  
• Guidance should be for both design and management as well. |
| (iv) Guidance should allow for check and balances to met out the possible inconsistencies of the system. | • Guidance referred to the DDA and suggested proper manner to conduct consultants.  
• Guidance could be better designed with role of project manager to provide check and balances to the process. |
(i) **Guidance for best practice requires access issues be consulted by various parties to the process of Access Planning**

Published guidance is prescribed to the local authorities, client, service providers and consultants on the best approach in dealing with design for access issues in the light of the DDA 1995. The importance of how to interpret what is reasonable in terms of providing for accessible services and physical access, while keeping the conservation principles and practice intact is the main objective of the guidance. It is not just showing photographs of examples of best practices but in particular with the case of English Heritage, giving specific recommendations to the process of design and consultation. Access Planning is a process that includes both the access and conservation issues in one.

(ii) **English Heritage and CADW as the authors of guidance for best practice is the proper bodies of reference to ensure conservation tenets are upheld**

English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Monuments had published guidance on access to historic buildings, properties and landscape. The statutory bodies proactive approach to provide clear guidance with respect to ensuring conservation principles and tenets were upheld would clarify issues pertaining to the DDA 1995 to the various stakeholders and interest groups.

(iii) **Guidance should encompass all the stages in the design process including management and operations issues after building completion**

The guidance did not explain the process after building completion although that was commented by many of the interviewees. For example, CADW explained that, “This document does not offer comprehensive guidance on the wider interpretation and presentation issues or the actual services provided by operators in historic buildings. This is because CADW's duties relate to physical features and we cannot direct how services are provided to disabled people” (CADW, 2002). English Heritage however implied the management and operations side through the diagram as explained that the Access Plan
“incorporates a comprehensive range of access solutions, from managed change to physical alteration,” and “may be implemented in stages according to prioritised access needs and long-term building development strategy”.

(iv) Guidance should allow for check and balances to rectify the possible inconsistencies of the system

Best practice on guidance has similar issues to the Access Strategy / Access Audit / Access Plan but focuses in a more general way about the guidance. There are suggestions that a more comprehensive guidance taking into account project managers and other consultants to be incorporated in the process rather than the traditional players with regards to historic buildings that are more for adaptive reuse.
8.3 Analysis of the findings and discussion of the findings: Reactive Process

Mechanisms that were identified as variables from the reactive process will be discussed in this section.

Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations (Part M) is the sole document that exists within the regulatory framework which is referred to in development control. Further explanation is provided by BS 8300, the corresponding standards which influenced the development of Part M.

The role of the Access Officer is another variable that will be examined as the reason for such as role is to interpret the standards and Part M, and the role exist in the reactive process to address access.

The Consultation with the users or the use of access groups in the consultation process is commonly made available by the local authority and to ensure control, the access groups were required to link up with the access officer.

The Conservation Assessment is a requirement by listed building control to be submitted in obtaining listed building consent, even though the mechanism is supposed to be done in the proactive process.
Table 8.11: AD Part M Building Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>At least there is one document which at least you must refer to if you are designing accessibility and even if you differ from it at least you know why you are doing something different, and then that is then very strongly has a very strong influenced on the approved document Part M which is published in 2004. Because it is a building regulations document is now the main first reference. So things have come into focus. Because the two documents and that has become the framework many other things can come about. So it comes back to the DDA – that is in the way the trigger. And now there is a lot of interest in what is good practice. The Heritage Lottery Fund, it has a huge impact on that.</td>
<td>AD Part M is the main reference for access for consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>Part M is probably subservient to listed building control. In other words if English Heritage says we are not going to knock those steps away to make it level, because we are saying we have duties in relating to the conservation that sort of thing, where it over-rides the duties in accessibility… I think the HLF did more than the Part M Building Regulations for historic buildings.</td>
<td>AD Part M perceived to be subservient to listed building control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cassie Herschel-Shorland  
Access Consultant  
If you mean the Access Statement for building and planning control, yes, certainly, just an example, one is because many museums are in historic buildings and in fact the museum are often the biggest object the museums own. And because AS allow for consideration of the qualities and the issues about historic buildings in the different way of meeting the building regulations Part M and just following the guidance. That is actually a very valuable thing to do. Because it sets up a rationale behind approach to access, how access is going to be met in terms of design and build.

In terms of the building approval it seems to be minimum, in other words, Part M 1999. Not that good a practice standard. That’s why strategy is so important. And that initial setting out of aims and objectives. What do you really mean by a good example of access. So, that’s the key.

Access Statement would be a better control mechanism rather than just rely on referring to AD Part M.

John Adams  
Consultant  
When you look at it from the point of view of historic buildings to the integrity of the building, physical alteration can be as simple as wanting to widen a historic door and changing the frame and whatever. It can be done sensitively or sometime it can’t be done. We have to look at the thing very carefully. It has to do always with the (and I don’t think I put it very clearly in

Access is about dimensions and physical alterations in historic buildings where AD Part M is
the document) critical issues. You can put it to what is the narrowest opening you can have, what is it that actually conditions that dimension...of course, it's the largest wheelchair that you can get...it's the wheelchair that comes to the critical issue, grade/slope, width of openings...

Part M is a difficult thing to apply and the principle has to be the presumption has to be that you try to implement the requirements of Part M in everything you do, but when things such as handrail heights, handrail design, you can’t alter grand staircases like Walker art gallery in Liverpool, simply because it doesn’t comply. But the fact that there is a lift there’s an alternative mean of access...

Alan Stanton  Architect

I think it’s a starting point but of cause it tries to generalize. One thing about buildings and existing buildings, you cannot really generalize. And each one has its own particular problem. You often have a custom-made solution to them. So its very hard to apply the spirit of Part M, the spirit of DDA, here after all it’s the spirit that we try to serve, well in general and then its up to the ability and skills of the architect and engineers to come up with a good solution.

AD Part M tries to generalize which is a disadvantage and it is up to the architects and engineers to come up with the solution.

AD Part M does not comply with conservation principles and requirements in many ways.

about minimum standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KE Martin</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Architects design buildings better than anyone else. The building regulations are there as minimum standards and architects go beyond that. Architects can negotiate although they are deemed to comply. For historic buildings, there is much interpretation.</th>
<th>AD Part M are minimum standards only. Conservation needs interpretation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tony Barton</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>The building regulations are minimum standard. Not really for us. We rarely read it. And because we are better than that. And we are dealing with historic buildings, never needing to apply any building regulations to historic buildings.</td>
<td>AD Part M are minimum standards. Not referred to when dealing with historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Coath</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>Clearly where you have a complicated problem to get to a building you need to find a satisfactory technical solution provided that should be a fundamental part of what you are doing to the building. Not a tag on issue but more fundamental. Comply with both requirements really. It is a question of dealing a holistic approach to historic building.</td>
<td>Fundamental issues have to be addressed and holistic approach needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.12: Discussion on Approved Document Part M Building Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) AD Part M is either not referred to or deemed not applicable when dealing with conservation practice and listed building control.</td>
<td>• AD Part M perceived to be subservient to listed building control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AD Part M does not comply with conservation principles and requirements in many ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AD Part M requirements are minimum standards only. Conservation needs interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AD Part M requirements are minimum standards. Not referred to when dealing with historic buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) AD Part M is not enough reference and need other mechanisms to achieve better control and good practice.</td>
<td>• Access Statement would be a better control mechanism rather than just rely on referring to AD Part M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AD Part M 1999 was minimum and need to use other mechanisms to get good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) AD Part M is general and about minimum standards and eventually the architects and those in the proactive process need to come up with the solution.</td>
<td>• Access is about dimensions and physical alterations in historic buildings where AD Part M is about minimum standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• AD Part M tries to generalize which is a disadvantage and it is up to the architects and engineers to come up with the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) AD Part M provides for a reference to consultants and access requirements raised need to be address.</td>
<td>• AD Part M is the main reference for access for consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fundamental issues have to be addressed and holistic approach needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) AD Part M is either not referred to or deemed not applicable when dealing with conservation practice and listed building control.
AD Part M 2004 had a section on historic buildings in the document, however Part M is about minimum standards and it is not referred to as consultants would approach designing for access as part of the design philosophy, partly due to the DDA 1995 and guidance and all around emphasis on inclusiveness by HLF and government bodies.

(ii) AD Part M is not enough reference and need other mechanisms to achieve better control and good practice.
For building control, Access Statement was suggested to be a mechanism that would implement Part M's requirements in the reactive process and other mechanisms would ensure access is achieved in the proactive process, for example guidance from English Heritage and CADW.

(iii) AD Part M is general and about minimum standards and eventually the architects and those in the proactive process need to come up with the solution.
There is strong belief that the proactive process actors such as architects and engineers would come up with the best solution and not necessarily following Part M as it is only minimum standards.

(iv) AD Part M provides for a reference to consultants and access requirements raised need to be address.
AD Part M proved to be the point of reference of consultants to refer to access requirements and no more than that.
Table 8.13: Role of The Access Officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Responses in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>That is a very strong role for the access officer and if they are good they will also have a local access group of local disabled people who can participate in these discussions. For one time I was the access officer for one of the London Boroughs. It is a very interesting experience because I was able to be quite interventionist having applications came in I would look at them and say this was not good enough or this has not made the access arrangements in a satisfactory manner....Access officer’s job is to raise the issues about the accessibility and come up with the solution so…</td>
<td>Access Officer’s (AO) job is to raise issues about accessibility and come up with solution. AO should also have local access group who can participate in discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>You have good ones and you have bad ones. I think access officers are there to raise awareness of...instead of it being reactive side...Access officers are certainly the reactive ones, they are on the controlling side and it would be wonderful in many ways that if they could move in the proactive side. They simply can’t be available to sit down with all the architects and designers who want to change all the buildings in London or Manchester or whatever. They can’t do that, instead what they do is they rely on understanding what the</td>
<td>AO’s job is to raise awareness rather than be reactive. But it will better if they are more on the proactive. AO job is to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
standards are. And where there are people who don’t understand those (standards) or leaves somebody to judgement or interpretation, that’s where the Access Officer should come in. In some boroughs this is the subject they are keen on, and funded and they have somebody who is good. And others that are not.

| Cassie Herschel-Shorland | Access Consultant | The access officer in Swansea was not involved in development control however she suggested that the client appoint Centre of Accessible Environments to be the access consultant so that someone could manage the consultation process with the local access group. | interpret the standards. |

Access officer’s role could be replaced by access consultant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Adams</th>
<th>English Heritage Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the architect is actually probably more important than any of them, for instance, she or he first of all has to make a proposal based on a proper understanding of the thing and invariably is the person left in the middle trying to resolve the different requirements of the conservation officer, definitely building control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And in the end it will be the conservation officer and / or the English Heritage, depending on the size of the nature of Grade 1 or Grade 2* or 2, it will be the conservation officer who going to be involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know they would obviously want to say they want more control obviously. And I know quite well that they don’t have the resources to exercise. Generally access officers are very concern about an access argument, but because of this thing to do with historic buildings their difficulty is in understanding the weight on the other side of the argument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architect more important than anyone and need to solve the different requirements with conservation officers and building control. Conservation officers would be the ultimate in involving with the historic building in development control. AO have difficulty in understanding the conservation side of the argument and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>It’s up to the intelligence of the local authority and their access officer to be reasonable and to understand the nature of the problem so it requires a certain amount of skill and intelligence all the way round. Sometimes the local authorities, they don’t have an access officer, they don’t know quite how to deal with it. Always its (access groups) organize with the local authority. You do need them to bring them, bring it all together. An access officer would be an ideal person to do that. So you can have people coming with strong preconceptions and prejudices. And experience with access officers have been very varied I’d say. Some a quite intelligent, quite reasonable, and some are being pretty appalling. They just play it by the book and they play it every possible way they could. Fighting over the tiniest details. While they should be concentrating on broader issues. And it is difficult because it’s a new area. It’s a question mark. I don’t know quite how access officers are trained, or its kind of hit and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO is needed to understand the nature of the problem, and need skill and intelligence. AO ideal person to bring together access group in consultation. AO should not be too argumentative and concentrate on the broader issues. They need to be more experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KE Martin</th>
<th>Tony Barton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Miss or they just go to conferences and seminars. I don't know how it happens. You know, the more experience ones are just better because at the end of the day, everything is a kind of compromise. | We do come across problems with not only on Grade 1 listed buildings, but other listed buildings as well, where the significant aspects of the building could be harmed by providing what an access officer might like. |
| Not enough access officers around. | AO actually specified things that would harm the building. |
| AO was not particularly professional with the job. | Issue ramp 1 metre, access officer says that lack 100mm, hence would have changed a lot if it was access officer said it should. |

Tony Barton did an audit, worked with a disability officer, even disabled staff (in wheelchair) can use the building easily. Access officer did audit on the ramp after that and said it to be short, but there were no minutes to prove that there was a discussion before to have it done like that. Access officer specifies things that would harm the building.

KE Martin worked with a disability officer, even disabled staff (in wheelchair) can use the building easily. Access officer did audit on the ramp after that and said it to be short, but there were no minutes to prove that there was a discussion before to have it done like that. Access officer specifies things that would harm the building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jamie Coath</th>
<th>Conservation Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| We have more interaction with the access officer in planning departments. So when we are getting a planning application together, they have that involvement. The involvement with building regulations (Part M) and building control, is purely all aspects of your building you dealt with by building control and you access happens to be one of them. So as long as we satisfy the requirements. But I find all that to be too rigid really. There use to be in London a system using district surveyors where you can actually argue a case against a particular requirement in building. And as long as they saw a reason and that you were satisfying the requirements you know, in the round, you could have a certain amount of flexibility by those regulations. That does not exist in the rest of the country and never has done, so clearly where the listed buildings’ significance. AO is not needed if architects do the job right. This applies to conservation and design officers.

Need to be inventive first and comply with the regulations, however implementation of the regulations should be flexible when it comes to historic buildings.
things are mandatory, just get on and be inventive as you can be to provide the requirements without damaging the building. Historic environment. [access]. I think there are instances in building control if you have a listed building, you do less to comply as in another situation, Part L (insulation) there are ways and means where you have a listed building, the listing and historic importance can take precedence over other things but then again that is a negative way of approaching it. You need to able to design what the intervention into the building that it complies with all these things possibly without ruining the character of the building.
Table 8.14: Discussion on the Role of the Access Officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) Access Officer ideally besides raising awareness of access issues, should be able to facilitate the process of consultation with access groups. | - Access Officer’s (AO) job is to raise issues about accessibility and come up with solution. AO should also have local access group who can participate in discussion.  
- AO’s job is to raise awareness rather than be reactive. But it will better if they are more on the proactive.  
- AO ideal person to bring together access group in consultation.  
- AO job is to interpret the standards. |
| (ii) Consultants and conservation officers would be sufficient to deal with access issues and access officers would be redundant. | - AO is not needed if architects do the job right. This applies to conservation and design officers.  
- Need to be inventive first and comply with the regulations, however implementation of the regulations should be flexible when it comes to historic buildings.  
- Conservation officers would be the ultimate in involving with the historic building in development control. |
| (iii) Access officers either could be replaced by others such as access consultant or need proper training to deal with historic buildings and conservation. | - Access officer’s role could be replaced by access consultant.  
- Architect more important than anyone and need to solve the different requirements with conservation officers and building control. |
• AO have difficulty in understanding the conservation side of the argument and always more on the access argument.
• Not enough access officers around.
• AO was not particularly professional with the job.
• AO should not be too argumentative and concentrate on the broader issues. They need to be more experience.
• AO actually specified things that would harm the listed buildings' significance.
• AO is needed to understand the nature of the problem, and need skill and intelligence.
(i) Access Officer ideally besides raising awareness of access issues, should be able to facilitate the process of consultation with access groups.

Access officers’ role when discussed earlier in chapter three and suggested with the findings in this section revealed that their roles could be obsolete or taken over by others, namely access consultants eventually. If there sole objective is to interpret the standards and the standards is minimum requirement, with all the mechanisms in place, the argument would be raised that access officers could be made redundant. However, the access groups would need to be facilitated in discussions with the consultants and the access officer would be the ideal person to do so from the local authority side. However, with changes made to the local authorities, and more responsibilities from the applicant, the cost of the access consultant could be absorbed and the access officers’ role could be taken by the access consultant, project by project basis.

(ii) Consultants and conservation officers would be sufficient to deal with access issues and access officers would be redundant.

Although debatable, with regards to who will be in charge of the Access Statements, there is compelling argument that access officers are not really needed to deal with access issues with the reasons explained in the next point.

(iii) Access officers either could be replaced by others such as access consultant or need proper training to deal with historic buildings and conservation.

Access officers training issues is in question with regards to a specialized subject such as access to historic buildings whereby the access consultant who are experienced with historic buildings could handle such projects.
Table 8.15: Consultation with Users (Access Groups).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Somebody has to produce for the building means or what problems it has in relation to the Part M recommendations or requirements. That is a very strong role for the access officer and if they are good they will also have a local access group of local disabled people who can participate in these discussions.</td>
<td>Access group (AG) need to be organised by the access officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>There are very good ones and very bad ones. Because what is the status...what is the purpose of a consultation? My argument is there are two reasons for it. One is: there is an interpretive element to this process; which says what you’re providing at this station at Stratford, may have different implication regarding this station in Heathrow... There is a difference, with one location and another. And so, one is locational. The other is best practice. Is the group’s there to contribute to their experiences to influence the design, or is it giving it control over the design. These are the two: experience or control.</td>
<td>AG is good to interpret local situations on access. Using AG is for best practice as the experience and the control given over design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Herschel-Shorland</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Well, I think consultation is invaluable. It is really important. That works because he (the designer) was able to communicate with the group directly. Understand their issues, rather than they be passed on.</td>
<td>Important that designer communicate with the AG directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>English Heritage Consultant</td>
<td>The ones I dealt with, I have seen them at work at the City of Westminster, which was a very good group which looks at virtually all the planning applications. Most local authorities don't have anything like that. They have local groups but I think that’s something which I think it’s not formally expected. It’s a pity in a way but we do try to build them in. It’s very much up to an applicant. To find out whom it is they can talk to.</td>
<td>It is up to the applicant to find a local access group unless the local authority (through the access officer) includes the AG in their procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stanton</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Yes, in Salisbury we are consulting with the local access group. We had two meetings which are actually very useful. Because people are a wealth of information. So they have been very helpful. Mostly its about information on detail. The general broad strategic manouvres we can know about, Part M talks about them but it’s in the kind of detail, the more people you talk to the better it is. I think you need to establish communication, it’s very good to bring them in the beginning of the project, and relationships can be established. My experience is such groups are very good when it comes to detail. Then you get on with the strategy and general proposal and then the proposals can then be shown to them. And then comments could be made on how about that, AG gives the local and specific problem details that Part M does not cover. AG assists the architect with a more detailed brief which cannot be found elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KE Martin</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>The lobbying of interest group should be done at the earliest stage in planning, right at the beginning, even during the conceptual stage and certainly before planning approval, listed building consent and building regulations.</td>
<td>AG should be involved at the earliest stages possible before development control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Barton</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>There are no user groups. We do early in the schedule deal with the users and people who are thinking of the building. No I can't think of a disability users group on any project. We do quite a lot of conservation plans and conservation statements.</td>
<td>AG is not necessary if the architect talks to people and users earlier on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Coath</td>
<td>Conservation Architect</td>
<td>It has been fine and it's been fruitful discussion on the access, the finishes and what have you. They have had several focus groups involved in our process.</td>
<td>AG provides fruitful discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of designing the building and one of the principal ones were the access group. Once the principles have been established then all the detail of design was being formed quite a lot with the interaction with the group.

In Sheffield museums, we have open meetings with the access groups, and explain what we are doing and walk around the site and had open forums. The access officer in Sheffield has really acted as a 'post box' between people in the access group and us and the client primarily, not so much us but the client. We had direct contact with the group and that have been very useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>on access, finishes and detail design.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The access officer is instrumental in getting the AG together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8.16: Discussion on Consultation with Users (Access Groups).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) Access groups need to be facilitated within the development process and the local authority’s access officer is often the main point of communication. | • Access group (AG) need to be organised by the access officer.  
• The access officer is instrumental in getting the AG together.  
• It is up to the applicant to find a local access group unless the local authority (through the access officer) includes the AG in their procedures. |
| (ii) Access groups are regarded as a good source of reference on access issues particularly the local issues and provide much more depth on the issue than just the standards. | • AG is good to interpret local situations on access.  
• Using AG is for best practice as the experience and the control given over design.  
• AG gives the local and specific problem details that Part M does not cover.  
• AG assists the architect with a more detailed brief which cannot be found elsewhere.  
• AG provides fruitful discussion on access, finishes and detail design.                           |
| (iii) Access groups should be consulted earlier in the process before development control. | • Important that designer communicate with the AG directly.  
• AG should be involved at the earliest stages possible before development control.  
• AG is not necessary if the architect talks to people and users earlier on.               |
(i) Access groups need to be facilitated within the development process and the local authority’s access officer is often the main point of communication.

This point is related to point (iii) where the point of contact to get consultation of a local access group is through the access officer. Often the access officer working in the local authority started as a local access group representative, and there are many access officers in part-time employment by the local authority. The local access group, in turn, needs to be facilitated by someone who is sensitive to their access requirements.

(ii) Access groups are regarded as a good source of reference on access issues particularly the local issues and provide much more depth on the issue than just the standards.

The access group provides best practice knowledge and locally focused experience to interpret the access requirements for the consultants. Often the access groups are working in a voluntary capacity and the informality of such meetings create a lively debate and discussion with the consultants.

(iii) Access groups should be consulted earlier in the process before development control.

The issue of access group is connected with the access officer. For example, if before development control, an applicant wants to have access to a local access group, the point of contact would be the access officer. The access group’s existence is formalized by the local authority and recommendations of the group should come from the local authority concern.
Table 8.17: Conservation Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Designation / Role</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Cave</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>I believe the conservation architects deals with these, and access concerns may be addressed in them.</td>
<td>Access is addressed in the conservation assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bonnett</td>
<td>Access Consultant / Architect</td>
<td>They are different, conservation plans and access plans, and although the conservation architects will try to merge access into conservation plans, there should still be a separate document like the access statement to refer to Part M.</td>
<td>Access should be separately dealt with and refer directly to Part M (in the form of Access Statement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Herschel-Shorland</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Well I think now the HLF is a really good example of a process because they would require an Access Plan, a Conservation Management Plan, an Audience Development Plan to work together...they have to work together. Access, for whom? You need to know your audience coming in order to provide perfect access. You need to know the environment and the issues involved in the building, what can and cannot be changed. They are linked and they have to understand and know each other to work. Cause you can’t have an Access Plan that is totally contradicting with the Conservation Management Plan or completely contradicting the audience development.</td>
<td>Access plan should not totally contradict with the Conservation Management Plan and the Audience Development Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>English Heritage Consultant</td>
<td>As you know any major conservation project that the HLF handles insisting on a full reasonable access otherwise they won't consider if for grant aid. Any historic buildings needs to have some sort of significant statement that goes with it to advise on any sensitive parts of the building or place. This could be anything from a short report, shorter than an A4 sheet right up to some very sizeable documents that goes to quite a lot of analysis exposure on what they know, and what they may need to know when they start work on the building. That is the other side of it because you know when working with historic building very often you don't know what you are going to come across when you start as all sorts of stuff is buried underneath. So that the background to…</td>
<td>Report on access needed for HLF’s condition for grant. The report could be really comprehensively done or just on a sheet of paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Alan Stanton | Architect | Yes, they will do the conservation plan, conservation impact studies, fabric surveys, detailed restoration.  
For example, in Salisbury and there is an access audit, and that is being integrated with the conservation plan. It's all being tied together. There are also environmental and ecological studies. Because although access is not strictly conservation, but it should be in terms of the conservation impact assessment, when you bring together designs proposals and the conservation plan. Of course the access studies needs to be involved in it. | Access audit need to be integrated with conservation plan in the form of conservation impact assessment. |
| KE Martin | Architect | Conservation assessment is an important document in the process of including access to historic buildings. | Process of including access. |
| Tony Barton | Conservation Architect | Conservation plans find issues about taking on board the future of the building. Of course one issue is providing access. And how its going to be done, so conservation plans set out the rules to protect the historic fabric. And to find that balance.  
Grade 1 listed building, I think, there has to be a conservation plan always that examine the issue of access. It is always possible...to find the art of the possible, for the architect to core his design skills and integrate something. | Conservation plan deals with access even with Grade 1 listed buildings as the challenge is for the architect to design and integrate access. |
| Jamie Coath | Conservation Architect | The thing that is brought it into focus as having to have it as a requirement for an HLF application for grant. That has made onus for historic buildings, go out and procure a plan. You know it talks about issues that likely to threaten the building. The value of the building. That is one where we also incorporate the access plan with the conservation plan. | Incorporate access plan with conservation plan. |
Table 8.18: Discussion on the Conservation Assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) A common practice of integrating the access plan into the conservation assessment is by incorporating access issues in the ‘conservation impact assessment’. | - Access is addressed in the conservation assessment.  
- Access audit need to be integrated with conservation plan in the form of conservation impact assessment.  
- Conservation plan deals with access even with Grade 1 listed buildings as the challenge is for the architect to design and integrate access.  
- Incorporate access plan with conservation plan.  
- Access plan should not totally contradict with the Conservation Management Plan and the Audience Development Plan. |
| (ii) Access issues should be dealt separately as to refer to Part M, in the form of access statement. | - Access should be separately dealt with and refer directly to Part M (in the form of Access Statement) |
(i) A common practice of integrating the access plan into the conservation assessment is by incorporating access issues in the 'conservation impact assessment'.

(ii) Access issues should be dealt separately as to refer to Part M, in the form of access statement.

Since the inception of the DDA 1995, the task of incorporating access into conservation plans had been common practice amongst the consultants who deals with historic buildings. However, the reference to Part M will not be explained in the conservation document, hence there is a need to separately deal with that in the access statement.

8.4 Discussion on the implication of the Access Planning Process on the Development Control Process

Discussions on the findings from 8.2 and 8.3 are further elaborated in this section with regards to the Development Control Process and will be further explored in chapter eight and the conclusion.

Although the mechanisms from the reactive process were outnumbered by the proactive process, in this chapter, the findings from the discussion always referred to the reactive process. The processes are inter-linked and served one another, as the development process consist of both processes. In the overall theoretical assumption, in order for the development process to occur, the control process needs to be structured and all the mechanisms will be geared to make the processes work. This section will elaborate the effectiveness of those mechanisms, set as variables to the study.

The question has always been, how effective are these mechanisms on their own and when relating to the other process. Control mechanisms such as Part M of the Building Regulations in England and Wales becomes a reference or a point of departure for best
practice in conservation practice but can never be used as a sole reference point, for example. Hence, the following discussion is to further state the possible configuration and relationships pertaining to both sets of mechanisms from both processes.

Access strategy, access audit and access plan are part of the Access Planning Process that are crucial for the start of the Briefing Process during the commencement of the project by the client and consultant. These processes need to be worked on before development control and referred to Stages A/B of the RIBA Plan of Work Stages. This stage is also referred to the Pre-Planning Approval stage and certain procedures and practice are normally conducted to ensure that the applicant is ready for Planning Approval and Listed Building Consent.

The main issue regarding these mechanisms is that for conservation practice, access issues must never be left behind the set protocol. Access audit and access plan are prescribed in the guidance by English Heritage (2004, 1995) and CADW: Welsh Monuments (2002), and how effective this mechanisms are depended on whether access requirements and conservation requirements are being addressed together. “The identification of potential conflicts and problems” and even “incorporating the access plan with the conservation plan” are believed to be able to make the system more effective.

In conservation practice it was only recently when Kate Clark arrived at English Heritage in 1995 that the Conservation Plan was formally introduced (Adams, 2004) and Access Plan was also introduced at this time, in the English Heritage guidance of 1995. The mechanisms were created to assist with requirements and duties imposed by the DDA 1995, and were considered to be addressing the problems identified in conservation practice with regards to access (Clark, 2000).

As these mechanisms work before development control they anticipate the access requirements required by Part M of the building regulations. If however, the Access Plan was not used, or the access requirements were not addressed at this stage, then Part M
and the other control processed would need to be exercised. However, the Access Plan is best practice guidance and not enforced, except where applicants applied for the HLF funding.

The process of creating best practice based on innovative solutions depended on the design approach of the design practice concerned. Considering that PPG 15 and the Welsh Circulars proposed on exactly how conservation guidelines should be adhered to, and how conservation architects were trained, the integration of access and best solution would be from the perspective of the conservation architects rather than those inexperienced in handling historic building conservation. In this way, access would be easier to negotiate in the development control process.

The issue of reasonableness and reasonable adjustment is believed to be most welcomed by practitioners in conservation as alternative means other than change of material use could be employed as stated in the DDA 1995. In chapter six, reasonable adjustment is seen in a cynical manner by the answers provided by many access and building control officers, where it is believed to be a way of not achieving full access. However, the findings in this chapter revealed that the DDA 1995 is not about design but about services and that due importance is given equally to the management aspects to solve the problems of access in certain cases in particular, historic buildings that are small or with tight spaces that need alternative means to services rather than physical access. Thus reasonable adjustments make possible the process of negotiation to occur within the development control process.

Access consultants would work well in specialized areas such as historic buildings as the access officer in development control is regarded as not effective or reliable to assist in the discussion. Access consultants brought in before the development control process of a historic building project would be able to work out the issues with the architect and even be able to assist in the development control procedures.
**Best practice guidance** as prescribed by English Heritage (2004, 1995) and CADW: Welsh Monuments (2002) are effective in illustrating what is required in order to achieve access in historic buildings. At the very least, those involved in conservation practice and the corresponding control processes, would understand the need for access strategy, access audit and access plan, as well as the definitions of reasonable adjustments and the regulations and legislation pertaining to creating access in historic buildings. The guidance are basic in a sense not able to illustrate the whole development process until post completion stage and did not include management and operations guidance, which would have allowed for more scope to anticipate the problems that will emerge.

The other mechanisms which exist within the development control process have been discussed in 8.3 and will be discussed further in Chapter 9 and the conclusion.

**8.5. Summary**

Similar to the Delphi, the Interviews also examined the mechanisms that were implemented and based on legislation, regulations or practice, operate as either: (i) procedure; (ii) process; (ii) guide or (iv) function. This will be explained in the Conclusion chapter where the different mechanisms will be analysed further in terms of their ‘operational’ or ‘actionable’ nature.

The interviewees in the interview method were involved more with the proactive processes rather than reactive, and the method of inquiry was semi-structured in nature to enable ideas and concepts to be brought to the conversation, thus giving broader results with regards to the mechanisms to be analysed.

**8.5.1. Research Question 1**

The issues on legislation stated with reference to reasonable adjustment that: historic buildings require both design and management solutions which needs to fit with one another; historic buildings that are small or with tight spaces may need alternative means
to services rather than physical access; management and services operations become more important when using a historic building; technical solutions using equipment such as lifts and stair lifts may have visual impacts and reasonable adjustments help the conservation side by bringing in alternative means and negotiation in design solution. The patterns from the statements in the interview findings showed strongly that reasonable adjustment is an effective mechanism being a process to interpret the DDA’s codes of practice. If compared to the Delphi study summary, the proactive actors of architects, conservation architects and access consultants contradict in opinion on the use of the reasonable adjustment’s process with the local authority officers, namely the Access Officers and some of the Building Control Officers.

8.5.2. Research Questions 2

8.5.1.1. Part M Building Regulation

From the interview findings, Part M was regarded as: either not referred to or deemed not applicable when dealing with conservation practice and listed building control; not enough reference and need other mechanisms to achieve better control and good practice; is general and about minimum standards and eventually the architects and those in the proactive process need to come up with the solution; and provides for a reference to consultants and access requirements raised need to be address. These findings suggested that Part M is a guide rather than a procedure that is documented and prescribed with legal influence. This interview conclusion on Part M showed that Part M on its own is not effective as it is just a regulatory guide and any advice on Part M could be disregarded in the development control’s decision-making process on historic buildings. The following direct quotes from the interviewees will reinforce this point: “Part M is probably subservient to listed building control. In other words if English Heritage says we are not going to knock those steps away to make it level, because we have duties in relating to the conservation, where it over-rides the duties in accessibility,” and “Part M is a difficult thing to apply and the principle has to be the presumption that you try to implement the requirements of Part M in everything you do, but when things such as handrail heights,
handrail design, you can’t alter grand staircases like Walker art gallery in Liverpool, simply because it doesn’t comply.” (Table 7.11)

8.5.1.2. Role of Access Officers

In the findings of this chapter, we found that the access officer ideally besides raising awareness of access issues should be able to facilitate the process of consultation with access groups. However other findings suggested that the access officer were considered redundant in cases where expertise is needed or better skills at negotiating decisions on historic buildings as consultants and conservation officers would be sufficient to deal with access issues; and access officers could either be replaced by others such as access consultant or need proper training to deal with historic buildings and conservation. Direct quotes to emphasis the summary is that, “generally access officers are very concern about an access argument, but because of this to do with historic buildings their difficulty is in understanding the weight on the other side of the argument,” and “Yes, if we are doing our job right, he (the access officer) is not needed is he?” This resonates with the Delphi study’s conclusion that the Access Officers’ role lack influence when it concerns historic and listed public buildings.

8.5.3. Research Questions 3

The group of architects, conservation architects and access consultants were unanimous in their opinion of best practice, where: guidance for best practice requires access issues be consulted by various parties to the process of access planning; English Heritage and CADW as the authors of guidance for best practice is the proper bodies of reference to ensure conservation tenets are upheld; guidance should encompass all the stages in the design process including management and operations issues after building completion; and guidance should allow for check and balances to rectify the possible inconsistencies of the system.
If compared to the Delphi study, it resonated with the lack of consultation processes and mechanism that could be addressed by having best practice. Hence, both the findings from the two methods are conclusive in stating that guidance is an effective mechanism. However, the issue of guidance need to be probe further and this point, guidance, such as the published document is just a guide is not as strong as either: a procedure, a function or a process, so the ‘how to make it more effective’ issue would need to be addressed. Also, the guide is more of a strategic mechanism whereas the process recommended in the guide which is the Access Planning Process that includes the 3 processes mentioned earlier could implement the guide’s aims and the philosophical ideal of conservation and accessibility merged together.

The issue of the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms was addressed by the findings on the Access Plan it was stated: Access plan has to be process driven in order to work and is done step by step; work together with different requirements; access to be addressed as part of the whole process of conservation; and access as part of project’s brief and guidelines.

The Access Planning Process is a specialized knowledge area, which if not properly trained, the person will not be able to understand. “We do an access audit (with either the access consultant or access officer), that’s the first step. Then we do a conservation plan and a conservation statement. So at least all the problems are outlined and you got a plan of attack on what’s to be done. And then it’s a question of everybody sitting down and trying to find the best solution” (Table 8.1). Even among access consultants, there are a few experts on historic buildings.
CHAPTER 9
Case study of the Development Control Process of
the National Waterfront Museum Swansea

9.1. Introduction

The National Waterfront Museum Swansea (NWMS) was identified and confirmed as the single-case study to validate the findings from the Delphi Method and Interviews explained in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8. The Delphi Method was used to collect data from the reactive process participants in the local authority, whereas the Interviews conducted were with architects, conservation architects and access consultants involved in the proactive process. Findings from Chapters 7 and 8 will be compared to findings from the case study, where the same set of people, in terms of function and role, however be interviewed in a different context and research procedure. The validation of the findings is found in Chapter 10.

The justification on the use of a single case study was discussed in Chapter 6, where the use of multiple evidence data analysis to substantiate the findings was employed. The complexity of examining a case study that focuses on the accessibility and inclusive design outcome of a historic and listed public building involves an examination on all the mechanisms that was discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.

Using the interview method, both open and structured type, summarising reports and using detached observation, an examination were conducted with the following mechanisms mentioned in Chapter 6.

Results will determine the degree of effectiveness in implementing accessibility to a historic and listed public building example by illustrating the strengths and weakness in both the development control and non-development control process. This investigation will answer all three hypotheses as explained in Chapter 6. The case study was used validate all the mechanisms in the reactive and proactive process, as this multi-method
approach would be suitable to validate the previous findings from the Delphi study and interviews.

**Site and building description**

The site for the National Waterfront Museum Swansea is a landscaped area with public buildings, parking facilities and routes through to link the city with these buildings and the Maritime Quarter beyond. It is a triangular site contained by the South Dock, a busy road on the northwest side and residential area to the northeast side. (Figure 9.1 and 9.2)

The National Waterfront Museum Swansea (NWMS) is adjacent to the Leisure Centre and the Royal Institute Museum beyond its boundary. A museum was previously housed in a Grade 2 listed industrial brick building. There is a new building linked to the northeast of the existing building. The new building contains galleries on two levels. The existing building houses facilities such as café, WCs, shop, technical elements and commercial units in addition to housing first floor galleries (CAE, 2005; Figure 9.1, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5).

The initial design and basic framework for NWMS was completed in the year 2001, and this was when the “basic rules and general planning were set up a long time before, addressing the extension to the historic listed building and aligning to the city and the waterfront” (Knight, 2004) NWMS was decided to be “a whole destination in itself”, “a catalyst for the regeneration of this whole area”, “basically the Jewel in the Crown of the area,” and an “influence on a very large area of Swansea.” NWMS will accommodate the Swansea Maritime and Industrial Collection and also the Industrial Collection held in Cardiff as it was intended to be collected into one facility (Knight, 2004)

In June 2000, the City and County of Swansea granted outlined planning permission for the erection of the museum building, provision of revised vehicular and pedestrian access, landscaping and carparking. The planning application was registered on 27 April 2000 and its approval was subject to compliance with 14 listed conditions including
details of the siting, design and external appearance of the building and the landscaping of the site (Wilkinson Eyre, 2002; Figure 9.6).

The fabric of the listed building and the rail routes across the landscaped site are two of the listing conditions that was preserved ad incorporate into the design concept as the careful placement of new built adjacent to the existing building, linked internally, followed the geometry set-up by the rail-lines” (Access Consultant quote in Table 9.10). The architect was pleased with the design as creating a “jewel and well crafted building with depth and complexity.” The 12.4 million pounds sterling project has secured some Heritage Lottery funding, forms part of ambitions to revitalise Swansea’s Maritime quarter in particular and the city in general (Blackler, 2003).

![Figure 9.1: The site plan of the National Waterfront Museum, Swansea. (The alignment is top of the picture is north while bottom is south where the waterfront is located.)](image)
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Figure 9.2: View towards the city from the main approach of the National Waterfront Museum Swansea.

Figure 9.3: View from the main car park side approaching the main entrance of the National Waterfront Museum Swansea.
Figure 9.4: View of the Grade 2 listed industrial brick building where on the ground floor there are old railway tracks that were used when the building was a warehouse.
9.2. Interviews with stakeholders – analysis, findings and discussions

There were two stages of interviews and visits. The first one was conducted in June/July 2004 and the second one was in November 2005, one during the construction period and the other after completion and opening of the museum to the public.

The first stage interviews’ objective was to obtain the basic information, issues on the different roles and mechanisms used before June/July 2004. The interviewees were persons whose roles are part of the reactive process: the building control officer, the planning officer, the conservation officer and the access officer. Two other interviewees were from the proactive process: the project architect and the access consultant, although the latter assumed many of the roles that the access officer would have done.

The span of a case study involved different processes and stages and the argument will be made in Chapter 10 on how the mechanisms to achieve accessibility and inclusive design in historic and listed public buildings should be made. Using the single case study of a public building which is a museum and where the listed building is being adapted to provide for a change of use from a warehouse to a temporary museum and to a new museum, the challenges in meeting the conservation ideal and accessibility needs will be illustrated in this chapter (Figure 9.6).
Figure 9.6: Progression of the stages in a basic time line. Corresponding stages in development control and non development control is shown with the RIBA Plan of Work Stages (RIBA, 1999; Figure 4.0).
9.2.1. Interview Stage 1: June/July 2004

A set of questions were given to the main actors in the development process, the building control officer cum site inspector, the conservation architect, planning officer, access officer, architect and access consultant. An interview was conducted as a follow up to the questions sent earlier in June/July 2004.

Table 9.1: Function / roles of interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Responses in quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Site Inspector/Building Control Officer | Role of building control officer in Swansea  
• Fire strategy  
• Access and facilities for disabled people  
• Structural stability  
• Drainage  
• All parts of building regulations |
| Architect / Urban Designer (Conservation) | Advice the planning officer on the effect of development on the character of the listed building |
| Planning Officer | Planning Approval |
| Access Officer | There is no Access Officer involved in the vetting of the plans. Only one as Policy Development Officer (Access)  
Role in this project has been advising the NWMS that they should appoint an Access Consultant. I support the consultant in setting up and managing the access group, local knowledge of access issues etc as I have all the local contacts |
| Project Director / Architect | Project Architect |
| Access Consultant | • Access Consultant  
• Manage Access Group  
• Building Appraisal and Access Audit Report |
The Building Control Officer enforced Part M building regulation. The Access Officer was not involved in the planning control and building control processes as the role is confined to dealing with policies. However, the Access Officer was the one responsible for bringing in the Access Consultant for this project. (Table 9.1)

When asked about their involvement in the NWMS project, the Architect / Urban Designer in Conservation Department was the only one involved from Pre Planning Advice to Post Completion. Other interviewees had different scopes of involvement, notably the Access Consultant was involved in the latter stages starting from Full Plans Application. The Planning Officer and Building Control Officer were involved in expected areas of designation, but notably the Access Officer and Access Consultant, who functioned as an ‘access officer’ were not involved in Pre Planning Advice right up to Listed Building Consent (Table 9.2) (Figure 9.7)

Figure 9.7: Stages where the interviewees were involved in for the NWMS project.
Table 9.2: Interviewees involvement in the different stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Building Control Stages</th>
<th>Building Control Officer</th>
<th>Conservation Officer</th>
<th>Planning Officer</th>
<th>Access Officer</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Access Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Planning Advice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Application (Planning Permit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building Consent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Plans Application (Building Regulation)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Completion (Occupancy)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.3: Interviewees opinion on whether measures on accessibility were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures Used</th>
<th>Building Control</th>
<th>Conservation</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Access Officer</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Access Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Statement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Advisory Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Plan / Audit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Access Statement was not used in this project’s development control processes. However, the use of an Access Advisory Group (Consultation with users), Access Officer (Access Consultant taking that function) and Access Plan or Audit were measures used in the project (Table 9.3).

Table 9.4: Measures for achieving access that had been used or will be using for building control processes, which had not been listed earlier in Table 8.3, for the NWMS project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Access Measures used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Inspector/Building Control Officer</td>
<td>Part M 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect / Urban Designer (Conservation)</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>Part M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director / Architect</td>
<td>Design Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other measures for achieving access that the interviewees cited were Part M 1999 and the Architect’s Design Statement. However, the latter’s quotes on access is limited to pedestrian access and not accessibility and inclusive design outcomes. The Design Statement was explained in Section 9.3.
When asked whether the DDA was considered in this project, the Building Control Officer and the Architect / Urban Designer in Conservation Department felt that DDA was not considered. Clearly there is a difference of opinion with Access Officer and Access Consultant stated that DDA was used (Table 9.5). Other legislative measures considered are part of the regulatory controls such as Part M, Listed Building Consent and Planning Permission, which are the responses given (Table 9.6).

Table 9.5: Disability Discrimination Act being considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>DDA considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Inspector/Building Control Officer</td>
<td>No (Part M only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect / Urban Designer (Conservation)</td>
<td>1999 – takes 5 years to adopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know. Planning application 2000-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director / Architect</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.6: Other legislative measures used to achieve accessibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Legislative measures used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Inspector/Building Control Officer</td>
<td>Part M 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect / Urban Designer (Conservation)</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No conservation plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welsh version.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>Planning Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welsh circulars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director / Architect</td>
<td>Part M 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Part M 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With reference to aspects not addressed in planning control or building control and accessibility of the NWMS project, in relation to the general or specific issues of access, 4 of the 6 interviewees commented on the Access audit done by access consultant. (Table 9.7). The earlier version of Access Planning Process by English Heritage (1995) is used just as a reference to a guided process framework. Accept for the Access Consultant, the other interviewees did not respond (Table 9.8).

Table 9.7: Comments on aspects not addressed in planning control or building control and accessibility of the NWMS project, in relation to the general or specific issues of access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Inspector/Building</td>
<td>Currently we are mixing BS 8300, Part M 2004 and Part M 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect / Urban Designer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conservation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>Access audit done by access consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>Access audit done by access consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director / Architect</td>
<td>Access audit done by access consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Access audit done by access consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.8: comment on the Diagram 1, ‘Access Planning Process (Adams, 2003)’ (The 2004 version was not available at the time this question was asked; see Appendix B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Inspector/Building</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect / Urban Designer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conservation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director / Architect</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Access Group was not consulted at the Pre-Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2.2. Interviews Stage 2: November 2005 (after completion of project)

Stage 2 interviews used two types of questioning – structured and open interviews. The questionnaire was given to all the interviewees that participated in Interview Stage 1, however only 2 responded.

- Access Consultant: Cassie Herschel-Shorland
- Building Control Officer: Mark Singh

The open interviews were conducted with Dave Croft and Frank (Access Advisory Group) and Sue James (Access Officer NWMS)

For the structured interview findings, key points will be made even if the finding by one of the interviewees is found to be significant or both interviewees made the same point (Table 9.9).

**Access Strategy**

Both interviewees said ‘No Access Strategy at early stages A/B and C/D’.

Building Control Officer said that ‘Access Consultant was responsible in drafting Access Strategy (question)’ but Access Consultant did not respond to the question.

Further more the Access Consultant added that ‘many decisions were already made prior to appointment of an Access Consultant.’ In summary,

(i) The Access Strategy is not clear and Access Consultant was involved later and;

(ii) No Access Strategy at early stages A/B and C/D.

**Access Audit**

The Access Consultant completed several drafts of report with access auditing elements but essentially it was a Design Appraisal Report as was quoted ‘Access Audit was for Design Appraisal after stages C/D but not done prior to that’. Any auditing results we not
used in the Management Plan or Conservation Plan. Those considered to have more role on identifying, prioritizing and recommending the access needs were the Architect and the Access Consultant, although the Client, Project Manager, Access Officer, Access Advisory Group were also mentioned.

**Conservation Assessment**

Both interviewees either did not know or assumed that a Conservation Assessment were done on the Grade 2 listed building prior to getting approvals. The special interest and significance of the historic elements were identified: (i) Fabric of listed historic building; and (ii) Rail routes across the landscaped site. Access requirements that were proposed were believe to have influenced the decision on how the special interests were preserved.

**Feasibility and option studies**

Access appraisal recommendations, progress reports and meeting reports, in addition to correspondence on design, were provided to inform the client decision on what was/is reasonable. Consultation with disability user group was undertaken much later.

**Draft access plan**

Access Consultant was brought in between stages C and D.

**Measures that have impact and/or physical alterations are recommended – statutory consents or other approvals required**

Detailed Design; Further Technical Studies; Further consultation; No Access Statements only Part M 1999 applies; Listed Building Consent

**Access Plan**

Access Plan adopted by all concerned

Programme and access training

Proposed education programme already shows commitment to inclusive design and review

No Access Plan was done, but it was recommended after building is completed.
Both site and building specific.

**Planning and Listed Building Control**
No Access Statement but only Part M 1999 applies
Access Consultant, Access Officer, Advisory Group
CCS Access guidance, CAE Designing for Accessibility and BS8300, Part M

**Building Control**
Access Officer;
Also Access Advisory Group, Architect, Building Control Surveyor / Part M 1999
Meeting to discuss basic requirements

**Completion and Post Occupation**
An Access Audit was done on the completed building before handover to the client by the Access Consultant and there were also other access audits done (Dave Croft).
Monitoring and user feedback by the disabled people's group was done after the building was opened to public. The measures that the client took to provide for accessibility and usability of the facilities provided after the building was opened to public are (i) Access Review; (ii) Access Awareness and Training for the staff. Post of Access Officer has been created to address access and outreach.
Table 9.9: Structured Interview Findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Access Consultant</th>
<th>Building Control Officer</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART ONE:</strong> Access Planning Process (Figure 4.1) and RIBA Plan of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages A/B and C/D (Table 4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1: Access Planning Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Was there a person identified to progress the Access Planning Process</td>
<td>No, this project was started before much</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the beginning stages?</td>
<td>of the current process for inclusive design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, who was identified?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Architect, Access</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant, Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2: Access Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Was the Access Strategy planned before identifying and appointing the</td>
<td>No, it was planned with the consultants</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>No Access Strategy at early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>architect and other consultants?</td>
<td>later</td>
<td></td>
<td>stages A/B and C/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, where was the Access Strategy written?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘No’, where was the Access Strategy written?</td>
<td>Access Audit / Access Recommendations (within client group and design meetings)</td>
<td>Access Audit / Access Recommendations</td>
<td>Access Strategy was written in Access Audit / Access Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Who was responsible in drafting the Access Strategy?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Access Consultant</td>
<td>Access Consultant was responsible in drafting Access Strategy (question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Was the Access Strategy used as a decision-making process to control and manage the project throughout until completion?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please add any comments on the Access Strategy:</td>
<td>This project would have benefited from a clear Access Strategy. Many decisions were already made prior to appointment of an Access Consultant and the project was developed and implemented during a time change in legislation,</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Access Strategy is not clear and Access Consultant was involved later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3(a): Access Audit</td>
<td>regulations and expectation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Was there an Access Audit done on the Grade 2 listed warehouse building on the site before the project commenced?</td>
<td>Yes, information gathering only due to extent of change proposed. Therefore Access Consultancy was focused on Design Appraisal.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Access Audit was for Design Appraisal after stages C/D but not done prior to that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, were access needs identified; the priorities on access and recommendations outlined?</td>
<td>Yes in the Design Appraisal report</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Design Appraisal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, please provide the details where the Access Audit / Access Recommendation was written:</td>
<td>In an overall summary report and within body of the report</td>
<td>Access Audit</td>
<td>Design Appraisal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Was the Access Audit incorporated into or used in conjunction with the</td>
<td>Neither, as it was used as part of the bid, implementation</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3(b): Conservation Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Was there a Conservation Assessment done on the Grade 2 listed warehouse building on site before the project commenced?</td>
<td>This would have been prior to CAE appointment and design decisions based on this already made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Was the special architectural, historic and archaeological interest identified?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, what are the special interests, their value and how was it repaired / preserved / altered?</td>
<td>Special interest included fabric of listed historic building and rail routes across the landscaped site. These were preserved by careful placement of new build adjacent to the existing building, linked internally. This followed the geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do not know

Special interest identified

Special interest - Fabric of listed historic building; and rail routes across the landscaped site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>question</th>
<th>answer 1</th>
<th>answer 2</th>
<th>answer 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, did the access requirements influenced the decision on how the special interests were repaired / preserved / altered? Please provide the details:</td>
<td>Yes, this continues in final site audits and access planning.</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Access requirements influenced the decision on how the special interests were preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: Feasibility and option studies</td>
<td>1) Were there any technical studies done in Stage A/B, including ‘means of escape’?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If ‘Yes’, what technical studies were done?</td>
<td>CAE (Access Consultant) was not appointed or involved at this stage. CAE audits do not constitute fire assessment.</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Was there any consultation done at this stage with relevant access and conservation bodies and disability user groups?</td>
<td>Undertaken much later</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If ‘Yes’, with whom was the</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response 1</td>
<td>Response 2</td>
<td>Response 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Was there a test of ‘reasonableness’ of proposed adjustment on the Grade 2 listed warehouse building?</td>
<td>Access appraisal recommendations, progress reports and meeting reports, in addition to correspondence on design, were provided to inform the client decision on what was/is reasonable.</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Access appraisal recommendations, progress reports and meeting reports, in addition to correspondence on design, were provided to inform the client decision on what was/is reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, what were the adjustments made?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Was there an analysis on any impact made to the Grade 2 listed warehouse building?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, what was the analysis made on?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Were there any mitigation measures done on the historic building, and in the site?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, what mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5: Draft Access Plan

A Draft Access Plan would differ from an Access Plan, especially if it was done at Feasibility Stage A/B, and might incorporate other documents, before becoming a full-fledge document on its own.

1) Was there any reconciliation on access and conservation needs?
   - not available- | do not know | - not available-

If ‘Yes’, at what stage of the design process was the reconciliation made and please provide the details of the reconciliation?
   (a) Feasibility Stages A/B (b) Scheme Design Stages C/D (c) Other
   Details of the reconciliation:
   - not available- | - not available- | - not available-

2) Was there a Draft Access Plan made in either Stages A/B and C/D referring to the RIBA Plan of Work Stages?
   No as CAE were brought in between stages C and D | - not available- | Access Consultant were brought in between stages C and D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6: Measures that have impact and/or physical alterations are recommended – statutory consents or other approvals required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Were accessibility issues for disabled people addressed with the following documents/processes in the Scheme Design Stage C/D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Detailed design - Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Development and impact assessments - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Further technical studies - Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Further consultation - Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Access Statement for Building Regulations - No as Part M 1999 applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Was the Listed Building Consent (LBC) required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If 'Yes', in what form was it made?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of meeting (b) Report (c) Access Statement (d) Design Statement (e) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6: Measures that have impact and/or physical alterations are recommended – statutory consents or other approvals required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Were accessibility issues for disabled people addressed with the following documents/processes in the Scheme Design Stage C/D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Detailed design - n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Development and impact assessments – n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Further technical studies – n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Further consultation – No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Access Statement for Building Regulations - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Was the Listed Building Consent (LBC) required?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building Consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Design; Further Technical Studies; Further consultation; No Access Statements only Part M 1999 applies
If ‘Yes’, what were the issues addressed when applying for the LBC, in particular where access have made any impact?  

<p>| Question 7: The Access Plan |<br />
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (1) Was there an Access Plan? Yes/No | Not yet - as been advised by museum team. The team now managing and running the museum is a different team to that involved in development and design of the building and displays. An Access Plan has yet to be fully developed by the museum. However, the commitment to do so is positive. | Not sure | No Access Plan was done, but it was recommended after building is completed. |
| If ‘Yes’, was it site or building specific? | Both site and building specific. | Both site and building specific. | Both site and building specific. |
| (2) Did the Access Plan incorporate a comprehensive range of access | Yes though no plan developed yet, as above, the education | Yes | Proposed education programme already shows |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>solutions from managed change to physical alteration?</th>
<th>programme already shows commitment to inclusive design and review.</th>
<th>commitment to inclusive design and review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If ‘Yes’, what were the access solutions incorporated?</td>
<td>Programme and access training -not available- Programme and access training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Was the Access Plan adopted by all concerned?</td>
<td>Yes, see point 1 Yes</td>
<td>Access Plan adopted by all concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Was the Access Plan reviewed and endorsed at regular intervals in relation to the Access Strategy?</td>
<td>Neither - It is understood that it will be do not know</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Was the Access Plan implemented in stages according to prioritised access needs and long term building development strategy?</td>
<td>-not available- do not know</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Please add comments and views on question 6 (3), (4) and (5) where relevant:</td>
<td>-not available- -not available- -not available-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART TWO: Planning, Listed and Building Control Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 8: Planning and Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Building Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No (Part M 1999 applies)</th>
<th>Yes, Part M</th>
<th>No Access Statement but only Part M 1999 applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Was the Access Statement or any other document on Access Recommendation being referred to at the Planning and Listed Building Control stage (RIBA Plan of Work Stages C/D) (Table 4.0)?</td>
<td>Access Consultant, Access Officer, Advisory Group</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Access Consultant, Access Officer, Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘No’, what other ways were done to ensure that access requirements were being considered?</td>
<td>CCS Access guidance, CAE Designing for Accessibility and BS8300</td>
<td>Part M 1999 is the base line; they have used Part M 2004 and BS 8300</td>
<td>CCS Access guidance, CAE Designing for Accessibility and BS8300, Part M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 9: Building Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>-not available-</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>-not available-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Was the Access Statement or any other document on Access Recommendation being referred to at the Building Control stage (RIBA Plan of Work Stages E/F, G/H, K) (Table</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If ‘No’, what other ways were done to ensure that access requirements were being considered?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The input(s) was/were from the:</td>
<td>Access Officer</td>
<td>Access Consultant, Access Officer, Access Advisory Group, Architect, Building Control Surveyor /</td>
<td>Access Officer; Also Access Officer, Access Advisory Group, Architect, Building Control Surveyor /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Was any guidance and regulatory control used at this stage? Please state the name of the guidance and regulatory control.</td>
<td>Part M 1999</td>
<td>Part M 1999 is the base line; they have used Part M2004 and BS 8300</td>
<td>Part M 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Were there meetings on site and testing by Building Control to ensure that the access requirements were met?</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss basic requirements</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss basic requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART THREE: Completion and Post Occupation Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10: Completion and Post Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response 1</td>
<td>Response 2</td>
<td>Response 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Was an access audit done on the completed building before handover to the client?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Do not know building regulation completion</td>
<td>An access audit done on the completed building before handover to the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If 'No', was there any other audit done? If 'Yes', please state.</td>
<td>David Croft of Croft Consultants, independent reports</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Other access audits also done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Was there any monitoring and user feedback done after the building was opened to public?</td>
<td>Yes – proposed for this month</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Monitoring and user feedback done after the building was opened to public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) What were the measures that the service provider / client take to provide for accessibility and usability of the facilities provided after the building was opened to public?</td>
<td>Access Review (b) Access Awareness and Training for the staff</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Access Review (b) Access Awareness and Training for the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Please comment further on the management and services aspects relating to the accessibility of the National Waterfront Museum,</td>
<td>Current directorship has a very positive and keen commitment to access improvements and delivering</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Post of Access Officer has been created to address access and outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea:</td>
<td>and inclusive service. A post has been created to address access and outreach. The Operations Manager is very proactive in addressing access and continued liaison an Access Advisory Group</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Project done when DDA coming into force and changes to building regulations and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional comments on this research questionnaire:</td>
<td>It is important to note that this project was undertaken during a time of change and changing (with DDA coming into force and changes to building regulations and standards) expectation as well as within limited resources.</td>
<td>-not available-</td>
<td>Project done when DDA coming into force and changes to building regulations and standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2.3. Interview Stage 2: November 2005

Open Interviews
- Access Advisory Group members: Dave Croft (partial sighted user) and Frank (wheelchair user)
- NWMS Access Officer: Sue James

Best Practice
Access group / disabled persons audited the completed building and services.
Group not satisfied with outcome of earlier meetings before completion.
DDA has influenced on the changes to be made for after completion stage

Part M
Group felt that Part M usage was inadequate and management issues, regarding means of escape requirements unsatisfactory.

Listed Building /Conservation Assessment
Dave Croft felt that the listed building was not an issue impeding access. Grade 2 listed buildings’ special interest, which warrants every effort being made to preserve them.

Consultation with user
Access group’s comments were not utilised satisfactorily.
The reason it was formed was based on the reaction from the planning submission. Role of Access Group
Changes to the Access Group
Access group well represented

Access Consultant
The Access Consultant did not meet the Access Group’s expectations.
Coordination between Access Group and Consultants lacking
Table 9.10: Open Interview Findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Response in quotes</th>
<th>Key points</th>
<th>Key words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Croft and Frank (Local Disabled Persons</td>
<td>Dave: They took it off and get us this one. This another table like here. And I</td>
<td>Access group / disabled persons audited the completed building and services.</td>
<td>Best Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Access Group representatives)</td>
<td>made them take it out. Put it against the wall. And leave a bit of space. (Café</td>
<td>Group not satisfied with outcome of earlier meetings before completion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>having fixed benches rather than movable furniture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date interviewed: 22nd November 2005</td>
<td>Frank: One table and one chair. Just one seat. We told them for 2 ½ years. (During</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting, conferences, everything we told them.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave: They haven’t followed the 1999 Part M. No. It didn’t comply with the BS 7598</td>
<td>Group felt that Part M usage was inadequate and management issues,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>either. You only have fire stairs if it won’t burn. It might burn while you are</td>
<td>regarding means of escape requirements unsatisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on it, but the stairs shouldn’t. I think the EVAC chairs they’ve got I don’t like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at all. They are dangerous. Frank: No, they completely ignore everything. My</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comment on this. I have some kid who will lift me up on the EVAC chair and no way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave: No. The lack of access is not because of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Croft felt that the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part M / Best practice**

Staircase for emergency

Column plinth base

Problems for people with vision impairments

Problems for people with vision impairments and wheelchair users.

Counter height was not disabled friendly

Car parking space for disabled people too few and too far away.

The accessible toilet was not accessible.

**Reasonable adjustment**

Column plinth base

The accessible toilet was not accessible in the listed building part.

**Access Audit / Access Plan**

Access audit was done by Dave Croft before opening of museum

NWMS will still work with the Access Group after the building has completed for the next year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the listed building). It’s lost its listed. Because it’s got lots modern tack to it.</th>
<th>listed building was not an issue impeding access.</th>
<th>/Conservation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave: (The access group) came about 3 years ago, straight after the planning. Because we made so many complaints on the planning application. And the complaints made in the planning application still weren’t dealt with.</td>
<td>Access group’s comments were not utilised satisfactorily.</td>
<td>Access Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave: We had access to it (planning submission drawings). Before planning permission. We set a complaint before planning permission. That was where we started. And that’s why the Access Group was formed.</td>
<td>The reason it was formed was based on the reaction from the planning submission.</td>
<td>Access Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave: It was made of eight various access groups. Various groups of disabilities. There’s the deaf, the blind, partially sighted and they were brought in as well for every three months. That’s for three years.</td>
<td>Role of Access Group</td>
<td>Access Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: I need to understand this Grade 2 listed building before it was renovated. So you were saying there was no void inside.</td>
<td>Grade 2 listed buildings’ special interest, which warrants every effort being</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frank and Dave: No. Solid floor.

Dave: Yes, but Cassie was supposed to be the Access Rep. for the whole project. And all she ever did was passed on what we drawn to her.

Frank: I am very disappointed with her. You have got revolving doors at the front of the building, which shouldn’t be.

Dave: Yes, we’d told them to put automatic sliding doors.

Frank: We never said anything to them which is out of the ordinary that would costs them too much money.

Dave: They all are stainless steel steps. It’s slippery but it’s high.

Dave: Best thing you could do is chip all that. Best is to hit your head on the pillar. I have done it twice. That one there I walked into.

Dave: There are going to be big changes in the next six months. We are just letting them run it at

The Access Consultant did not meet the Access Group’s expectations.

Access Consultant

Staircase for emergency

Part M / Best practice

Column plinth base

Part M / Best practice / Reasonable adjustment

Changes to the Access Group

Access Group
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the moment. See how things are going to work and we will start making changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Problems for people with vision impairments</th>
<th>Best practice / Part M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave: Difficult, very difficult. I am alright because I know the building. But one of the guys from out of town, he got very bad vision and he (forget it) especially like sharp corners like that. Architects don’t take notice of health and safety.</td>
<td>Problems for people with vision impairments and wheelchair users.</td>
<td>Best practice / Part M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank: You take our practice walking through the sharp edges.</td>
<td>Counter height was not disabled friendly</td>
<td>Best practice / Part M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave: You know the big display they have - I have hurt myself twice. It was dark.</td>
<td>Access audit was done by Dave Croft before opening of museum</td>
<td>Access Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank: That counter I couldn’t reach it. They have brought it down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave: They brought us over to see it (before the opening), how good it was. What I ended up writing 14 pages report on two rooms. Wasn’t on the whole building. It was on 2 rooms. It couldn’t go anywhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank: There’s for 4 cars but you can only put 2</td>
<td>Car parking space for</td>
<td>Best practice / Part M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 360 |
| Sue James  
(Access Officer National Waterfront Museum Swansea – employed 8 months before)  
Date interviewed: 23rd November 2005 | There are over 20 representatives across the board of access group and most of them have their own consultancies as well. Wealth of knowledge to offer. The group meet up generally every quarter. | Access group well represented | Access Group |
|---|---|---|---|
| cars in.  
D: We got permission from Swansea city to put a disabled parking area, and we got 8 bays. The builder went wrong and we got only that space now. | disabled people too few and too far away. | M |
| Frank: I could get in the toilet just about.  
Dave: Before they altered it, you couldn’t get in there. They had to alter it. | The accessible toilet was not accessible. | Part M / Best Practice / Reasonable adjustments |
| I think particularly the last year with the access group themselves because they worked with the new project office for quite some time and there were different levels of what they thought could be achievable and I think it lacked communication in certain parts. Looking back how they work in partnership with the steering | Coordination between Access Group and Consultants lacking | Access Consultant |
The access group itself they have very high expectations. There was still quite a lot that needed to be done a year ago, but I don’t think it was fully explained to them that there is still a lot that needs to be done. It was mainly because there were not enough information given to them in the actual building and how the project developed.

But we have an action plan so next year we might be able to do this. Perhaps this we haven’t the manpower but we will create a procedure to combat this issue. We have worked with them as well then on that so they see so many different ways.

And what I wanted to do and generally what I’d do is to keep that dialogue. I wanted to show them that their role is not finished. There is still a role to play within the museum, that DDA had a regulation change, you know, after a year they will be updated. And what we want to achieve in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination between Access Group and Consultants lacking</th>
<th>NWMS will still work with the Access Group after the building has completed for the next year</th>
<th>DDA has influenced on the changes to be made for after completion stage</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Consultant</th>
<th>Access Plan</th>
<th>Access Audit</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
the museum is obviously best practice, if possible
not just general standard.
9.3. Reports - analysis, findings and discussions

This section will summarise mainly key findings from the Building Design Appraisal and Audit Review Report of the National Waterfront Museum Swansea. The report was completed by the Centre for Accessible Environment (CAE Report) and the Access Consultant who was appointed to start auditing when the building was in between Stage C and D. Additionally the Design Statement by the Architect (Wilkinson Eyre, 2002) will also be summarised.

"The audit review updates design appraisals covering access to all facilities available to the public and as indicated drawings issued for appraisal by Wilkinson Eyre Architects," and it is also a "final summary report of wider access consultancy work for the project" (CAE, 2005). Findings from 9.2 stated that the access audit was done for further improvements after building completion rather than the development process from the beginning as quoted where, "the report on adjustments to be made to improve access can be used to inform an ongoing Access Action Plan for the museum" (CAE, 2005).

The criteria for assessment stated in the CAE Report is the following: (i) need to maximise access to and use of the buildings, landscape and open spaces for visitors and staff; (ii) provisions in Approved Document Part M of the Building Regulations; (iii) current guidance on the provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act, in particular the Code of Practice, Rights of Access, Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises, and British Standard BS 8300: Design of Buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people; (iv) currently published good practice in design and detailing which meets the needs of disabled people; (v) need to observe reasonable functional and financial practicalities of implementing action to improve access.

(CAE, 2005)

The criteria for assessment included access issues in general, Part M and the standards, DDA, best practice and reasonable adjustments considerations and requirements.
However, "means of escape for disabled people, including the fire alarm system and management procedures for evacuation were not reviewed as part of this audit." Additionally, the audit on WC was done in a separate report (CAE 2005).

The audit commenced on 24 August 2002, where the Access Consultant reviewed drawings made by the Architect including the proposed (i) site plan; (ii) ground floor plan; (iii) first floor plan; and (iv) cross-sections; (v) site masterplan; (vi) site planning submission; (vii) stage D scheme drawings; (viii) carpark layouts. However, no detail or specification was supplied on August 2002 (CAE, 2005; RIBA, 1999).

Earlier, the Architect submitted a Design Statement, dated 29 April 2002 which supported the application made by the Architect on behalf of National Waterfront Museum Swansea to the local authority (Wilkinson Eyre, 2002). Planning application was registered on the 27 April 2000, hence the Access Consultant appraisal was conducted after Stage C, sometime during Stage D as mentioned by the Access Consultant, "Centre for Accessible Environments were brought in between stages C and D" (section 9.2) Stage D is "application for full development control approval" (Table 4.1), whereby the issues on access were addressed at a time when the Architect had already completed a lot of decisions on the schematic design stage.

Later the drawings were updated on 22 October 2002 and on 12 December 2002, where another set of drawings was appraised, which included (i) additional detail discussed and another plan, the lift selection. However at this point, the detail on the stairs, WCs and environment were not available for appraisal. The Access Consultant conducted the final site audit on 23 March, 28 April and 31 August 2005, where the Access Group participated in 31 August 2005 which a group’s visit (CAE, 2005).

The main report is divided into 5 columns, where the drawing number and area is listed in the first column, a description of the audited elements is in the second column, and thereafter recommendations made earlier in August 2002, another set in December 2002 and finally the audit review (site visit) in March and August 2005 (CAE, 2005).
The following are the summary of findings based on the different elements audited in the building, outside of the building, external areas and in the landscaped area (Figures 9.7 and 9.8). The focus of the summaries is on the most recent outcome, where the Access Consultant audited the building and site in March and August 2005. The findings will be compared to the detached observation findings, made in November 2005 to be explained in Section 9.4

**External routes and approach/ Parking/ External landscape/ External areas to the museum building**

The audit focused on the (i) problems of wayfinding where more “visual, tactile and audible features were needed to identify the routes”; (ii) best practice of detailing the landscaped area, such as path edges to be more defined and noticeable; (iii) floor surface to be firmed rather than using loose gravel; (iv) benches with back rest and arms to be provided to lessen the burden of walking long distances; and (v) parking area being too far away about 100 metres. The parking problems were discussed at length and some provision for 4 cars were made at Burrows Place, a side entrance nearer to the museum. There were suggestions for link posts to be set 50 metres from each post to identify the route (CAE, 2005).

**Museum building/Refurbished existing museum building/ New building extension**

In the open court area: (i) the use of slate was raised as some users were confused into thinking that they are steps; (ii) railway tracks near Burrows Place having 100 mm gap which is too wide, however these historic tracks are of special interest (Figure 9.9); (iii) a lot of glass were used where manifestations are needed all around; (iv) low level of lighting outside and inside of the building in some places; (v) revolving doors needing manifestation; (vi) benches and tables of the same colour and no contrast; (vii) fixed seating at the café which is difficult to negotiate or not accessible at all; (viii) floor surface when wet is slippery; (ix) handrail at the upper floors does not continue to the wall thus creating gaps; and (x) manifestation needed in the internal glazing at the mezzanine floor (CAE, 2005).
Figure 9.8: The ground floor plan of the National Waterfront Museum, Swansea.

Figure 9.9: The first floor plan of the National Waterfront Museum, Swansea.
Figure 9.10: The cross-section of the National Waterfront Museum, Swansea shows the Grade 2 listed building on the right and the new building on the left.

Figure 9.11: The railway track lines on the external floor area is one of the special interest preserved and enhanced.
9.4 Detached Observation - analysis, findings and discussion

A detached observation method was used to observe the building's accessibility factor. The author used this method, recorded visually and commented using the checklist published by the Centre of Accessible Environments. The author is also a physically disabled person using crutches and is considered a physically disabled user.

Further analysis (Figure 9.22) revealed that the architectural design concept which followed the setting of the historic building to the dockside and using desired lines to generate the new design forces the new building and new extension to be in an angled form. The author analysed from the building's ground and first floor plans (Figures 9.8 and 9.9) that in terms of wayfinding and low levels of lighting there were a lot of funny angles and objects to negotiate for the partially sighted and non sighted people and also problems for wheelchair users (Table 9.10) as quoted, "You take our practice walking through the sharp edges," and "You know the big display they have - I have hurt myself twice. It was dark."
Table 9.11: Main problems on accessibility identified based on the detached observation method using an Access Audit checklist by CAE, done on the National Waterfront Museum, Swansea on 22nd November 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items audited</th>
<th>Main Problems Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach, routes and street furniture</td>
<td>Fairly straight-forward approach but it is quite far to walk from the main car parking area which is about 100 metres away. Way finding problems as NWMS building is not easily recognisable from a distance coming from the main car parking area. (Figure 9.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>Detail of street furniture may impede those who are partially sighted or non-sighted, such as grating around trees are open and edges of the planting area not noticeable enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External ramps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External steps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrances</td>
<td>Problem with revolving doors, lack of manifestation. Side door need to be operated and is not automatic. Push button is needed. (Figure 9.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception areas and lobbies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors</td>
<td>Problem with colonnade plinth base as Dave Croft who was partially sighted complained about tripping over them a few times, however there is contrast on the colonnade against the floor and brick wall (Figure 9.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal doors</td>
<td>Some glazed internal doors on the 1st floor gallery area in the listed building have no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal ramps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal stairs</td>
<td>Main staircase is skewered at an angle and difficult to use. For a crutch user, it is difficult to go on steps at angles. (Figure 9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform lifts and stairlifts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCs: general provision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCs: wheelchair users</td>
<td>Tight space inside. Difficult to lock and unlock door independently by wheelchair user. Fittings such as door’s horizontal bar are not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal surfaces</td>
<td>Floor surface are quite slippery if wet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Café facilities using benches not easy to use, however the solution they provided at the sides makes it accessible to sit and eat although you do not have many choices. (Figure 9.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Wayfinding problem is of concern for partially sighted and non sighted people especially externally. (Figure 9.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Low lighting (Figure 9.19 and 9.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td>Acoustic not good as when there are large crowds of people, it is noisy. (9.16 and 9.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of escape</td>
<td>EVAC chairs are provided but disabled people interviewed were not confident of their use. Fire stairs leads to the outside of the building are not enclosed and have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External area</td>
<td>External stairs that were not enclosed outside have safety issues for partially sighted people as there is no warning that the stairs are there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

open risers.
Figure 9.12: View of the external area from the main car park area approaching towards NWMS. At the left is the Leisure Centre.

Figure 9.13: View from the first floor level of the new building looking down at the lobby area and the set of revolving doors.
Figure 9.14: View looking down from the first floor level at the reception counter.

Figure 9.15: Corridor and lobby area shows the new column and old column side by side.
Figure 9.16: The brick pier of the listed building in front of the main stairs seen from the lobby area.

Figure 9.17: Exhibits and banners shown in the area where old and new meets, with the main staircase behind. The exit to the waterfront can be seen from the lobby.
Figure 9.18: The void created to link the ground and 1st floors and create a double volume space. View of the roof trusses of the listed building can be seen from the ground floor.

Figure 9.19: View of the corridor off the first floor galleries in the listed building.
Figure 9.20: View of the café area from the first floor level showing the table and benches configuration.

Figure 9.21: Exhibition space in the first floor level of the listed building.
Figure 9.22: Conceptual Design Analysis by the Author showing the site planning of the new extension referred to the existing historic and listed building and the waterfront and the desired lines created by the railway tracks with reference to the city. The shape of the extension followed the shape of the former old railway tracks. (This diagram was reconstructed from the published plan by the author as a way to analyse design).
9.5. Summary

The Conclusion for the Single Case Study which is the research method used to validate the findings will be interpreted and finalised in the conclusion chapter (Chapter 10) where each hypothesis will be addressed against the final summaries from this chapter. The case study was used to validate all the mechanisms in both the reactive and proactive process, as this multi-method approach would be suitable to validate the previous findings from the Delphi study and Interview study which was either more towards either reactive or proactive. The following are findings found in this chapter.

9.5.1. Research Question 1

The pattern from the Interview method summaries in Chapter 8 showed strongly that reasonable adjustment is an effective mechanism.

In this study, access requirements that were proposed in the NWMS project were believe to have influenced the decision on how the special interests were preserved.

“Access appraisal recommendations, progress reports and meeting reports, in addition to correspondence on design, were provided to inform the client decision on what was/is reasonable” (Section 9.2). Reasonable adjustments require a process of negotiation and compromise where in this case study it was shown that the client wanted to engage issues on access with an Access Group as well, although it was started after stages C/D (Table 4.1).

An access group member felt that the listed building was not an issue impeding access. The case study findings showed that (Chapter 9; Table 9.10; Section 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4):

- The accessible toilet was not accessible in the listed building part.
- Railway tracks near Burrows Place having 100 mm gap which is too wide, however these historic tracks are of special interest
- Low level of lighting outside and inside of the building in some places
• Problem with colonnade plinth base as an access advisory group member who was partially sighted complained about tripping over the old column plinth base a few times.

Although, evidence from the case study showed that some interviewees believed that the DDA was not considered in the development control process, the reasoning was flawed as reasonable adjustments although commenced in 2004, was about services provision that should be anticipated earlier. The Access Group being used after the building completed in 2005 because the DDA’s reasonable adjustment implications were not anticipated earlier by the consultants and even confirmed by the Building Control Officer and the Architect / Urban Designer in the conservation department doubted its influence (Table 9.5). This resulted in the client having to provide time and money to changes and alterations to what had been constructed earlier.

There is evidence to support the case study to validate the argument that there is: The lack of interpretation and definition perceived about Reasonable Adjustments in the development process of historic and listed public buildings.

9.5.2. Research Question 2

The case study findings showed that Part M 1999 were used as stated by the different interviewees, however when investigated in situ and probed with interviewees with the users, Part M’s usage and other building regulations such those dealing with means of escape requirements were felt to be unsatisfactory. Many building elements were not fully Part M compliant such fire staircases for emergency, historic column plinth base, way finding for people with vision impairments, tight spaces around the building for wheelchair users, counter height which was originally not low enough, car parking space for disabled people which was quite far away about 100 metres and the accessible toilet which was not accessible when the building was opened to public.
Part M non compliant issues were also quoted in the CAE Audit and detached observation findings as well. For example, in the observation, the angled main staircase under the void were allowed to be constructed based on the architectural design but in terms of practicality went against Part M and the standards.

In the single case study findings the Access Officer was not involved in the planning control and building control processes as the officer’s role was confined to only dealing with policies. The Building Control Officer was the controlling officer for Part M Building Regulation on the NWMS project. In conclusion for the case study, the Access Officer not being able to be part of the development control process made her function ineffective or limited in this respect. The Access Consultant undertook many of the job specifications of the Access Officer in the development control process namely to facilitate and manage the access group consultations with the architect and other consultants and also wrote access audit reports.

The Access Consultant being a specialist in museum design also fulfilled that role as it was summarized earlier that the access officers either could be replaced by others such as access consultant or need proper training to deal with historic buildings and conservation. Hence for both summaries, it was proven by the case study that there is a lack of influence Access Officers have in their function in the development control process for historic and listed public buildings.

There is evidence to support the case study to validate the argument that there are:

1. Part M Building Regulation lack of influence in decision-making process to incorporate access requirements for historic and listed public buildings in the development control process.

2. The lack of influence Access Officers have in their function in the development control process for historic and listed public buildings.
9.5.3. Research Question 3

The case study project did not have an Access Officer working in development control at the time and the Access Consultant only started work at a later stage between Stages C and D (RIBA, 1999), which meant that from stages A to C, access requirements were not being addressed as a whole. These stages included:

Stage A: Appraisal Identification of Client's requirements and possible constraints on development. Preparation of studies to enable the Client to decide whether to proceed and to select probable procurement method.

Stage B: Strategic Briefing Preparation of Strategic Brief by, or on behalf of, the client confirming key requirements and constraints. Identification of procedures, organisational structure and range of consultants and others to be engaged for the project.


(RIBA, 1999; Table 4.1)

The Access Plan was not incorporated much earlier as the findings for the case study revealed. 4 out of the 6 interviewees confirmed that an Access audit was completed by the Access Consultant. However, the Access Audit commenced on 24 August 2002, whereas the outlined planning permission was given in June 2000 and the initial design and basic framework for project was completed in the year 2001, where the “basic rules and general planning were set up a long time before, addressing the extension to the historic listed building and aligning to the city and the waterfront” (Knight, 2004) (Figure 9.22)
The Access Audit was done more than two years after the planning permission, which explained that there was no input on the drawings while other commitments were made in stages A, B and C, as stated earlier. The Access Consultant added that ‘many decisions were already made prior to appointment of an Access Consultant.’

The Access Consultant completed several drafts of report with access auditing elements but essentially it was a Design Appraisal Report rather than an Access Audit report on the existing building. A Design Appraisal Report is based on reviewing the architect’s and consultants’ drawings.

‘Access Audit was for Design Appraisal after stages C/D but not done prior to that’ was quoted in the report. Any auditing results were not used in the Management Plan. This means that the Listed Building Consent requirements for a Conservation Assessment were not given input on access issues.

However, this case study reiterated the importance of Access Planning by the insistence of the local access group, who volunteered to have the building as accessible as possible, as stated, “Access Audit was done on the completed building before handover to the client by the Access Consultant and there were also other access audits done”.

The Access Group representative felt that their input during the after Stages C/ D and during the Construction Process were not taken into consideration as quoted, “(The access group) came about 3 years ago, straight after the planning, because we made so many complaints on the planning application. And the complaints made in the planning application still weren’t dealt with.”

There was a change in terms of management and as a result of the access group’s input on the displeasure of the not getting there message across the disabled people’s group was continued after the building was opened to public. A post of Access Officer has been created to address access and outreach.
The measures that the client took to provide for accessibility and usability of the facilities provided after the building was opened to public are (i) Access Review; (ii) Access Awareness and Training for the staff as the Access Plan was never incorporated earlier. When interviewed in October 2005 after the building was completed the Access Consultant confirmed that “The team now managing and running the museum is a different team to that involved in development and design of the building and displays. An Access Plan has yet to be fully developed by the museum. However, the commitment to do so is positive.”

The case study validate that the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms resulted in poorly designed or non accessible historic and listed public buildings particularly with regards to the Access Plan not being used in the beginning of the project.
CHAPTER 10
Conclusion and Implications

10.1. Conclusions on research questions 1, 2 and 3

At this juncture, it is worthwhile to reiterate the three research questions that made up the backbone of this thesis, as follows:

1. Research Question 1 posed the theoretical question by reviewing the practice of conservation in general, investigating the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of conservation policies and practice and how the recent introduction of accessibility and inclusive design legislation and policies influences conservation practice.

2. Research Question 2 probed the development control process’s policies translated into implementation. The planning control and building control processes’ mechanisms relating to the implementation of the regulatory framework executed within the local authorities and the influences of the regulatory framework on the practice of conservation.

3. Research Question 3 probed further the area between policies and practice relating to the proactive process of non development control by examining in detail the recommended guidance and mechanisms by English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments which is the Access Planning Process (Figure 4.1).

The summaries of findings for the investigations (Delphi method, survey method using interviews and the case study) of each research question are given as follows.
10.1.1. Research Question 1

The practice of conservation and the recent policy changes involving the accessibility and inclusive agenda governing historic buildings were examined and the impact of both the conservation and accessibility legislation and policies on disabled people’s rights to access and services of historic and listed public buildings were probed by examining the impact made by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA 1995).

The research conducted found evidence that the impact of the DDA 1995 was far reaching and the mechanism in the legislative framework, which is the term and process called Reasonable Adjustments was effective from the view point of the proactive process’s participants, but however was controversial in its acceptance in the reactive process. This is not so much that the functional mechanisms, the Access officers and some of the Building Control officers were totally against it but because of the lack of interpretation and definition perceived about Reasonable Adjustments. The reason why there is the lack of interpretation does not lie in the DDA 1995’s code of practice Part 3, but the expectations of disabled people and those representing disabled people’s needs, hopes and aspiration on equal access to the built heritage. Reasonable adjustments could be interpreted and even sanctioned by law by giving a justifiable excuse not to implement the desired inclusive experience of a historic public building, hence the discrepancy in definition (DRC, 2006).

10.1.1.1 Delphi findings

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the Practice of Conservation highly influenced the mechanisms of the reactive processes in development control. Conservation was regarded as being more important where the DDA was regarded as having a weak enforcement of accessibility legislation where it was quoted that “conservation has a greater argument as it concerns historical preservation” and “listing a building is a valid excuse for not including disabled people’s needs or the very minimum provision is made” (Section 7.2.8).
There is a perception of importance regarding historic buildings to anything else as being secondary to the aesthetics and significance aspects, where the special interest of the historic building is of the utmost importance. "Listed buildings cannot be treated in the same way as other buildings" and "historic buildings should remain as they were originally created, irrespective of access or any other issues", "conservation is important and access can be managed to fit around it", and "planning and listed building legislation allows a strong line to be taken" (Section 7.2.8) were quoted to reinforce this perception.

This attitude cannot be forced to change unless being challenged with a stronger legislation mechanism rather than reasonable adjustments. The duty set upon the service providers included “to provide a reasonable alternative method of making the service in question available to disabled persons” (DRC, 2006), if there is no way to remove or alter the barrier. Although it was in force from 1 October 1999, there are “no such prescriptive regulations made in support,” (Doyle, 2008). Therefore, compared to the conservation legislation, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the DDA 1995 does not provide a clear prescriptive guidance which is only to be subjected to interpretation in a court of law, rather than the local authority’s regulative framework.

Whereas for the 1990 Act, it clearly stated in Section 7 that, “No person shall execute or cause to be executed any works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, unless the works are authorised” (ODPM, 2005c), which is considered decisive and prescriptive, to be acted by the Listed Building Consent control mechanisms.

10.1.1.2 Interview findings

The issues on legislation stated with reference to reasonable adjustments that: historic buildings require both design and management solutions which needs to fit with one another; historic buildings that are small or with tight spaces may need alternative means to services rather than physical access; management and services operations become
more important when using a historic building; technical solutions using equipment such as lifts and stair lifts may have visual impacts and reasonable adjustments help the conservation side by bringing in alternative means and negotiation in design solution. The patterns from the statements in the interview findings showed strongly that reasonable adjustment is an effective mechanism being a process to interpret the DDA 1995’s codes of practice.

As explained and compared to the Delphi study summary, the proactive actors of architects, conservation architects and access consultants contradict in opinion on the use of the reasonable adjustment’s process with the local authority officers, namely the Access officers and some of the Building Control officers. The argument given in Section 10.1.1.1 stated that the DDA 1995 was not prescriptive and lack in clarity with regards to the decision-making process, and this in turn affected the conservation practice and the approach that the proactive actors could undertake. The lack of physical access could be compensated by having better communicational access where virtual representations of displays in un-accessible levels of a historical premise would be sufficient to fulfil the duty of the service provider according to the DDA 1995. The arguments between different parties would be lessened and compromises made early.

10.1.1.3 Case study findings

The pattern from the Interview summaries showed strongly that reasonable adjustments is an effective mechanism. The single case study validated some of the previous Interview summaries that showed strongly, where reasonable adjustment is an effective mechanism with the following findings.

Access requirements that were proposed in the National Waterfront Museum Swansea project were believed to have influenced the decision on how the special interests were preserved where it was quoted, “These (special interest) were preserved by careful placement of new build adjacent to the existing building, linked internally” (Section 9.2) and details executed such as the contrast on the colonnade against the floor and brick wall
(Section 9.4). This is in keeping with the Interview summary where 'historic buildings require both design and management solution needs to fit with one another confirmed with the case study.'

"Access appraisal recommendations, progress reports and meeting reports, in addition to correspondence on design, were provided to inform the client decision on what was/is reasonable" (Section 9.2). This referred to the Interview summary where reasonable adjustments help the conservation side by bringing in alternative means and negotiation in design solution. Reasonable adjustments require a process of negotiation and compromise as stated in the Delphi study finding quoted that, "in our organization there is a clear respect for the historic fabric of the listed building and all efforts are made by the persons involved to ensure that the access provision is a reasonable compromise" (Table 7.4), which agree with the case study finding.

An access group member felt that the listed building was not an issue impeding access. The quote is referred to the Interview summary where historic buildings require both design and management solutions which needs to fit with one another and the Delphi study finding was quoted that, "it is finding a balance. People who have access issues appreciate the historic environment. However it is important that these structures are accessible to all" (Table 7.4).

The previous three paragraphs showed the argument for reasonable adjustments, but there were findings to support the lack of interpretation and definition perceived about reasonable adjustments.

The case study findings showed that (Chapter 9; Table 9.10; Section 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4):

- The accessible toilet was not accessible in the listed building part.
- Railway tracks near Burrows Place having 100 mm gap which is too wide, however these historic tracks are of special interest.
- Low level of lighting outside and inside of the building in some places.
• Problem with colonnade plinth base as an access advisory group member who was partially sighted complained about tripping over the old column plinth base a few times.

Reasonable adjustment is a process mechanism needing interpretation and negotiating skills to arrive at an accepted solution, but the findings in the Delphi study showed an overwhelming show of opinion from some of the local authority officers that the process could be interpreted to only mean a compromise or even minimum standards. Although this research did not investigate training of the access officers, the findings significantly showed that the function of the Access Officer, which will be elaborated further in Section 10.1.2), requires to have a sense of ownership, where ownership here means the bargaining power to negotiate or the right to negotiate and get a desired result.

Clearly, the interpretive element of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 is not enforceable in a regulative way and is difficult to implement with limited influence to conservation practice as issues regarding historic listed building where those that have more authority are the conservation and planning officers, whereas the role of access officers and building control officers, where the latter is not designated in the planning offices, are used when available rather than be an instrumental function in the decision-making process on accessibility issues.

Although, evidence from the case study showed that some interviewees believed that the DDA 1995 was not considered in the development control process, the reasoning was flawed as reasonable adjustments although commenced in 2004, was about services provision that should be anticipated earlier. Why was the Access Group being used after the building completed in 2005? That was because the DDA 1995’s reasonable adjustment implications were not anticipated earlier by the consultants and even confirmed by the Building Control Officer and the Architect / Urban Designer in the conservation department doubted its influence (Table 9.5). This resulted in the client having to provide time and money to changes and alterations to what had been constructed earlier.
The fact that reasonable adjustments forces conflicts to be solved by the court of law was quoted here, “no determination or definition has yet been provided to explain what reasonable might be. The final arbiter of this would be the courts,” (Table 7.6) and “there are no enforcement provisions in the DDA 1995 other than that individuals can take a person or company to court if they believe they have been discriminated against” (Table 7.17)

Thus the case study validated the argument that there is:

The lack of interpretation and definition perceived about Reasonable Adjustments in the development process of historic and listed public buildings.

10.1.2. Research Question 2

The planning control and building control processes were examined in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms that enforce the regulation dealing with accessibility and conservation combined. Further examination on the effectiveness of the implementation of these mechanisms were conducted whereby the role of officers in planning control and building control process were investigated when addressing the access needs of disabled people, in local authorities in England and Wales, focusing on Approved Document Part M Building Regulations and the Access Officers in the development control process.

Part M Building Regulation lack influence in the decision-making process to incorporate access requirements to historic and listed public buildings

10.1.2.1. Delphi Findings

The refusal of four officers to answer the question on Part M in Round 1 of the Delphi study gave an indication of possible conflicting opinions regarding the use of Part M to incorporate access requirements in historic buildings. In Section 7.4.4, it was conclusive
that Part M's influence is not conclusive. It became apparent that the Access Statement was a very much sought after mechanism to assist in implementing access requirements with reference to Part M Building Regulations, which a number of access officers and building control officers had hoped for. Building regulations is not referred to in the Planning Control departments although planning and conservation officers generally anticipate Part M has to be discussed earlier in planning approval and listed building consent (Section 7.4.1). Access statement had been quoted often and regarded to be the 'missing' mechanism that could positively interpret Part M into the development control process. However, the research to examine the effectiveness of Access Statements could not be done due to the fact that it was used officially in 2006, which is four years after the start of this thesis. This further explained in Section 10.1.2 and 10.1.3.

The DDA 1995 was suggested to have more impact, with a quote that he or she "fears that Part M will have little impact on listed buildings due to uncertainty of what is deemed reasonable," which focused back to the argument of integrating Part M and DDA 1995's requirements together. Another side to the discussion is enhanced by the quote that, "Part M will depend on the relative strengths of opinion or influence within each local authority. Those with strong access cultures will tend to use it as a stick to improve facilities. Those without that culture will tend to only do as much as they need to in order to fulfil their responsibilities." This pointed to the decision-making process using Part M and its lack of influence, which will be discussed in issue on the Role of the Access Officer.

10.1.2.2. Interview findings

From the interview findings, Part M was regarded as: either not referred to or deemed not applicable when dealing with conservation practice and listed building control; not enough reference and need other mechanisms to achieve better control and good practice; is general and about minimum standards and eventually the architects and those in the proactive process need to come up with the solution; and provides for a reference to consultants and access requirements raised need to be address. These findings suggest
that Part M is a guide rather than a procedure that is documented and prescribed with legal influence. This interview conclusion on Part M showed that Part M on its own is not effective as it is just a regulatory guide and any advice on Part M could be disregarded in the development control’s decision-making process on historic buildings. The following direct quotes from the interviewees will reinforce this point: “Part M is probably subservient to listed building control. In other words if English Heritage says we are not going to knock those steps away to make it level, because we have duties in relating to the conservation, where it over-rides the duties in accessibility,” and “Part M is a difficult thing to apply and the principle has to be the presumption that you try to implement the requirements of Part M in everything you do, but when things such as handrail heights, handrail design, you can’t alter grand staircases like Walker art gallery in Liverpool, simply because it doesn’t comply” (Table 8.11).

10.1.2.3 Case study findings

From the Delphi study and Interviews, the prevailing opinions concluded so far that Part M on its own is not effective as just as a regulatory guide to ensure that access requirements are ‘followed’ by the client and consultant in the development control’s decision-making process on historic buildings.

The case study findings showed that Part M 1999 were used as stated by the different interviewees, however when investigated in situ and probed with interviewees with the users, Part M’s usage and other building regulations such those dealing with means of escape requirements were felt to be unsatisfactory. Many building elements were not fully Part M compliant such fire staircases for emergency, historic column plinth base, way finding for people with vision impairments, tight spaces around the building for wheelchair users, counter height which was originally not low enough, car parking space for disabled people which was quite far away about 100 metres and the accessible toilet which was not accessible when the building was opened to public.
Part M non compliant issues were also quoted in the CAE Audit and detached observation findings as well. For example, in the observation, the angled main staircase under the void were allowed to be constructed based on the architectural design but in terms of practicality went against Part M and the standards. The issue with Part M as stated even in the Delphi study was that the ineffectiveness was with the listed buildings compliance, and less so with new buildings. The negotiation part decreases the capacity of Part M to be a procedure. Part M is not a process, nor is it a function yet. So as a guide Part M will need a partnering mechanism to make it more functional, thus more effective.

Part M’s main issue is not Part M as a guide but rather the enforcement of Part M for historic buildings. For architects that used inclusive design principles as their design guide, the outcome would be of no consequence, but for those who negotiate for would compromise for minimum standards then there will be an unsatisfactory outcome. The case study validated that Part M Building Regulation lack influence in decision-making process to incorporate access requirements to historic buildings, which will be further proved in the next section on the Role of Access Officers.

The lack of influence Access Officers have in their function in the development control process for historic and listed public buildings.

Part M 2004 stated that: “In arriving at an appropriate balance between historic building conservation and accessibility, it would be appropriate to take into account the advice of the local authority’s conservation and access officers, and English Heritage or CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments, as well as the views of local access groups, in order to make the building as accessible as possible” (ODPM, 2004). The research on Access Officer could be further taken into account the training aspects and other inquiries, however for this research, it is the function of the Access Officer in relation to enforcing the Building Regulations which has been identified and investigated. The following research summaries conclude this part of the research.

10.1.2.4. Delphi study findings
Role of officers in planning control and building control process when addressing the needs of disabled people in local authorities in England and Wales showed that the Conservation Officer to be the most important or equally important to the other officers, including the Access Officers (Sections 7.2.2 and 7.4.5). The role of the local authority officers and their many functions require making decisions and interpretation of the legislative and regulative mechanisms. One of the main research objectives is to review the local authority officers' function, in particular, the Access Officer's function. Although the Role of the Access Officer was specified to be tested, the role of the Conservation and Planning Officer becomes more important in implementing Accessibility in Historic Buildings as especially the former is the main point of reference in the Listed Building Control process.

Referring to Section 7.3.7, where other than the access officers, other officers thought that access officers should not be given a specific function such as doing access audit, recommending access solutions and doing access statement, but more of advice or reviews or comments or make aware of access problems during meetings and discussions. Access officers may articulate well in describing the problems on the implementation of access requirement and Part M, however they are not established in the decision-making process for listed buildings. All the access officers interviewed stated that they are not more influential than the planning and conservation officers, so with this perception, the final decisions in the process would fall to the planning and conservation officers rather than the access officers and building control officers.

10.1.2.5. Interviews findings

In the findings of this chapter, we found that the access officer ideally besides raising awareness of access issues should be able to facilitate the process of consultation with access groups. However other findings suggested that the access officer were considered redundant in cases where expertise is needed or better skills at negotiating decisions on
historic buildings as consultants and conservation officers would be sufficient to deal with access issues; and access officers could either be replaced by others such as access consultant or need proper training to deal with historic buildings and conservation. Direct quotes to emphasis the summary is that, “generally access officers are very concern about an access argument, but because of this to do with historic buildings their difficulty is in understanding the weight on the other side of the argument,” and “Yes, if we are doing our job right, he (the access officer) is not needed is he?” This resonated with the Delphi study’s conclusion that the Access Officers’ role lack influence when it concerns historic and listed public buildings.

10.1.2.6. Case Study findings

In the single case study findings the Access Officer was not involved in the planning control and building control processes as the officer’s role was confined to only dealing with policies. The Building Control Officer was the controlling officer for Part M Building Regulation on the NWMS project. In conclusion for the case study, the Access Officer not being able to be part of the development control process made her function ineffective or limited in this respect.

The finding in the Interview Method confirmed with the finding in the case study where in the interview, consultants and conservation officers would be sufficient to deal with access issues and access officers (function) would be redundant. Hence, the case study clearly proved that the summary is valid, in this study with regards to the consultant’s role. The Access Consultant undertook many of the job specifications of the Access Officer in the development control process namely to facilitate and manage the access group consultations with the architect and other consultants and also wrote access audit reports.

The Access Consultant being a specialist in museum design also fulfilled that role as it was summarized earlier that the access officers either could be replaced by others such as access consultant or need proper training to deal with historic buildings and conservation.
Hence for both summaries, it was proven by the case study that there is a lack of influence Access Officers have in their function in the development control process for historic and listed public buildings.

The case study for research question 2 validated both findings on:

- Part M Building Regulation lack of influence in decision-making process to incorporate access requirements for historic and listed public buildings in the development control process.
- The lack of influence Access Officers have in their function in the development control process for historic and listed public buildings.

10.1.3. Research Question 3

The Access Planning Process that includes the processes of Access Strategy, Access Audit and Access Plan exist in the development process of a historic and listed public building in England or Wales. An examination of the policies and guidance published by English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments in order develop the incorporation of access for disabled people were conducted by investigating Best Practice on guidance and the Access Plan.

Negotiation is regarded to be a common exercise in the decision-making process of development control. Part M is regarded as minimum requirements to solving access problems for existing buildings and may not always work well on historic buildings where flexibility in the design approach and access solutions are needed.

Best Practice Guidance would come from two main sources: Part M and BS8300 or English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments’ guidance are in the form of a publication with guided advice. The perspective of guidance is beyond the published document, where the interpretation of the guidance would be felt in the practicalities of design and conservation of the historic and listed public building.
English Heritage publication in both the 1995 and 2004 versions illustrated diagrams of the guided work processes that form parts of the development process and how it should undertake. The Access Planning Process’s (APP) definition in this thesis refers to a generic process, which constitutes the 3 processes of Access Strategy, Access Audit and Access Plan and the work process guidance by English Heritage (Figure 4.1). Hence, in the research, APP is always referred to with regards to the data collection procedures. The lack of consultation processes and mechanisms resulted in poorly designed accessible historic and listed public buildings.

10.1.3.1. Delphi findings

The main research question (Chapter 1) posed the question: Does the importance of Conservation take precedence over the importance of Accessibility in the process of developing a Historic and Listed Public Building, from the design stage until completion and post-occupancy? Hence, with the Delphi Method, it was meant to facilitate the discussion and conflicting opinions with regards to the 'Conservation Practice versus Accessibility'.

How does the debate contribute to the understanding of the finding on the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms? The debate relates to the understanding of what building conservation is and the constituents that make a good building as oppose to a bad building. These constituents are the processes and mechanisms that is lacking as a result of a poorly designed or non accessible building.

The knowledge of the process or the Access Planning Process would be helpful for the local authority officers concern when dealing with applications for listed building consent, planning approval and building control approvals. The Delphi Method findings showed that when asked about the Access Plan, only one Building Control Officer could describe the access plan as a result of the audit. Amongst the access officers and building control officers, they were not able to make a connection between the Access Audit and Access Plan as in section 7.4.1, access officers responses showed that the majority were
involved with the Access Audit, Access Plan and Access Strategy also emphasised that Access Strategy need to state qualifications of the person to progress, presumably with the application.

Although the officers mentioned about improvements to a building using plans, proposals, schemes or projection as the method, Access Planning is more than that. This ignorance of not knowing exactly was Access Planning is reflective in the findings where the officers articulated the problem of lack of consultation and mechanisms but could not really put a finger to it. The findings revealed the lack of design expertise and building aesthetics more important where it was quoted that “training should be made on how to make buildings accessible without ruining it” and “the excessive use of ramps will spoil the appearance of some listed buildings” (Section 7.2.8). Hence, the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms could either be due to the lack of knowledge and understanding regarding how the Access Audit could be integrated in the Access Plan or the lack of understanding how the Access Plan could be useful in the greater scheme of the conservation project.

10.1.3.2. Interview findings

The group of architects, conservation architects and access consultants were unanimous in their opinion of best practice, where: guidance for best practice requires access issues be consulted by various parties to the process of access planning; English Heritage and CADW as the authors of guidance for best practice is the proper bodies of reference to ensure conservation tenets are upheld; guidance should encompass all the stages in the design process including management and operations issues after building completion; and guidance should allow for check and balances to rectify the possible inconsistencies of the system.

If compared to the Delphi study findings, it resonated with the lack of consultation processes and mechanism that could be addressed by having best practice. Hence, both the findings from the two methods are conclusive in stating that guidance is an effective
mechanism. However, the issue of guidance need to be probe further and this point, guidance, such as the published document is just a guide and is not as strong as either: a procedure, a function or a process, so the 'how to make it more effective' issue would need to be addressed. Also, the guide is more of a strategic mechanism whereas the process recommended in the guide which is the Access Planning Process that includes the three processes mentioned earlier could implement the guide's aims and the philosophical ideal of conservation and accessibility merged together. Knowledge of best practice would need to be widely shared and made known among those practising conservation.

The issue of the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms was addressed by the findings on the Access Plan it was stated: Access plan has to be process driven in order to work and is done step by step; work together with different requirements; access to be addressed as part of the whole process of conservation; and access as part of project's brief and guidelines.

The Access Planning Process is a specialized knowledge area, which if not properly trained, the person will not be able to understand. "We do an access audit (with either the access consultant or access officer), that's the first step. Then we do a conservation plan and a conservation statement. So at least all the problems are outlined and you got a plan of attack on what's to be done. And then it's a question of everybody sitting down and trying to find the best solution" (Table 8.1). Even among access consultants, there are a few experts on historic buildings.

10.1.3.3. Case study findings

The case study project did not have an Access Officer working in development control at the time and the Access Consultant only started work at a later stage between Stages C and D (RIBA, 2005), which meant that from stages A to C, access requirements was not being addressed properly. These stages included:
Stage A: Appraisal Identification of Client's requirements and possible constraints on development. Preparation of studies to enable the Client to decide whether to proceed and to select probable procurement method.

Stage B: Strategic Briefing Preparation of Strategic Brief by, or on behalf of, the client confirming key requirements and constraints. Identification of procedures, organisational structure and range of consultants and others to be engaged for the project.


(RIBA, 2005; Table 4.1)

The Access Plan was not incorporated much earlier as the findings for the case study revealed. 4 out of the 6 interviewees confirmed that an Access audit was completed by the Access Consultant. However, the Access Audit commenced on 24 August 2002, whereas the outlined planning permission was given in June 2000 and the initial design and basic framework for project was completed in the year 2001, where the “basic rules and general planning were set up a long time before, addressing the extension to the historic listed building and aligning to the city and the waterfront” (Knight, 2004) The Access Audit was done more than two years after the planning permission, which explained that there was no input on the drawings while other commitments were made in stages A, B and C, as stated earlier. The Access Consultant added that ‘many decisions were already made prior to appointment of an Access Consultant.’

The Access Consultant completed several drafts of report with access auditing elements but essentially it was a Design Appraisal Report as was quoted ‘Access Audit was for Design Appraisal after stages C/D but not done prior to that’. Any auditing results were not used in the Management Plan. This means that the Listed Building Consent requirements for a Conservation Assessment were not given input on access issues.
However, this case study reiterated the importance of Access Planning by the insistence of the local access group, who volunteered to have the building as accessible as possible, as stated, “Access Audit was done on the completed building before handover to the client by the Access Consultant and there were also other access audits done”. Hence, there Access Audit and Conservation Assessment actually would have bore a direct influence the final outcome of the Access Plan and thus influencing the Access Planning Process of the building’s accessibility performance.

The Access Group representative felt that their input during the after Stages C/ D and during the Construction Process were not taken into consideration as quoted, “(The access group) came about 3 years ago, straight after the planning, because we made so many complaints on the planning application. And the complaints made in the planning application still weren’t dealt with.”

There was a change in terms of management of the National Waterfront Museum Swansea project and as a result of the access group’s input and the displeasure of the not getting there message across, the disabled people’s group was continued by the management even after the building was opened to public. A post of Access Officer was then created to address access and outreach.

The measures that the client took to provide for accessibility and usability of the facilities provided after the building was opened to public are (i) Access Review; (ii) Access Awareness and Training for the staff as the Access Plan was never incorporated earlier. When interviewed in October 2005 after the building was completed, the Access Consultant confirmed that, “the team now managing and running the museum is a different team to that involved in development and design of the building and displays. An Access Plan has yet to be fully developed by the museum. However, the commitment to do so is positive” (Table 9.9)
The case study validated the point that the lack of consultation processes and mechanisms resulted in poorly designed accessible historic and listed public buildings particularly with regards to the Access Plan not being used in the beginning of the project.

10.1.4 A summary of the conclusions

The policies and practice of conservation have an influence on the accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales (Hypothesis 1 relating to Research Question 1).

Although the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 was introduced with its code of practice to ensure the rights of disabled people to services and goods (DRC, 2006), the impact was not as far reaching as the findings of this research is concerned, as conservation legislation and conservation practice were regarded to be more decisive and prescriptive in meeting its objectives and agenda in comparison. The UK Government’s proposed Heritage Reform Bill 2008 revealed the complexity of the problem which lies in the implementation of development control to historic buildings. The Select Committee from the House of Commons identified the function of the local authority officers, especially the conservation officers as a crucial factor to make the reform work (House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, 2008). DDA 1995 provided the mechanism of reasonable adjustments, a legislative process to interpret the problem and provide the corrective measure and get the desired result and solution to the problem, however reasonable adjustments is not prescriptive. Reasonable adjustment would only enable the case to be decided by the court of law and not via the local authority control regime.

The planning control and building control processes influence accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales (Hypothesis 2 relating to Research Question 2).

Part M Building Regulation and Access officers were both found to be lacking in influence, the former as a guide and the latter as a function in the development control
process on ensuring for accessibility of historic and listed public buildings. The research findings showed that the Access Consultant function was more influential than the Access Officer when advising on historic buildings. Additionally, the Access Statement which is a procedure (CABE, 2006; Denbighshire County Council, 2008; Cyngor Gwynedd Council, 2008), to implement the regulative mechanism needed to address the one-sidedness situation where Conservation is placed to be of more importance than Accessibility.

The findings also showed that the conservation officers to be the most important group in implementing accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales, and the need to address how conservation officers would enable to do that, need considerable working out of the problem. As with the earlier report by the House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee (2008), the concerns for heritage reform to be successful is with regards to costs and resources at hand, mirrored by the quote, “we recommend that the Government ensures that there are sufficient staff with the necessary skills, in particular conservation officers in local authorities, to successfully implement the Bill”.

The Listed Building Consent is part of the planning control and building control processes where the Conservation Plan is a procedure used in implementing PPG15 and the relevant Welsh circulars, the policy guidance relating to the 1990 Act. The two procedures, Access Statement and Conservation Plan could both be incorporated together in the Access Planning Process of a historic and listed public building’s development control process, thus placing the responsibility more on the conservation officer. In this case, the heritage reform needs to be planned well for this integration of different needs to be successful and influential.

The processes to implement accessibility are effective within the practice of conservation (Hypothesis 3 relating to Research Question 3).
The Access Planning Process in its most recent form was introduced by English Heritage (2004) where the constituents of Access Audit and conservation assessment directly influence the final outcome of the Access Plan (Figure 4.1) Even the 1995 version (revised 2003) reflected similar important relationship between the access audit and final access plan. The guidance provided by English Heritage and CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments provided sufficient evidence of the importance to include access into historic buildings. However, this research showed that the reactive process participants from development control are not aware of the Access Planning Process and the importance of access audit with regards to creating an access plan. The proactive process participants on the other hand are aware of this development as the guidance created by English Heritage and CADW were targeted at the clients, service providers and their consultants.

This research showed that the processes to implement accessibility are not effective within the practice of conservation as notably the proactive process participants are aware but not the reactive side. This one sided situation should be rectified by targeting the guidance to inform the reactive process participants, especially the conservation officers. At the same time, more effort to encourage access consultants to be specialist in historic buildings would create a pool of experts in the area. Hence the ready knowledge and good practice works would be the norm rather than the exception.

10.2 Implications for policy and practice

In this policy-relevant thesis, the findings also revealed implications in conservation practice. Conservation importance takes precedence over the importance of Accessibility in many ways, although Accessibility is placed with some importance. This is the main result of the findings from a triangulated study using a Single Case study to validate the Survey method using Interview findings and Delphi Method findings conducted on the Development Control Process in England and Wales.
As mentioned earlier in Chapter 6, the mechanisms investigated in this research are varied and of different nature and characteristics which is divided into four characteristics: process; guide; function and procedure (Table 10.1). Some of these mechanisms were more conclusive and evidential in this research, and some were less significant. In this conclusion chapter, Reasonable Adjustments, Part M Building Regulations, Role of the Access Officers, Best Practice which were guidance and Access Plan were the most significant mechanisms and variables where the evidence were more conclusive. Access Consultant and Conservation Assessment were secondary in significance, followed by Consultation with users and Best Practice which were innovative. Access Audit and Access Strategy were analysed together with Access Plan. Although the Access Statement is mentioned here and in the findings, it was not a variable that could be examined.²

The suggestion in this research is that in order for implementation of a mechanism to be effective, it must relate to other mechanisms that have different characteristics (Table 10.1). The mechanisms are perceived to be connected with each other in some way that could make the whole process work.

Some mechanisms have direct relationships with the other, and some have indirect or a general process that assist with the overall process. For example, Part M Building Regulations as a guide needs to be interpreted and negotiated by a function (which is an active and operational component) and this could either be the Access Officer or the Building Control Officer. A procedure which is embedded in the control system which is the Access Statement would assist greatly in implementing the building regulation, Part M.

² Access Statement was officially conducted from 10 August 2006 (CABE, 2006) for England and 30 June 2007 (Carmarthenshire County Council; Denbighshire County Council, 2008) for Wales, hence there were no data collected for this possible variable for this PhD thesis as the data collection research was done for more than two years from mid 2003 to end of 2005. Although participants in the research mentioned of Access Statement, they had not used the mechanism at that time.
Procedure has regulative implications, for example, Conservation Assessment has a form which states what the applicant intend to do and would need to be rectified if deviated from what is stated earlier. Procedure is bureaucratic in nature but is necessary to refer to when something goes wrong and the document could be legal-binding or at least validated within the control system.

Further findings revealed that it was important to strengthen the consultative processes and mechanisms in order to produce good designs of accessible historic and listed public buildings. From Section 10.1.4, with respect to the research questions stated earlier in 10.1, one mechanism that this thesis did not examine was Access Statement. It was explained in Chapter 6, that the Access Statement was implemented after the research’s data collection stage had finished in 2005.

The Access Statement would be the missing component in the regulatory framework, acting as a much needed procedure that would enforce Part M Building Regulations more guidance role. The Access Officer’s role and function would also be enhanced as the Access Statement needs a start, the follow through and a review at the end of the process of development control, and the Access Officer would be given the responsibility and ‘ownership’ to manage the processes that this mechanism would create.

The Access Plan could be the proactive process’s Access Statement. Hypothetically, in a meeting on a listed building consent, with the two sets of document, the Conservation Statement and the Access Statement together can be incorporated, highlighting the impact of access solutions to the special interest and other aspects of a historic and listed building.

The effectiveness of the Access Statement would very much depend on the decision of whether the internal part of the historic building will have to comply to access requirements in Part M. (Table 10.1)

Table 10.1: Mechanisms identified relating to their characteristics
This implication of having the Access Statement as part of the process in development control is essential to policy-making implications as it will push for changes to the listed building consent process especially. The applicants will need to address access in their planning and design as they would need to explain otherwise why they are not following it, from planning control to completion.

The reactive process and the proactive process need to be more accommodating to each other. Access Officers need to be more trained to have better negotiating skills and able to facilitate the many needs that are expected of the development control system. Policies to include Access Officers in the development control and making the function of Access Officer more influential would create a better system of enforcing Part M access requirements. Access Officers must be trained to be access auditors and are able to see the connection between audit results and Access Plan. Only then the regulatory framework will work better as you will have the proper procedure in the Access Statements, the influential function in the Access Officer, the correct process used in the
Access Plan in a regulatory framework to enforce the Part M Building Regulations and the standards.

10.3. Literature review post-conclusion

10.3.1 Heritage Reform
As mentioned in Chapter 2 and 3, earlier efforts in heritage reforms started in the United Kingdom as early as the year 2000 culminating in the most recent development that resulted in the Heritage Reform Bill where, “in March 2007, DCMS and the Welsh Assembly Government published a White Paper setting out the proposals for reforming the heritage protection system. These reforms are intended to build on the best of the current system to ensure we develop a new system which can respond to future challenges,” which includes “maximising opportunities for inclusion and involvement” (DCMS, 2007). “The draft Heritage Protection Bill was published in April 2008. It is a draft Bill for England and Wales, which sets out the legislative framework for a unified and simpler heritage protection system that will be more open, accountable and transparent. The new system has been designed to provide more opportunities for public involvement and community engagement in understanding, preserving and managing our heritage” (DCMS, 2008). With regards to ‘inclusion’ and ‘community engagement’, it has been shown in this research’s single case study, the local access group insisting in participating voluntarily in the effort to make their local historic building a success and a proud endeavour. By giving their feedback on their needs on access, both the physical and communicational aspects, the group wanted to be involved in the decision-making process. The volunteering endeavour was done before the Heritage Reform Bill was tabled in Parliament and all it needed was an Access Officer to insist with the client, on the engagement of this group to the consultative process. How would heritage reforms be translated in action? Based on this example, if the Access Officer did not insist on the client, will the consultative process be effective? Will the building be more accessible and inclusive? Heritage reforms did not consider the role of the access officer although the planning reforms did.
This relates to the recent development and notably the amendment to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the 1990 Act mentioned earlier, which has been revised to The Planning (Applications for Planning Permission, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2006. The insistence on including design and access statements implied the importance of including the Access Officer in the planning and building control process. The applicant would need to provide evidence of how access is designed into the proposal. The latest development on heritage reforms is the "new Planning Policy Statement (PPS) on the historic environment. This

3 Design and access statements

3A. —(1) Any application to a local planning authority for listed building consent shall be accompanied by a statement ("a design and access statement") about—
(a) the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the works; and
(b) subject to paragraph (4), how issues relating to access to the building have been dealt with.
(2) A design and access statement shall—
(a) explain the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the following aspects of the works— (i) scale; (ii) layout; (iii) appearance; and
(b) explain how the principles and concepts referred to in sub-paragraph (a) take account of—
(i) the special architectural or historic importance of the building;
(ii) the particular physical features of the building that justify its designation as a listed building; and
(iii) the building's setting.
(3) Subject to paragraph (4), a design and access statement shall also—
(a) explain the policy adopted as to access, including what alternative means of access have been considered, and how policies relating to access in relevant local development documents have been taken into account;
(b) explain how the policy as to access takes account of—
(i) the special architectural or historic importance of the building;
(ii) the particular physical features of the building that justify its designation as a listed building; and
(iii) the building's setting;
(c) state what, if any, consultation has been undertaken and what account has been taken of the outcome of any such consultation;
(d) explain how any specific issues which might affect access to the building have been addressed; and
(e) explain how features which ensure access to the building will be maintained.
(4) Paragraphs (1)(b) and (3) do not apply in relation to an application for listed building consent to carry out works affecting only the interior of a building.
(5) In this regulation—
"appearance" means the aspects of a building which determine the visual impression it makes, including the external built form of the building, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture;
"layout" means the way in which a building is situated and orientated in relation to other buildings, routes and spaces; and
"scale", in relation to a building, means the height, width and length of the building in relation to its surroundings.".
will be published in draft for consultation before the Easter recess in 2009. Department of Culture Media and Sports (DCMS), Communities and Local Government Department (CLG) and English Heritage are committed to producing a clear and up to date PPS that brings together the various heritage protection regimes and underlines their essential place in the planning context.” (DCMS, 2008a) PPS would be replacing the Planning Policy Guidance and its Welsh equivalent which was the main criticism addressed by the Select Committee that reviewed the Heritage Reform Bill.

One of the important development with regards to the Heritage Reform Bill, was that the Select Committee identified the training of conservation officers in local authority to be one of the significant objectives to successfully contribute to the reforms (House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, 2008), and in this research it has been evidently clear that when it comes to making accessible historic buildings the conservation officers are the most important group in the control regime. The Select Committee reported further that, “the draft Bill has been undermined by the incomplete nature of the legislation. We find it deeply disappointing that we have not had the opportunity to review the draft Bill in its entirety. We recommend that a complete schedule of all further necessary legislation and guidance be published as soon as possible, together with a timetable and arrangements for appropriate consultation and implementation. The Government must prioritise the revision of Planning Policy Guidelines (PPGs) 15 and 16 to ensure that the new guidance on planning policy can be implemented at the same time as the Bill” (House of Commons Culture, Media and Sport Committee, 2008). With regards to this research, another very significant comment by the Select Committee was that, “we recommend that the Government ensures that there is sufficient staff with the necessary skills, in particular conservation officers in local authorities, to successfully implement the Bill.” Without the numbers and training done on conservation officers, heritage reforms could not be successful without this implementing mechanism and this implied that the function of the conservation officer is deemed to be more important than ever.

10.3.2 Access Statements
Local authorities in England and Wales have acknowledged that it is now a statutory requirement for Access Statements to accompany an application for planning permission and Listed Building Consent, although the latter could be done with some exclusion. “Listed Building application is only for interior works” (Cyngor Gwynedd Council, 2008). This is reflected elsewhere, “Listed Building Consent applications (external work only - not internal works)” (Denbighshire County Council, 2008).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Access Statement was officially conducted from 10 August 2006 (CABE, 2006) for England and 30 June 2007 (Carmarthenshire County Council; Denbighshire County Council; Cyngor Gwynedd Council, 2008) for Wales. “Where relevant, if an Access Statement is not submitted or does not provide adequate information, the application will be invalid. Applicants will be required to submit an Access Statement to ensure that inclusive design is considered at the earliest possible stage in the development process and to ensure that the facilities are integrated in an inclusive manner. For a Listed Building Consent application, the content of access statements will benefit from pre-application discussions and engagement with local access groups and/or local authority access officer, and Conservation Officers” (Denbighshire County Council, 2008).

Currently, the approach to inclusive design needs to take account of the Planning Policy Guidance 15 and 16 (England) and Welsh Office Circular 61/96 (Planning and the Historic Environment: Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas) and also BS 7913:1998 – the Principles of the Conservation of Historic Buildings.

A statement should include a brief explanation of how the adopted policy or approach to people’s access takes account of:

1. the special architectural or historic importance of the building;
2. the particular physical features of the building that justify its designation as a listed building;
3. the building’s setting; and
4. the range of access solutions considered and reasons why the chosen solution is the best, both for improving access and for respecting the historic character of the listed building.

The statement should make clear how the approach to inclusive design has balanced the duties imposed by the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) (1995 & 2005) where the proposal is subject to those and the particular historical and architectural significance of the building. The statement should detail any specific issues that arise particularly with regard to the fact that the building is listed, the range of options considered and where inclusive design has not been fully provided, an explanation as to the reasons why this was not possible. Where alteration to existing buildings are proposed, and the fabric of the structure restricts the ability to meet minimum levels of accessibility, details could be provided of other adaptations, such as portable equipment or changes to management practices, that will meet the requirements of the DDA.

(Denbighshire County Council, 2008)

The earlier research findings showed much optimism in using the Access Statement especially by the Access Officers and Building Control Officers from the reactive process. As to be suggested in Section 10.5 on future research, it would be necessary to examine the effectiveness of the access statement in conjunction with the Listed Building Consent in particular. Although the literature review in this section showed that access statement could not be done on internal works, the implementation of the mechanisms effectiveness will still need to be ascertained. Further more when the new Planning Policy Statement (PPS) on the historic environment gets published in 2009 and the Heritage Reform Bill gets accepted by Parliament, there could be much changes in the development control process.

On the other side of the debate, Pendlebury (2009) outlined his concern regarding the approach taken on behalf of the Government's agencies so far, "that conservation can have regressive consequences as it should be part of a more reflexive conservation
debate,” and the immediate concern would be for, “the heritage sector to be critically researching and examining the benefits it claims for the activity of conservation, where the benefits asserted such as collective identity, towards regeneration or towards the process of social inclusion, often have weak underpinnings in terms of theoretical and empirical evidence” (Pendlebury, 2009).

Pendlebury (2009) further emphasised on how the broad objectives could reconcile within the local context, similar to what that was suggested in reference to the local access group in the single case study findings. Hence one of the gaps in knowledge is on how the conservation objectives such as social inclusion could be implemented into local authorities’ activities and programmes.

10.4. Limitations

The study was conducted during the period where the stakeholders to the development process of historic public buildings were awaiting for the enforcement mechanism of the recently introduced legislation DDA 1995 and its codes of practice. Coupled with Part M Building Regulations revised and introduced in 2004, along with BS 8300 revised three years earlier, this thesis was not easy to conduct amidst all that uncertainty.

The limitation for this research is the fact that due to the changes coming in and the uncertainty, not many people wanted to participate in this research as participants. Other limitations include limited budget to travel and work on the case study which is in Swansea, whereas the author is based in Salford. The author would have liked to do more visits with disabled people as users to historic buildings but this would have need more budget and time.

10.5. Contribution to knowledge

The unpredictable nature of the topic and the basic research question was conceived based on the experience of the author who is a disabled person and at the same time
having an interest on the subject of building conservation. Rich with heritage and history, England and Wales as the context and phenomenon to investigate the topic was ideal. As the United Kingdom was experiencing heritage reforms since the year 2000 and the introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act in 1995, the issues surrounding this debate between ‘Conservation versus Accessibility’ compelled the author to undertake literature review on three major aspects:

1. Theory and policies relating to conservation and accessibility.
2. Policy and practice of the planning control and building control processes in the local authority (reactive process).

The hypothesis created from the literature review and preliminary studies combined convinced the decision to engage on a unique methodological approach, combining the Delphi Method, with the Survey method using Interviews, both examining the reactive and proactive processes and the combined results and findings were validated by a Single Case Study to determine the conclusions as explained in Chapter 1, 5 and 6.

The conclusions were explained in Section 10.1, where a summary of findings showed that the thesis answered the problems posed by the research questions and hypothesis earlier. The following points were the contribution to knowledge with reference to the thesis’s topic and hypotheses, which also provided the answer to the research questions posed earlier.

The first research question relating to the ‘theory and policies relating to conservation and accessibility’ was proven that:

1. Conservation legislation and conservation practice were regarded to be more decisive and prescriptive in meeting its objectives and agenda in comparison to accessibility legislation. It is represented in the local authority via the
Conservation Officer as the functional and operative mechanism, the 1990 Act and Planning Policy Guidance and related regulations as the guidance mechanism and a set procedure using the Conservation Statement.

2. The accessibility and rights based legislation, DDA 1995 provided the mechanism of reasonable adjustments, a process to interpret the problem and provide the corrective measure and get the desired result and solution to the problem, but it is not prescriptive and the interpretation at the local authority level is not clear.

The second research question relating to ‘policy and practice of the planning control and building control processes in the local authority (reactive process)’ was proven that:

3. The regulative framework and mechanism that concerns accessibility for disabled people, lack influence in the functional and operational mechanism as the Building Control officer has to deal with many functions and the Access Officer do not have a control function to make decisions regarding Part M and access requirements but only acts as an advisor.

4. The Access Consultant function was more influential then the Access Officer when advising on accessibility to historic and listed buildings that comes in through the planning control and building control processes.

5. The Conservation Officer’s function is the most important in implementing accessibility of historic and listed public buildings in England and Wales.

The third research question relating to ‘policy and practice in building conservation and best practices (proactive process)’ was proven that:

7. The reactive process participants in development control were not aware of the Access Planning Process and the importance of access audit with regards to creating an access plan.

8. The proactive process participants were aware of the Access Planning Process (APP), and the importance of Access Audit and Access Plan. The APP guidance created by English Heritage and CADW were targeted at the clients, service providers and their consultants.

10.6. Further research

Further research could be done on the regulatory framework’s mechanisms, namely Part M Building Regulation, the function of Access Officers and Access Statements as a procedure. Part M Building Regulations incorporated since 1990 were limited in its influence to make access changes to historic and listed public buildings.

The effectiveness of the DDA 1995 could be further researched, where reasonable adjustments is the legislative mechanism guide to be interpreted by heritage service providers and their consultants to enable equal participation of disabled people to enjoy the heritage properties and the services provided in the premises. Some people argued that the legislation was not prescriptive enough to make significant improvements.

Research in reasonable adjustments and the interpretation would be essential to understand how policies in legislation could be translated into practice. Other research that would be valuable is best practice in terms of guidance in relation to the Access Planning Process and best practice and innovative solutions in heritage development, in particular how architects work in developing inclusive design concepts in historic buildings.
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Appendix A: List of questions given to participants for the Delphi Method study

Round 1 Questions

1. What is your role in the organisation you work in?

2. Who is responsible in your organisation in dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings?

3. Are you involved in the process of planning approval and/or building control for historic public buildings in your organisation? If yes, what is the nature of your involvement?

4. Are you involved in the process for listed building consent for historic public buildings in your organisation? If yes, what is the nature of your involvement?

5. In meeting the access needs of disabled people for listed building consent application, do you think that too much emphasis is given to conservation issues rather than access issues? In your opinion, elaborate the reason why you answered yes or no.

6. Do you think building regulations and standards such as Part M and compliance to BS 8300 should be used in the listed building consent application process for historic public buildings? If the answer is yes, how much should the regulations and standards influence the listed building consent application process?

Please choose an answer from the following:
• Minimum influence, for example, as long as the disabled person could enter the
building that would be sufficient as the building should be preserved in its original form.

- More compromise needed to include access features. For example, there should be contrast in some of the building elements for vision-impaired people and acoustic changes for deaf and hard of hearing people. Cobbles or rough surfaces should be replaced with more usable surfaces which aesthetically must sympathise with the original form.

- Maximum influence, as many listed buildings are made into new uses to provide services for the public, changes are inevitable and disabled people should be able to get the same services like everyone else.

7. Do you have an access officer in your organisation?

Does the access officer in your organisation give advice on accessibility to listed building consent applications?

If the answer is Yes to question 7 b, state the frequency of the access officer’s involvement in the listed building consent; (Tick one box only.)

- A few times and only when deemed very necessary.
- Sometimes when there are difficulties in solving technical and or design issues.
- Often and as much as the access officer is available to participate.
- Always as to make sure that all possibilities are considered to include disabled people’s needs as much as possible.

8. What is the role of the access officer in your organisation? (Tick as many boxes as you need.)

- I do not know
- Minimum role – facilitate complaints by disabled customers.
- General advisory services such as making access guides to accessible places.
- Strategic planning and developing access policies in the planning department and such like.
- Sit-in and give specific advice during building control meetings and to advise on the
design of new buildings in terms of access for disabled people.

- Sit-in and give specific advice during building control meetings and listed building consent meetings to advise on the applications.

Round 2 Questions

9. a. How has the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) been influencing accessibility to historic public buildings in recent years, since 1995?
b. How will the DDA influence accessibility to historic public buildings after October 2004?
c. How will Part M of the Building Regulations influence accessibility to historic public buildings after May 2004?
d. Please elaborate further on your replies to questions 9a, 9b and 9c.

10. In the context of the topic being discussed, what do you understand by the following terms or document? (Please state below your reply or indicate in the boxes whether you wish not to comment or you do not know.)

- Access Statement
- Access Plan
- Access Groups
- Access Consultant

11. Would you like to comment on what work the access officer should undertake when the access officer is being consulted during the following stages of approval:
- pre-application stage of planning approval.
- pre-application stage of listed building consent.
• pre-application stage of conservation area consents.

12. In the context of the topic being discussed, what do you understand by the following terms or document? (Please state below your reply or indicate in the boxes whether you wish not to comment or you do not know.)

- Conservation Plan
- English Heritage’s ‘Easy Access to Historic Properties’ Guide or the CADW equivalent
- Reasonable Adjustments

13. From the Summary of replies given for Round One, we noticed that a pattern of words had emerged, such as ‘minimal provisions’, ‘compromise’, ‘negotiate’ and ‘balance’. Please comment further. [reasonable adjustments]

14. Please comment on anything that you want, based on the Summary of replies for Round One.

Round 3 Questions

15. Based on the Access Planning Process diagram enclosed, are there any stages indicated that you had/will be involved in? (Figure 4.1) (English Heritage, 2004) Please list the stage and process.

16. Please comment on the diagram, such as whether you would like to add or subtract anything from it.

17.a) Have you received any advice from local access groups in order to make a decision about a historic building application for change of use and refurbishment before?
b) Do you find local access groups useful in your work? And if ‘Yes’, how do you find them useful?
c) What is the policy of your local authority on the use of local access groups for advice in your department?

18. Almost a year had lapsed since we last contacted you, and you may have answered questions 9 (a) and (b) on the Disability Discrimination Act (that came into force October 2004, and started after 1995). Would you like to add or subtract to that comment you made in the Round Two Questionnaire?

19. Has Part M Building Regulations (May 2004) been influential in accessibility to historic public buildings since we last contacted you in early 2004. (You may disregard this question if you had only recently answered question 9 (c) in the Round Two Questionnaire.)

20. In your opinion, which officer (conservation, access, building control, planning or others) will be the most influential in dealing with accessibility to historic public buildings in the next five to ten years?

21. What are the major changes that you see happening in the last few years in terms of Accessibility to Historic Buildings, with regards to either the Local Authority’s Role or in the Development Process as a whole, including the clients, developers, architect and access consultant’s role?

22. Would you like to comment on any best practices or examples of historic buildings that had been successful in achieving accessibility and inclusive design?

23. Please add anything further which you would like to add:

**ACCESS AUDIT**
Define access needs in relation to service and its users

Priorities Agreed

**ACCESS REQUIREMENTS or STATEMENT OF NEED**

**SITE BUILDING ANALYSIS**
Identifies special, historic or

Priorities Agreed

**CONSERVATION STATEMENT or STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

**FEASIBILITY STUDIES**
Aims and how to achieve them
Technical studies, including means of escape
Impact analysis and possible mitigation measures
Costs, affordability and benefits
Consultation with local authority conservation and access officers

**DRAFT ACCESS PLAN**
Measures to reconcile access needs with conservation requirements

Proposals have impact on physical features

Confirm LBC not required
Consultation with users
Develop detailed proposals

Confirm LBC will be needed
Further impact analysis
Continuing consultation with local authority and users
Detailed design development
Submit proposals for LBC or other approvals

Obtain LBC

Confirm costs and timescales for implementation

ACCESS PLAN
IMPLEMENT ACCESS PLAN

Confirm costs and timescales for implementation