

APPENDIX A (for Cabinet, 22nd September 2021)

Consultation Draft version of Borough wide Local heritage List listing criteria – 2020 to 2023: Table of consultation responses

Consultation Response Type	Summary of issues raised	Summary of SBC Response
Parish and Town Councils	<p>1. Hartlip Parish Council No comments on the proposed listing criteria, general support offered.</p> <p>2. Bobbing Parish Council – Recommendation to refer to HER list published and maintained by KCC.</p> <p>However, in addition to the heritage categories in the Swale BC document, which appear to be predominantly building related Bobbing PC would like to suggest Swale BC also consider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local views (Swale has downland/coastal views which when developed will be lost forever) • Character trees (Singular or cluster of trees can contribute significantly to an area both urban and rural. Also memorial trees) • Blossom Areas (some residential areas have ornamental trees. Rural orchards could have blossom walks through the orchards) • Blue badge buildings (where are these plaques for local/national notable persons) • Agricultural buildings (Swale is rural, many barns are older their industrial counterparts. Consider farms and barns.) • Clusters of buildings (would they be changed by new/intrusive development which could change a small cluster) • The interaction and relationship of small group of buildings <p>However, given that the character of an area may change over the years (eg, new road schemes, hedgerows removed, landscape changes in agriculture trends eg different crops, more stables and more frontage parking). Then perhaps these local area assessments could be time limited or related. For example every Local Plan review or for a 10 year period then reconsider the contribution it is making to the local area.</p> <p>3. Lynsted with Kingsdown Parish Council – Query on types of heritage to be included and clarification sought. Recommendation to make data user friendly, accessible and easy to navigate.</p> <p>4. Minster on Sea Parish Council – General support and recommendation to include for ‘undiscovered’ heritage.</p>	<p>Response for 1-7: Overall support for local heritage list initiative is welcomed. The nominations provided will need to be assessed against the listing criteria, a number of recommended assets are already statutory listed, therefore those will not be included in the Local Heritage List. Recommendation to include character trees, memorial trees, orchards and blossom areas will not be considered for Local Heritage List, because they are already covered either by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or Landscape Characterisation Appraisal. Recommendation to include the local views or similar will need to be further assessed as and when an example comes up for nomination, if it stands the significance test for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Rarity b. Representative c. Architectural Interest d. Town/Landscape value e. Group value f. Artistic value g. Historical association h. Archaeological interests <p>Inclusion of Local views was discussed at the Local Plan Panel on 8th September and it was concluded that local views should not be included in the Local Heritage List for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Views related to built heritage fabric/ visible landmarks are covered in Conservation Area appraisals. Distant views in Swale would largely cover natural environment or long vistas over the downs and sea views, these do not necessarily incorporate the heritage assets and would require a set of policies to align with within the Local Plan. If a need is felt in the future to incorporate Local Views policy within the development framework then landscape characterisation appraisal may be a better place for it. See item 3.4 in the report.

	<p>5. Newington Parish Council - No comments on listing criteria, generally supportive of the listing criteria document, submitted a list of buildings/structures for nomination.</p> <p>6. Iwade Parish Council – No comments on listing criteria, generally supportive of the listing criteria document, submitted three possible candidates for nomination.</p> <p>7. Tunstall Parish Council – No comments on listing criteria, support offered for help with nominations.</p>	
<p>Consultation Response Type</p> <p>Local heritage attractions and local amenity groups & societies</p>	<p>8. Friends of Milton Regis Court Hall - No comments on listing criteria, support offered for help with nominations.</p> <p>9. Sheppey Local History Society - No comments on listing criteria, support offered for help with nominations.</p> <p>10. Sittingbourne Heritage Museum – Support for Council’s initiative . Recommendation to include a principal distinction between the statutory list and a local one is that the latter should take account of the context of historic buildings -their current or former function in relation to the daily life of the local community. Further recommendation to consider listing historic buildings in the following categories, whether or not they are still in use for that purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public houses – “Roadhouses” built between the World Wars –when the motor-car was becoming popular, leading to the construction of bypasses & “arterial” roads • village accommodation once reserved for paupers -Poor Houses • buildings that were erected more than a century ago and were prominent in the life of the community such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • village halls • forges • post-offices • schools • oasts • sail-lofts • other historic buildings which used to be devoted to local industry • residences of priests & other religious leaders • places of worship <p>11. Dolphin Sailing Barge Museum – Request for the Museum to be added to the local heritage list.</p>	<p>Response for 8-12: Overall support for local heritage list initiative is welcomed. The nominations provided will need to be assessed against the listing criteria, a number of recommended assets are already statutory listed, therefore those will not be included in the local heritage list.</p> <p>Recommendation to consider listing historic buildings in categories/ building types specific to Swale will be duly considered in terms of organising the final list and its accessibility.</p>

12. **The Historical Research Group of Sittingbourne (HRGS)** – General support and offer to contribute towards nominations. Recommendation to include following criteria:

- a. Rarity
- b. Representative
- c. Architectural Interest
- d. Town/Landscape value
- e. Group value
- f. Artistic value
- g. Historical association
- h. Archaeological interests

A list of nominations was also included in the response.

13. **Kent Historic Buildings Committee** – Overall support for developing a Borough wide local heritage list with the following recommendations:

In the category of Architectural Interest we would suggest substituting the word “setting” for the word “townscape” so as to embrace heritage assets in more rural surroundings.

In your numbered list under the heading Architectural Interest, we would suggest that the draft document is lacking in local flavour. We feel it would be helpful to list the kind of things that would be particularly ‘Swale-like’, an association with which would stimulate an assessor’s interest.

Such a list could include:

- Shipbuilding and the barge trade
- Brick making
- Paper making
- Military installations, including gunpowder production
- Brewing
- Fruit and hop culture – eg with reference to oasts

Perhaps these could be included by cross-reference to your very sound Heritage Strategy where appropriate?

Other points: Is ‘unique to the local area’ too restrictive if interpreted literally?

Would ‘special to..’ or ‘peculiar to..’ be more appropriate? ‘Contribution to Townscape’ again needs expanding to include rural areas. ‘Streetscape’ is an alternative that would include village settings and we would suggest adding ‘landscape’ to both the title and criterion 17.

We suggest that a principal distinction between the statutory list and a local one is that the latter should take more account of the context of historic buildings - their current or former function in relation to the daily life of the local community. We recommend that the council should consider listing historic buildings in the following categories, whether or not they are still in use for that purpose:

Response for 13: The suggested recommendations are taken on board and reflected in the track changed Listing Criteria document, included as Appendix B. The officers have already been consulting the HER list and the old ‘Green Back’ books, and so far approximately 210 assets have been identified that could possibly be included in the local heritage list.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public houses – including “Roadhouses” built between the World Wars – when the motor-car was becoming popular • village accommodation once reserved for paupers - Poor Houses • buildings that were erected more than a century ago and were prominent in the life of the community such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • village halls • forges • post-offices • schools • oasts • sail-lofts • other historic buildings which used to be devoted to local industry • residences of priests & other religious leaders • places of worship <p>Further recommendation to review the old ‘Green Back’ books and HER list maintained by KCC.</p> <p>14. Faversham Society – This was a late representation but was included due its helpful constructive contents. The Society has recommended that including 1960's building would add to the completeness of the architectural portfolio in Faversham- with specific reference to the Post Office Building. They have further suggested that 1840 is too early, 50 years ago is also heritage – therefore 60's and 70's building stock should be considered. They have also raised concerns regarding moveable heritage, how it is impossible to list moveable heritage - barges and railway carriages and engines are an important part of our heritage. Within the listing criteria document they have suggested that words like unique are very restrictive - special, local significance should ideally be used. A list of possible candidates for nomination was also provided.</p>	<p>Response for 14: The suggested recommendations for considering listing of 60's and 70's buildings has been taken on board, however on closer scrutiny of the listing criteria document, it was agreed at the Local Plan panel that Item 6 under Architectural interest would cover heritage assets of the 60's and 70's. At the present time, it would be difficult to include moveable heritage into the listing criteria due to time and resource constraints. Inclusion of moveable heritage needs further careful exploration as part of the proposed Heritage Theme topic paper on moveable heritage, which can be brought forward as part of Action Plan 2 of the adopted Heritage Strategy.</p>
--	--	--