

Notes of Local List Selection Panel Meeting 26rd January 2018

Meeting held 14.00 – 16.15 at Sevenoaks Town Council offices

Selection Panel (SP):

Simon Raikes (Chairman of the Selection Panel & Sevenoaks District Councillor)

Elizabeth Ashworth & Lily Mahony (SDC)

Alice Brockway & Isabelle Ryan (Historic England)

Roger FitzGerald (Chairman, ADP Architects)

Elizabeth Purves (Sevenoaks District Councillor & co-editor of 'Sevenoaks: An Historical Dictionary')

Wendy Rogers (Senior Archaeological Officer, KCC)

Sevenoaks Society Local List Project Management Team (PMT):

Sir Michael Harrison (President, Sevenoaks Society)

David Gamble (Former Chairman, Sevenoaks Society)

Geraldine Tucker (Research Team Manager)

Nick Umney (Information Management)

1. Apologies:

Rebecca Lamb (Conservation Officer, SDC)

John Stambollouian (Survey Teams Manager)

Lily Mahoney took notes for SDC at the meeting

2. Minutes of meeting held 3rd February 2017

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.

3. Matters arising

None.

4. Update on progress

Welcoming members of the Panel, Sir Michael Harrison noted that this was to be the final Selection Panel meeting. With the first meeting taking place on 10th January 2014, there had been thirteen meetings of the Panel spanning four years. Given this timescale, inevitably there had been a few changes of personnel on the way although he noted that three members of the Panel had attended throughout, including the Chairman of the Selection Panel. He thanked everyone warmly for their dedication and whole-hearted support.

Sir Michael brought members of the Panel up to date with developments relating to the Local List. Since the last Panel meeting, the PMT had received, among other things, invitations to speak at various gatherings about the process involved in drawing up a Local List. David Gamble and John Stambollouian had attended the Civic Voice AGM in Wakefield in October and held two discussion sessions which were well received. In addition, together with John Stambollouian, Sir Michael had himself attended the Maidenhead Civic Society AGM to speak about the Local List process. The PMT have also now agreed to give the City of Winchester Trust a presentation on how they achieved a local list for Sevenoaks.

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

Elizabeth Ashworth then updated members. Since the last Panel meeting, the Supplementary Planning Document and Tranche 1 of the Local List had been adopted at the Council's April Cabinet meeting. The SPD outlines local listing criteria and sets out a policy approach to be applied to heritage assets. Also at Cabinet, the Council resolved to apply Article 4 Ds for the demolition or partial demolition of locally listed buildings and boundary treatments not in a Conservation Area. In discussion, the Panel noted local listing was a material consideration for SDC planners. The outcome of the appeal on the locally listed 95 Dartford Road property was felt by the Panel to be a test case for the Local List.

Continuing, Elizabeth Ashworth said, that as a result of the Tranche 2 public consultation process, nineteen comments had been received from the public. One was received after the end of the consultation period but was still included. Seven were to be considered by the Panel today. A further two were against the removal of boundary treatments for off-street parking in Holmesdale Road and would be dealt with direct by SDC without reference back to the Panel as concerned parking. In addition, four public comments either provided further information or clarification to the asset's description. The remaining responses were in support of the Local List. The Panel noted that the outcome of Tranche 2 public consultation seemed very satisfactory given that some 255 assets were involved.

5. Reconsideration of assets arising from public consultation on 2nd Tranche

Seven assets merited further consideration by the Selection Panel with a view to reaching a final decision on their status for the Local List.

Asset 10702 - 17 Serpentine Road (part of a group of 4 pairs of semi-detached Victorian properties consisting of Nos. 7&9, 11&13, 15&17, and 19 &21)

Nos. 11 – 21 had been put forward for consideration by the Panel at an earlier stage but only 11&13 had met the standard required to be placed on the Local List. The gates and railings of No. 17 had however been considered particularly fine examples of their type (see SC below) and had been added to the Local List. The Panel had also recommended that the whole group be placed in a Conservation Area.

Selection Criteria (for gates and railings of No. 17)

16 – Association with a historic landscape or of identifiable importance to the historic design or development of the area.

19 – A rare surviving example of street furniture that contributes positively to the local area.

Panel discussion

It was noted that the owner of No. 17 supported the local listing of his original Victorian cast iron gate and railings together with the Selection Criteria although he reported that these features were older than the date of 1896 given in the description. The owner's main point was that he felt that his and adjoining properties built at the same time and to the same design should also be included in the Local List, similar to his neighbours at Nos. 11 &13 Serpentine Road.

In discussion the following points were noted:

- Further research had confirmed that the date of build – around 1880 - was earlier than previously thought. The description of the gates and railings would be altered to reflect this. Evidence had also been found to show that the original inhabitant of No. 15 (George Hooper) had an historical significance for Sevenoaks.
- However, these houses were of a type common to Sevenoaks and the Panel's original decision had been based largely on the fact that Nos.11 & 13, with its

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

decorative pierced bargeboards intact, had remained the least altered. Since no new architectural evidence had been presented to the Panel which might persuade them otherwise, Panel members were content to confirm their original decision not to add No. 17 Serpentine Road or its immediate neighbours to the Local List.

- The Local List was however an active one. It would continue to be reviewed and updated. Thus if further architectural evidence were presented, these properties might be added to the Local List at some future point.
- In the interim, all four pairs of semi-detached properties would continue to be recommended for placement in a Conservation Area.

Asset 10752 - Blackhall Spinney, Blackhall Lane

Selection Criteria

4 - Built 1920-1938. An outstanding example of the style of the period.

7 - Designed by an architect of national or local importance.

11 - Exhibits important characteristics of design, decoration, craftsmanship or use of materials.

18 - Building or group of buildings that contributes significantly to the townscape, street scene or appearance of the area.

Panel Discussion

The Panel noted that the survey team who took the original photograph of this property did so from what they believed to be a small lane running past the house whereas in fact “the lane” was part of a shared private drive. SDC had apologised to the owner and removed the photograph from the Local List website. A fresh photograph of the building had recently been taken, strictly from public access, for the Panel’s further consideration.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- Aside from the issue of the photograph, it was not clear whether the owner wished or not to object to his property being on the Local List. He had advanced no evidence against the Selection Criteria.
- Nonetheless, the Panel reviewed the property again against the new photograph and confirmed that all the Selection Criteria above remained valid and that therefore the property should remain on the Local List.
- It was noted that the owner of Blackhall Spinney was concerned to ensure that the process of selecting properties on the Wildernessee estate had been objective and fair. He was puzzled in particular about the absence of some Baillie Scott houses on the Wildernessee estate and had drawn up lists which he felt confirmed his views.
- On this, it was explained that the owner, perfectly understandably, had not appreciated that many of the Baillie Scott buildings on the Wildernessee estate fell **outside** the scope of the Local List as they were outside the parameters of the STC area. The Local List also did not include buildings that were already statutorily listed. As the research had shown, once the lists were adjusted, they showed remarkable similarity. SDC were replying to the owner direct about this. No further action needed to be taken by the Panel.

Asset 10767 Maple House, 16 Woodland Rise

Selection Criteria:

7 - Designed by an architect of national or local importance.

Panel Discussion

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

The Panel noted that the owner of this property felt that the additions and alterations made since its construction to the “original alleged design by Baillie Scott” plus the planning permission recently obtained to alter the house further, meant that the property should no longer form part of the Local List.

In discussion, the following points were noted:

- Notwithstanding any additions/alterations, Maple House appears in John Newman’s 2012 Pevsner Guide to the Buildings of England - “Kent: West and the Weald” as a Baillie Scott house of merit.
- Any internal alterations and changes to the rear of the property fell outside the scope of the Local List.
- It was also not felt that the planning permission now granted would result in significant change. Should it do so, there was always scope in the future to remove the property as appropriate from the Local List, given the intention that the Local List should be reviewed and updated as a matter of course.

In conclusion the Panel felt that SC 7 remained valid due to the historical association with an architect of national importance and that the asset should therefore remain on the Local List.

Asset 10773 Seven Lamp Posts along Parkfield

Selection Criteria:

- 14 – Important association with the development of the town or its social or cultural history.
- 19 – A rare surviving example of street furniture that contributes positively to the local area.

AND Asset 10775 Seven Lamp Posts along Wildernesse Avenue

Selection Criteria:

- 16 – Association with a historic landscape or of identifiable importance to the historic design or development of the area.
- 19 – A rare surviving example of street furniture that contributes positively to the local area.

Panel Discussion

Given their similarity, these two assets were taken together. It was noted that **Asset 10764 Five Lamp Posts along Woodland Rise** was also of relevance to the discussion.

The Panel noted that the Chairman of the Wildernesse Residents Association had written in support of locally listing the lamp posts in Parkfield These seven old lamp posts were the original ones installed when the Wildernesse estate was built, and the Trustees of Parkfield had been very careful to maintain them in good condition. However, the Trustees of Wildernesse Avenue did not agree so far as the lamp posts in their own road were concerned. While the latter agreed that the lanterns were historic in nature, they did not believe they dated from the development of the estate in 1924.

In discussion, the Panel agreed that the lamp posts were historic in nature but that the date of 1924 could not be proved. After careful consideration, the Panel agreed that the lamp posts should remain on the Local List but that the description should omit the words **“dating from the development of the estate in 1924”** from the description of the lamp posts in Wildernesse Avenue. The Panel further agreed that the Selection Criteria used for all three Assets relating to lamp posts in Parkfield, Wildernesse Avenue and Woodland Rise should be the same. **SC14 should therefore be replaced by SC 16 for Asset 10773 (lamp posts along Parkfield).**

Asset 10786 Donyland Cottage, Wildernesse Avenue

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

Selection Criteria

7 - Designed by an architect of national or local importance.

Panel discussion It was noted that the owner felt that it was not appropriate that his property should be included on the Local List in the light of alterations that had taken place since it was first built [Note - around 1927].

In discussion, the Panel considered carefully all the additional factual and photographic information that had been supplied. In doing so, the Panel noted that a number of the comments related to the interior of the building and the rear. These were matters which were not relevant to local listing. In conclusion, the Panel felt that SC7 remained valid as the asset, despite the alterations, was still recognisably a Baillie Scott house, and that therefore the property should remain on the Local List.

Asset 10804 Wall leading up from Seal Hollow Road to Quarry Shaw

Selection Criteria

16 – Association with a historic landscape or of identifiable importance to the historic design or development of the area.

19 – A rare surviving example of street furniture that contributes positively to the local area.

Panel discussion

The Panel noted that the photograph from the original survey had inadvertently been taken from the private access drive leading up to this property. SDC had apologised to the owner and removed the photograph from the Local List website. A fresh photograph of the wall had recently been taken, strictly from public access. Viewing this, the Panel maintained that the wall still merited the Selection Criteria listed above and that therefore the wall should remain on the Local List. It was further noted that part of the wall appeared to lead directly from Seal Hollow Road itself. SDC undertook to look further at this and see whether the description needed some expansion.

Asset 10823 Wall on East side of Greatness Lane (Nos. 6-76)

Selection Criteria

16 – Association with a historic landscape or of identifiable importance to the historic design or development of the area.

19 – A rare surviving example of street furniture that contributes positively to the local area.

Panel Discussion

The Panel noted that an objection had been lodged against listing this wall especially at the lower end of the road and also against the reference in the description to “ugly car bays”. Regarding the latter point, the Panel felt that this wording should be removed.

On the question of listing the wall itself, further photographs of the wall lower down the road had been provided by the PMT. [Note – these photographs have now been established to be outside properties with numbers in the 50s, 60s & 70s.] The photographs showed a marked difference both in quality and height between the upper part of the road nearest Seal Road and the lower end nearest Weavers Lane. Near Seal Road, the quality of the two-metre wall was clearly discernible in marked contrast to the lower end where the wall was only half a metre or less in height and where different materials appear to have been used. The difference was such that the Panel’s concern was that the wall at the lower part of the road had been built/rebuilt at some later date.

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

The historical research showed that land had been purchased in 1913 for council housing in Greatness Lane. However only 16 “council cottages” (now Nos. 10 – 40) had been erected in 1914 before the First World War halted further building. After the War, building had recommenced in the 1920s. It was therefore entirely possible that after the War, the wall may have been built of different materials. The Selection Panel had however listed the entire wall at its earlier session on the understanding that the wall was of the same quality throughout its length.

In conclusion, the Panel felt that the upper wall of Greatness Lane nearest Seal Road should continue to form part of the Local List but that SDC should visually inspect the wall to see at which point it was no longer original - possibly around No. 40 – after which it would no longer form part of the Local List. SDC undertook to amend the entry accordingly.

6. The Future

Monitoring of the Local List

The Panel noted that SDC had in hand a process for monitoring the local list. SDC were currently working hard to ensure the accuracy and robustness of their internal communications, databases and importantly the legalities connected with Article 4 implementation. It was however emphasised that the Local List was not set in stone. The intention was to revise and update it on a regular basis.

Sir Michael Harrison mentioned that he had asked SDC (Rebecca Lamb) if it were possible to include a notation for locally listed buildings on SDC's Conservation Area Plans in the same way as statutorily listed buildings are presently notated on those Plans. He understood that Rebecca had liked the idea but said that as the Plans were adopted Plans, this would mean that they would have to go back for re-adoption with the added notations. SDC undertook to consider whether this was possible or whether there was some alternative way of achieving the objective.

Wendy Rogers mentioned that KCC were currently waiting for the SDC Local List data base. Once this had been received, the list would be put on the Kent HERS. The intention was that this interactive database would then clearly show which buildings in the Sevenoaks area were on the local list. The Panel noted that the HERs map is the one place where all the historic environment records are shown on one map base. As such it would be very useful in reinforcing the legitimacy of the local list if it appeared there also.

SDC local listing seminar

On a possible Local List seminar, Sir Michael Harrison said that the PMT were offering to hold a seminar under SDC auspices for other areas outside Sevenoaks that might be interested in carrying out a local listing exercise, as for example, Riverhead, Seal, Weald, Westerham. Elizabeth Ashworth responded by saying this would be extremely useful at some future stage but SDC did not have the capacity at present to do this. There remained work to be done to finalise Tranche 2 and take it through Cabinet. The process of a Local List was a new one for SDC. There was also still much work to be done on implementing Article 4 Direction as a formal legal process has to be followed. Nonetheless the offer of such expertise was greatly appreciated and SDC hoped to be able to draw on it at a later stage. SDC were keen not to be seen to favour only the Sevenoaks Town area and would like the Local List process to be adopted by others.

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

In the interim, Wendy Rogers stressed what an amazing project the Local List was and hoped that this could be advertised more widely, possibly in some other way, and extended to other areas. Some Panel members felt that the Sevenoaks Society might work up a paper to act as a model or case study for others. In conclusion, Alice Brockway undertook to speak to her colleagues in Historic England who are involved in advertising such things and see what might be possible.

7. Assets for national listing

During the course of the Local List process, the Selection Panel had identified nine assets for possible national listing. It was now a question of deciding how to take this forward. Elizabeth Ashworth said that it did not necessarily have to be the SDC who did this as anyone can put buildings forward for listing. Alice Brockway agreed with this. Explaining the process of national listing, Alice said that the criteria were extremely challenging. The process was also a lengthy one, possibly as long as two to three years as the HE listing team tended to prioritise consideration of buildings for listing where there was an imminent threat to the building concerned. In this respect, Article 4 Direction on local listed buildings and boundary treatments outside Conservation Areas will give a measure of protection inasmuch as they could not be demolished without planning permission. Alice considered that the first step was to look at the criteria for national listing set out on the HE website and develop any application using these guidelines.

8. New or extended Conservation Areas

During the course of Selection Panel consideration over the past four years, a number of assets had been identified which would entail either extending an existing Conservation Area or creating an entirely new one. Some preliminary discussion had already taken place between the PMT and the SDC (Rebecca Lamb). The question was two-fold; how to take this process forward and also who was best placed to do this.

Sir Michael Harrison said that there was some thought that the Sevenoaks Conservation Council (CC) might be the most appropriate forum. Noting that Elizabeth Purves was on the CC, he asked for her opinion. In response, Elizabeth Purves said that she disagreed that the CC was the correct forum for this. She felt the Sevenoaks Society had the requisite manpower and resources, including expertise, to do this. Elizabeth Ashworth pointed out that if the Sevenoaks Society were to do this, then Regina Jaszinski as lead offer at SDC was best placed to advise. The SDC did have a remit to review existing CAs at regular intervals. Elizabeth Ashworth said as part of this year's work programme SDC would be carrying out a review of five Conservation Area Appraisals looking to trial a new format. None of the five are in Sevenoaks but, depending on the outcome of this trial, SDC would look to review the CAs of Sevenoaks as a whole. Elizabeth Ashworth also mentioned the importance of volunteers in this process [Note: Volunteers from the local community had been of help in establishing both the Hartsland CA and the Wildernesse Estate CA.]

In the ensuing discussion, members felt that it was important that the assets already identified by the Selection Panel should be incorporated in a Conservation Area and not simply left on the shelf. Sir Michael Harrison said that the PMT had already compiled a list of these. In conclusion, the Panel suggested that this list be sent to SDC and further advice sought on how to take this matter further forward.

9. AOB

Wendy Rogers mentioned that the Greensand Commons project may have some impact on Sevenoaks. Panel members noted that this would include Sevenoaks Common and possibly

Appendix C –Minutes from Selection Panel

other 'common' areas. Wendy Rogers undertook to send the email address for this project to Sir Michael Harrison for further circulation.