



APPENDIX A

Public Consultation – February 2017

for

Options Appraisal

at

OTFORD, ARCHBISHOP'S PALACE

867504

March 2017

177 KIRKDALE

LONDON

SE26 4QH

TEL 020 8659 3250

FAX 020 8659 3146

Oxford, Archbishop's Palace Options Appraisal

Contents

- 1. Information..... 1
- 2. Responses..... 2
 - 2.1 Why is the Palace significant to you?..... 2
 - 2.2 What level of public access do you think should be provided?..... 4
 - 2.3 What local needs could be served by the accommodation available in the Palace Gatehouse and Tower in future? 6
 - 2.5 The Gatehouse: What do you think about part or all of the space being used for these purposes: Private residential; holiday let; visitor centre; community meeting space, other? 8
 - 2.6 The Tower: What do you think about part or all of the space being used for these purposes: Private residential; holiday let; visitor centre; community meeting space, other? 10
 - 2.7 Would you agree with new accommodation being added to the Tower or Gatehouse in order to generate revenue for the maintenance of the buildings? 12
 - 2.8 Please add any other comments: 14

1. Information

Nick Forthergill	Local resident and on committees of Otford Heritage Centre and Historical Society.	
Jackie Howe	Local resident and Sec Historical Society.	
Caren Chapman	Local resident	
Anthony Wiltshire and Evelyn Wiltshire	Local resident	
Ed Thompson	Resident and member of Historical Society and Heritage CTR	
Christine Clucas	Answered yes to are you a local resident or do you represent an organisation? *	
Philip Clucas	Local - Parish Councillor/ Committee of Historic Society (OPHS)	
Phil Chapman	Local resident	
Heather Stanley	Local resident	
T Stanlel	Local resident	
Keith Gofton	Local resident and Otford Society	
Howard Leicester	Local resident and works with NHS England as an accessibility advisor for inclusive communication documents and face to face.	
Laura Papanicola	Resident	
*Chris Reed		
Phyllis Putt		
*David Evans	Local resident	
*Michael Dudding	Resident	
*Gabbie Dudding	Resident	
*Peter Nixon	Resident	
*M Edmead	Local resident	
*Ann Richards	Local resident	
*Linda Dunning	Local resident	
*Robert Dunning	Local resident	
Doug Cracknell		
*Rodney Lissenden		
*Corinne Fisher	Local resident	
*Denise Barrett	Local resident	
*Elisabeth Lindsay	Local resident	
*Audrey Thomas	Local resident	
*Jennifer Dean	Frequent visitor	
*Jane Donaldson	Local resident	
*Janet Boswell	Local resident	
*Winifred Medhurst	Local resident	
*John Bassendine	Local resident	
*Mary Bassendine	Local resident	
*James Bassendine	Local resident	

*	Feedback form completed	
---	-------------------------	--

2. Responses

2.1 Why is the Palace significant to you?

It is the most important historical site in Otford and one of the most important Tudor sites in the country.

Iconic part of village's history.

It is just down the road and is an integral part of the village.

As a local resident I value having a Tudor relic on my doorstep.

It is a unique link with Otford's Tudor past.

It is a wonderful landmark and one to be proud of.

Represents Otford history since c840s.

Part of the character of our historic and beautiful village.

Live adjacent, gives significance to Otford, makes it slightly "different".

Last remaining part of palace visible above ground.

Part of our heritage. Pride in village history.

Because it is a big opportunity. Now under-exploited. Looks unhelpful at the present. The Palace has a strong family and personal associations.

I live there!

Important piece of local history.

Lived in village for 40 years.

A building of national significance.

I am happy and proud to have the palace and its history in my village.

It is of national importance as a mediaeval/Tudor palace where the Book of Common Prayer was penned.

The most important historical building in Otford.

Underlies Otford's history – significant to schoolchildren.

This site is Otford and we should pay towards its upkeep as do residents in Putney pay for upkeep of Richmond Park.

Historic interest – amazing unused benefit to the village.

Romantic scene.

Historical interest.

I love the village.

It is part of Otford's history.

My relative's home has a good view of the tower.

Historical interest.

Part of local history and potential income to Council.

It is an important part of the our village and the local area and the adjacent valley.

Local heritage.

Part of the history and landscape of the village our home for 30+ years.

Lived here all my life, interested in history, archaeology of local area. Otford Palace is central to identify of the village.

2.2 What level of public access do you think should be provided?

Enough for visitors in cars to Tower/ Gatehouse and/ or if used for residential use.

Walking – not by car.

At present – all of the grounds.

As much access as found to be viable.

As much as possible.

A new Heritage Centre and parish offices in the Tower Gatehouse – holiday lets or short term lets.

Public access for all (not closed of i.e. rented on as an office).

Access to the roof for views would be great, but may be incompatible with eventual use.

Same as existing -free to all.

Some as current – is accessible and free.

Totally, if affordable. Recognise there may be need for some commercial sacrifice to finance it.

Some access to interior essential. Provide max accessibility for people with sensory condition and mobility difficulties. Illustrate difficulties of access in old buildings.

Would like to go into Tower.

A less important factor than generating income.

As much as possible if feasible.

External viewing and if possible some internal access with supporting information/displays.

Depending on its future use, at least part available internal viewing and keep the field surrounding areas.

Full public access at specified times.

Full, free public access.

As much as possible, without harming the buildings.

Full.

As much as possible.

As it is.

Don't know.

The more you can manage.

Public access for visitors but some other provision would be required for vehicles.

No answer.

If it becomes private housing it will be difficult to have too much access, but if visitor centre etc. will be good to have access over site.

As much as is feasible.

Full access into Heritage Centre.

As much as possible.

Vital not to lose opportunity for public access. To convert to housing or offices would make it very difficult to reverse in future.

2.3 What local needs could be served by the accommodation available in the Palace Gatehouse and Tower in future?

Heritage Centre and Office for Parish Council.

Heritage Centre and possible extension.

Possibly moving the Heritage Centre as long as that would free up the two semis currently serving the Heritage Centre for private dwellings.

No answer.

Visitors and Heritage Centre, meeting rooms etc.

A new Heritage Centre and parish offices in the Tower Gatehouse – holiday lets or short term lets.

Preferably as new Heritage Centre – either for Otford (sell School House) or as Heritage Centre for Darent Valley.

Provision of information about the palace does not appeal, but seems unlikely to be viable. Most likely it should be housing, like the cottages.

None.

None.

Darent Valley Information Centre.

Provide residencies for historical, _____ players, Jousts! Short of accommodations reasonably priced for rent (sale or sheltered accommodation).

No answer.

Residential.

Visitor and teaching centre and school *** .

A centre for information about Otford's history/place for public access.

-

Visitors Centre for Darent Valley, for schools and locals.

Educational, visitor and other cultural attractions.

Perhaps as a local museum with any local artefacts founds.

No answer.

A visitors centre – exhibition of site.

For meeting place guides, Info. Centre etc.

Don't know.

-

No answer.

No answer.

No answer.

Not sure there will be any benefit in leaving as it is as gatehouse is cold etc. so very unlikely to be used by locals.

A large number; particularly bringing visitors to the village as an attraction and as a historical place.

Local heritage centre in both buildings with community space use.

School visits/Parish Council offices/Heritage Centre.

Darenth Valley will need to define itself as a tourist destination to protect against encroachment. In the long run, Otford palace would be a central part of that. In the short term, meeting space, space for parish co., historical soc.

2.5 The Gatehouse: What do you think about part or all of the space being used for these purposes: Private residential; holiday let; visitor centre; community meeting space, other?

(Private residential and holiday let highlighted). Suggest use Gatehouse for the above, so can use Tower for Heritage Centre/ Parish Office.

All possible, depends how much income is needed to maintain use of Tower. Suggested £50,000 per annum.

We have enough community meeting space. If not, then education for surrounding schools.

Visitor centre or community meeting place or museum.

No answer.

A new Heritage Centre and parish offices in the Tower Gatehouse – holiday lets or short term lets.

Yes, to holiday let, visitor centre, community meeting space and Heritage Centre etc.

First choice – private residential, second choice – visitor centre, third choice – holiday let, fourth choice – community meeting space, fifth choice – business.

Visitor Centre possibly but traffic generation needs careful consideration.

Visitor Centre or community – none of others.

Ideally public access, but if only way to finance it in perpetuity, residential use would be acceptable.

Yes, to private residential, holiday let, visitor centre and sheltered housing. Plenty of community meeting space now.

Prefer private residence to holiday let for security reasons/ like others (centre etc.) but needs to pay for itself.

Private residential.

Back-up to Gatehouse. ?Holiday let.

Visitor centre/meeting place.

Visitor Centre – education – of the castle, Roman remains in Darent Valley and for tourists to the area.

Ideally, a meeting space, or as a let to generate income – but with some access at certain times.

Community meeting space, visitor centre. Prefer not private residence.

Visitor centre or community space.

Visitor centre and community meeting space.

Visitor centre if not *** new by the Tower.

Visitor Centre, community meeting space.

Residential to provide income. ? Private long term lets.

-

Visitors centre.

Holiday let.

Private residential, holiday let, visitor centre, community meeting space.

Private residential, holiday let, visitor centre, community meeting space:

I'd be happy for any of the above as they potentially bring more visitors to area, thus some income.

Whatever makes the building viable bearing in mind the above.

Visitor centre, community meeting space.

Visitor centre, community meeting space.

Gatehouse should probably be part of shared scheme with Tower. For instance possibly as a café to support visitors centre. Strongly opposed to residential, office etc.

2.6 The Tower: What do you think about part or all of the space being used for these purposes: Private residential; holiday let; visitor centre; community meeting space, other?

1. Heritage Centre 2. Office for Parish Council.

Visitor Centre, too small for meetings and others inappropriate.

Private residential or holiday lets – but who would administer H/L's?

Interior to be (as far as possible) brought back to original.

No answer.

A new Heritage Centre and parish offices in the Tower Gatehouse – holiday lets or short term lets.

Not private residential or holiday let, but Heritage Centre etc.

First choice – private residential, second choice – visitor centre, third choice – holiday let, fourth choice – community meeting space, fifth choice – business.

Visitor Centre possibly but traffic generation needs careful consideration.

Ideally public access, but if only way to finance it in perpetuity, residential use would be acceptable.

Yes, to private residential, visitor centre; community meeting space.

Prefer private residence to holiday let for security reasons/ like others (centre etc.) but needs to pay for itself. Would rather not private.

Private residential.

Visitor and community centre.

Visitor centre/meeting place.

Would prefer to keep it open for area, but realise its commercial value.

Visitors Centre for schools in the area.

Educational or cultural resource/meeting place, visitor centre – NOT residential.

Visitor centre or community space.

Visitor centre and community meeting space.

Possible meeting place and view platform from roof.

Visitor centre, community meeting space.

Visitor Centre: community meeting space.

-

Community meeting space.

Visitor centre.

Private residential, holiday let, visitor centre, community meeting space.

Private residential, holiday let, visitor centre, community meeting space:
I'd be happy for any of the above as they potentially bring more visitors to area, thus some income.

Residential and holiday lets are secondary to the other purposes and only needed to finance the rest.

Visitor centre, community meeting space.

Visitor centre, community meeting space.

Strongly opposed to residential, office in particular. Support local trust scheme for visitors centre.

2.7 Would you agree with new accommodation being added to the Tower or Gatehouse in order to generate revenue for the maintenance of the buildings?

Yes. I think anything like this would be acceptable to help use the Tower for public use.

Possibly – depends on plans.

Yes, depending on parking/ access and providing there is still access to the current green space / significant portion of it.

I am not against this idea, but it must be done with great care and thought.

Yes.

If tastefully done could be a good idea.

No – prefer you sold School House to generate revenue.

Only as a very last resort, if the alternative is terminal decay.

No.

No.

Only if it was the last gasp solution to funding their maintenance.

Would be ok.

Gatehouse yes.

If necessary and in keeping with the original.

Limited, with restrictions.

Yes – but also to better describe the Palace site.

Not sure.

If carefully regulated.

NO!!

Yes.

No. Perhaps Otford residents could provide funds via Council Tax.

Yes.

No!!

No.

Not agreeing with a carpark on or very near to palace field.

Yes, provided that the design is in keeping with the project.

Yes.

Only if new accommodation doesn't change the look/aspect of the building. Maybe some houses could be built on edge of site.

No.

Only if extension is for local community use or Parish Council use.

With great caution – important to preserve the buildings – finance from sell off of Parish offices is they move to extension to Tower/Gatehouse?? New accommodation NOT for housing or offices – only for community use.

Not to the Tower, that would be an irreversible step, to damage integrity of remaining buildings. Possibly development, part of the way along Otford Road, if necessary to support a visitors centre.

2.8 Please add any other comments:

If it is financially possible to sustain it would be wonderful to be able to use the tower for public use (as above). This would involve public access onto Palace Field.

Whether donations from residents would be worth exploring is questionable – and only for purchase. Continuing administration expenses is another matter.

These are quite narrow thoughts – is there nothing more adventurous or out of the box we can consider (nightclubs aside of course!) if we want it to be self-sustaining. Ultimately we know that if we do nothing, Sevenoaks will have to keep/ maintain it, so why should Otford Village risk its finances on a venture? We couldn't keep enough interest going in the Otford Village Society – which spends money on things in the village proposed by and for the benefit of villagers to keep the OVS going – why on earth do we think we are going to be able to generate interest in something that is currently free, requires no effort (importantly) and takes no effort. Don't underestimate the lack of motivation that currently exists here, even when a benefit can directly benefit you personally – so for something that has no impact on villager's lives I can't see any enthusiasm on the horizon. My husband and his colleagues (volunteers) worked really hard to try and drum up interest/ enthusiasm to keep OVS going but to know avail. The older residents do not want charge and are prepared to turn up to be heard to get the status quo maintained. The younger residents don't seem to feel engaged. I would hate for Sevenoaks to spend oodles of time/ treasure to get this off their hands, only to get it back... but with huge additional costs attached due to folding of trust / similar. For example, here's a sort of illustration.... When the pond was redone, some bright spark promoted the idea of putting crossing stones over to the pond (like pedestrian stones). When I pointed out that this implies tacit approval of using the road/ pond like this and would open up the authority to liability if there were road accidents/ injury as a result of pedestrians crossing onto the pond – they reconsidered. Things like this don't get thought about... such as where else in the world do you/ anyone want to cross roads to picnic on roundabouts? More examples of successful schemes need to be presented and also info regarding how much the current heritage centre is used / income it would generate. That sort of thing.

This whole project is full of problems, but with care a way forward could be found. I think it would be an idea to have “a park” i.e. Palace Tower Park – set out in some way that would indicate its Tudor roots. I see flower beds, seats, statuettes; and anything that presents an area of tranquillity for residents to sit in.

It seems to me that this is a once a lifetime chance for the village to ‘own’ our little piece of history – lets go for it.

Perhaps provide green parking in the field on the same side of the road as the school.

Bubblestone site of previous archaeological excavation (1970s) should not be built over! Possibly consult Alison Weir / David Stamroy – both know the site and may have ideas and influence.

I am very concerned by the idea that Sevenoaks DC will transfer all responsibility for upkeep, insurance etc. to local residents. I would hate to see the remaining buildings fall into ruin again, but doubt the financial viability of the site being a visitor attraction. On that basis, making the buildings into housing like the linking cottages would seem the easiest way to keep them structurally sound and – ideally – “listed” to prevent fundamental changes to the historic buildings. Any moves to make the site into a tourist attraction would also have an unwelcome impact on limited parking and already busy roads.

The likelihood of this generating sufficient income to make it financially viable without ruining the location and setting is very low. Additional cars and coaches will create huge problems in a village already challenged for parking.

There simply is not enough here to be a visitor destination let alone providing any sensible access to the site. Cars/ coaches cannot be allowed onto the site.

Like the idea of taking cottages back. We need starter homes and retirement homes for residents; acceptable development would be ok.

Relate to model of the solar system in the playground area idea. Would be happy to help through contacts with BSI and NHS England. Contactable via email.

No answer.

None.

None.

Consider asking the Parish to increase its precept – i.e. to raise funds for the benefits of all the village.

None.

The Palace field could be usefully used – for markets, events (jousts?) fete etc. – perhaps the foundations indicated by brick outlines and a garden created or park area.

Providing an income stream to maintain and manage this resource is key. The Palace field could help with this for farmers' market, fetes, church events (weddings?), plays and film shows in the summer, for example.

None.

This is a unique site for the Darent Valley and also Sevenoaks and must be preserved. A small museum and exhibition centre to display the rich history of the area would be welcome.

Very helpful presentation and hopefully something positive will be the outcome.

I understand the need for income but the site could be ruined by development.

None.

None.

None.

None.

I would agree to adding £15 to local council tax to maintain the palace and gatehouse.

I know Guiding will be disappointed to lose the Gatehouse as that is currently their store/meeting room, but that's only very minor in the scheme of things. Overall, I wouldn't want the Tower/Gatehouse to fall into disrepair, so most of the suggestions for site are "OK" by me.

I am particularly interested to see the Tudor gardens developed quickly. They are presumably cheaper and easier to accomplish and create interest in the final project.

None.

None.