

Conserving and enhancing our historic environment

Summary of Regulation 18 consultation responses (March 2026)

Question 44 – Do you agree with Policy HE1: The Historic Environment?

Total Number of responses received: 49					
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
5	15	6	4	1	18

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect a wide range of views, from strong support for the overarching approach to designated and non-designated heritage assets to concerns that the policy is overly detailed and burdensome. Of the 49 responses received, around three quarters provided detailed comments on HE1. While the majority of respondents welcomed the principle of protecting and enhancing the historic environment, they raise differing views about how this should be achieved and the degree of prescription that is appropriate.

The majority of respondents who expressed a view supported Policy HE1 (strongly agree or agree). Key themes from these responses included:

- General support for the Policy’s intent, including its alignment with good practice.
- Importance of protecting Green Belt, historic sites and landscapes.
- Need for a local heritage list.
- Recognition of social, cultural and community benefits related to heritage.
- Some respondents made constructive suggestions related to the need for clearer policy wording and consistency with the NPPF, heritage statements to use appropriate expertise and proportionate detail and stronger action on protecting heritage at risk, including proactive or enforced maintenance.

Of those respondents who expressed a neutral response to Policy HE1 the key themes from responses included:

- Need to set out the importance of setting and context in decision making.
- Need for a borough-wide local list of heritage assets.

Of the respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the policy the key themes from the responses included:

- Lack of protection for the cultural and social value of villages, including identity.
- Inadequate recognition or management of non-designated heritage assets.
- Insufficient attention to heritage settings and context.

- Negative impacts of new development on assets, including traffic, and cumulative harm to conservation areas not being addressed.
- National policy requires a conserve or enhance, not a conserve and enhance, approach.
- Insufficient enforcement and monitoring of heritage assets and independent, expert involvement.
- Some development allocations contradict the policy aim of protecting settings and designated assets.
- Policy overly prescriptive, adding extra layers of assessment not justified by national policy.

For those who did not answer the sentiment question, key themes included:

- Need for a local list of non-designated heritage assets.
- Negative impact of development on settings and wider historic environment
- Policy overly prescriptive, adding extra layers of assessment not justified by national policy.
- National policy requires a conserve or enhance, not a conserve and enhance, approach.
- Non designated assets given an inappropriately high level of protection.
- Need for qualified expertise and trustworthy evidence in managing heritage impacts.
- Greater enforcement and more proactive heritage management by the Council.
- Policy should only apply to designated assets, to accord with the NPPF, and require heritage statements to demonstrate a clear, instead of sufficient, understanding of the asset.
- While many comments were technical or critical, a number of respondents broadly supported the policy direction.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- **Historic England** were happy with the policy and agreed that the local plan sets out a positive and proactive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk, as required by the NPPF.
- **Kent County Council** did not express a sentiment view but stated that the local plan rightly identifies the Heritage Strategy as the key strategy by which heritage can play a full role in the borough in the future. Regarding section 2 of the policy, KCC notes that TMBC does not have a local list of heritage assets. KCC suggests that criterion 5c should proactively encourage owners to conserve their heritage assets and also refer to enforcement action, where appropriate. Section 6 should be amended to require heritage statements to demonstrate a clear,

instead of sufficient, understanding of the asset and refer to heritage themes where applicable. A more detailed reference to historic farmstead guidance and to the Kent Historic Environment Record were also suggested.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- **Maidstone Borough Council** expressed a neutral response to the policy.
- **Tonbridge Wells Borough Council** were satisfied with the policy but suggested cross-referencing Policy NE7, as ancient woodland and veteran trees are also heritage assets, and adding a definition of locally listed heritage assets.

Summary of feedback from Town and Parish Councils

- **Aylesford Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy and stated that Historic sites boost well-being, education, and community engagement while attracting tourism and events, generating local income that helps maintain cultural assets without increasing taxes.
- **East Malling and Larkfield Parish Council** did not express a sentiment view but were very keen for TMBC to establish a Local List of heritage assets with a timetable. The number of listed buildings mentioned in the Plan was queried.
- **Stansted Parish Council** were unhappy with the policy, stating that non-designated heritage assets are extremely important in the borough and that a separate local list and dedicated policy on non-designated assets was needed.
- **West Malling Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, stating that residents support the protection of the unique historic environs of West Malling and want the many heritage assets and open spaces protected from unsuitable development.

Feedback from other organisations

- **High Weald National Landscape** were generally supportive of the policy but suggested some amendments. Policy HE1 part 5 should only apply to designated assets, to accord with the NPPF.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments on Policy HE1. A number of representations were received from residents, land promoters, parish and district councils, statutory bodies and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the policy.

Policy HE1 is intended to set out the borough's overarching approach to the historic environment that will support our vision of conserving and enhancing heritage assets. Officers consider that Policy HE1 remains appropriate and balanced.

However, we will consider a number of refinements to the supporting text to address concerns about clarity, interpretation and application and also to the policy itself to ensure matters raised are included. This will include:

- a) Clarifying the meaning of the terms used;
- b) Clarifying the policy direction regarding a local list of non-designated heritage assets as well as confirming that this will be progressed; and
- c) Checking and ensuring conformity with national policy.

Question 45 – Do you agree with Policy HE2: Listed Buildings?

Total Number of responses received: 28					
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
3	11	6	2	1	5

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect a range of views, from strong support for the approach to listed buildings to concerns that the policy goes beyond national policy. Of the 28 responses received, just under half provided detailed comments on HE2. While most respondents supported preserving listed buildings and their settings, they raise differing views about how this should be achieved and how changes to listed buildings should be assessed.

Most respondents who expressed a view supported Policy HE2 (strongly agree or agree).

Key themes from these responses included:

- Historic sites boost wellbeing, education, and community engagement while attracting tourism and events, generating local income that helps maintain cultural assets without increasing taxes.
- The contribution made by listed buildings to the unique character of settlements.

One respondent from those who expressed a neutral view towards Policy HE2 submitted a comment. The key theme from this response was:

- Only consequence of developers demolishing parts of listed buildings without consent appears to be delay.

A small number of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. The key themes included:

- Why promote the protection of old buildings when urban sprawl destroys the culture and identity of villages which provide the context for listed buildings.
- Policy does not ensure that increased traffic from nearby development will not have any impact on listed buildings.
- Policy not aligned with NPPF terminology requiring substantial weight being given to an asset's conservation relative to its significance.
- Need to encourage development that enhances listed buildings or their setting to benefit the quality of environments.
- The impact of energy efficiency measures on significance should be assessed.

Some respondents did not express a sentiment towards the policy. Key themes included:

- Policy not aligned with NPPF in considering loss and harm to a listed building.
- Retaining the original use of listed buildings usually involves the least intervention.
- Support for heritage statements being prepared by qualified and experienced conservation professionals.
- Heritage statements should include an impact assessment on significance for energy efficiency measures.
- Terminology related to the settings of listed buildings should be clarified.
- Policy should be amended to align with the NPPF in considering loss or harm to a listed building and reflect that retaining the original use usually involves the least intervention.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- **Historic England** agreed with the policy.
- **Kent County Council** did not express a view but suggested that section 2 of the policy be amended to reflect that retaining the original use usually involves the least intervention. Section 3 should also refer to the addition of energy efficiency measures in the heritage statement together with an assessment of impact on significance. KCC supported heritage statements being prepared by qualified and experienced conservation professionals.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- **Maidstone Borough Council** expressed a neutral view of the policy.

Summary of feedback from Town and Parish Councils

- **Aylesbury Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy and stated that Historic sites boost well-being, education, and community engagement while attracting tourism and events, generating local income that helps maintain cultural assets without increasing taxes.

- **West Malling Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, highlighting the contribution made by 117 listed entries to the unique character of West Malling. Residents want this protected and supported. New homes should use the most sustainable materials to maintain the historic character of the town.

Feedback from other organisations

- **High Weald National Landscape** were generally supportive of the policy but suggested some amendments. Policy HE2 part I should be amended to align with the NPPF in considering loss or harm to a listed building.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments on Policy HE2. A number of representations were received from residents, land promoters, parish councils, statutory bodies and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the policy.

Policy HE2 is intended to set out the borough’s approach to listed buildings that will support our vision of conserving and enhancing heritage assets. Officers consider that Policy HE2 remains appropriate and balanced.

However, a number of refinements will be made to the supporting text to address concerns about clarity, interpretation and application and also to the policy itself to ensure matters raised are included. This will include:

- Amending the policy and supporting text to take account of responses, where this would not conflict with national policy, such as the consideration of energy efficiency measures.
- Ensuring that the policy and supporting text is aligned with the NPPF.
- Clarifying terminology, such as the setting of listed buildings.

Question 46 – Do you agree with Policy HE3: Conservation Areas?

Total Number of responses received: 38					
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
4	13	4	2	3	12

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect a range of views, from strong support for the approach to conservation areas to concerns that the policy goes

beyond national policy. Of the 38 responses received, around two thirds provided detailed comments on HE3. While the majority of respondents supported conserving and enhancing conservation areas and their settings, they raise differing views about how this should be achieved and how changes to conservation areas should be assessed.

The majority of respondents who expressed a view supported Policy HE3 (Strongly agreed or agreed). Key themes from these responses included:

- Agreement that replacing detrimental items in conservation areas can enhance their character and appearance.
- Designation adds value, improves culture and interest, balances old and new, against faceless development / urban sprawl.
- Contribution to a sense of place.
- Need to protect the setting of rural conservation areas from development and coalescence.
- Need to preserve status of area whilst acknowledging housing need.

Some respondents expressed a neutral view of the policy. Key themes included:

- Quality of many conservation areas in the borough has suffered due to cumulative effect of minor damaging changes, including highways and utility works.
- Most conservation area appraisals need updating.

Some respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the policy. Key themes included:

- Need for consistency in policy requirements for conservations areas that crossed local authority boundaries.
- Consider the impact of development on the settings of conservation areas.
- Additional traffic from development can have detrimental impacts.

A significant proportion of respondents did not express a sentiment towards the policy. Key themes included:

- Harm to areas arising from new development traffic impacts should be properly assessed.
- Detrimental impact of conservation area buildings suffering from long-term neglect should be addressed.
- Areas and their settings should be safeguarded from cumulative harm from development, e.g. effects on views in and out.
- There is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance conservation areas.
- Policy not aligned with the NPPF in consideration of harm to heritage assets.

- Support for policy and commitment to completing conservation area appraisals.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- **Historic England** agreed with the policy.
- **Kent County Council** supports this policy and the commitment to completing conservation area appraisals.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- **Maidstone Borough Council** were dissatisfied with the policy, stating that the Conservation Area for Watringbury crosses the LPA boundary and Maidstone Local Plan Review 2021-2038 Policy LPR ENV1 requires applications to provide a heritage statement, which is not set out in policy HE3.

Summary of feedback from Town and Parish Councils

- **Aylesford Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, stating that the designation adds value, improves culture and interest, balances old and new, against ever more faceless development / urban sprawl.
- **East Malling and Larkfield Parish Council** did not express a sentiment view but suggested that Paragraph 8.30 should recognise that threats to conservation areas can include impacts from traffic and congestion, especially where street patterns are narrow.
- **East Peckham Parish Council** were unhappy with the policy in relation to perceived negative impacts on 2 local conservation areas from proposed site allocations, which would join 2 conservation areas and lead to a buffer to the conservation area to the west being developed.
- **Hildenborough Parish Council** did not express a sentiment view but want to play an active part in the review of the Hildenborough Conservation Areas.
- **West Malling Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, expressing a commitment to preserving the status of their conservation area, whilst acknowledging the need for new homes. All building must be sympathetic and appropriate.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments on Policy HE3. A number of representations were received from residents, land promoters, parish councils, statutory bodies and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the policy.

Policy HE3 is intended to set out the borough's approach to conservation areas that will support our vision of conserving and enhancing heritage assets. Officers consider that Policy HE3 remains appropriate and balanced.

However, a number of refinements will be made to the supporting text to address concerns about clarity, interpretation and application and also to the policy itself to ensure matters raised are included. This will include:

- a) Amending policy and supporting text in accordance with comments received, where this would not conflict with national policy.
- b) Ensuring that the wording is properly aligned with the NPPF, such as the assessment of harm to heritage assets as well as the consideration of traffic on heritage assets.

Question 47 – Do you agree with Policy HE4: Historic Parks and Gardens (Designated and Non-Designated)?

Total Number of responses received: 28					
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
4	13	4	2	0	5

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect strong support for the approach to historic parks and gardens. Of the 28 responses received, less than half provided detailed comments on HE4. The majority of respondents suggested specific changes to strengthen the policy and supporting text.

The majority of respondents who expressed a view supported Policy HE4 (strongly agree or agree). Key themes from these responses included:

- Support, highlighting the well-being benefits of visiting parks etc.

Some respondents expressed a neutral view of the policy. Key themes included:

- Assets are important to character of area but not strongly protected in law.

A small number of respondents were dissatisfied or unhappy with the policy. Key themes included:

- Concerns were raised about the protection of Historic Parks and Gardens, including the absence of explicit policy wording stating that development harming their setting, significance, or key views would be resisted.
- That a minimum distance should be required between development and any Historic Park or Garden to ensure that issues such as traffic noise and user safety are fully considered.

Some respondents did not express a sentiment towards the policy. Key themes included:

- Support for emphasising importance of settings and views.
- Need to ensure list of registered parks and gardens is correct.
- Supporting evidence used to identify non-designated sites not recently reviewed and updated.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- **Historic England** agreed with the policy.
- **Kent County Council** welcomed commitment to historic parks and gardens but the list is drawn from the SKE12972 - The historic parks and gardens of Kent (Kent Gardens Compendium) - Historic Environment Record, which is now some years old. It is recommended that this list be reviewed. Suggested expanding the policy to reflect the NPPF regarding harm and loss and updating the term 'Scheduled Ancient Monuments' to 'Scheduled Monuments'.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- **Maidstone Borough Council** were neutral regarding the policy.

Summary of feedback from Town and Parish Councils

- **Aylesford Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, highlighting the well-being benefits of visiting parks etc.
- **Hildenborough Council** did not express a sentiment view but welcomed the acknowledgement that Non-Designated Historic Parks and Gardens are also relevant and worthy of protection. Reference to non-designated parks and gardens should be included in the Heritage Impact Assessment for the Plan.
- **West Malling Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, highlighting the well-being benefits of visiting parks etc.

Feedback from other organisations

- **High Weald National Landscape** supported the inclusion of the policy but suggested that supporting text should explain the status of Registered Parks and Gardens. Policy should be expanded to reflect the NPPF regarding substantial harm or loss to registered parks and gardens.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments on Policy HE4. A number of representations were received from residents, land promoters, parish councils, statutory bodies and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the policy.

Policy HE4 is intended to set out the borough’s approach to the historic parks and gardens that will support our vision of conserving and enhancing heritage assets. Officers consider that Policy HE4 remains appropriate and balanced.

However, a number of refinements will be made to the supporting text to address concerns about clarity, interpretation and application and also to the policy itself to ensure matters raised are included. This will include:

- a) Revising/updating terminology for consistency.
- b) Additional text to reflect the NPPF, for example regarding harm and loss of registered assets.
- c) Reviewing list of registered parks and gardens to ensure information is correct.

Question 48 – Do you agree with Policy HE5: Archaeology?

Total Number of responses received: 29					
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
4	16	5	0	0	3

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect strong support for the approach to archaeology. Of the 29 responses received, just over a third provided detailed comments on Policy HE5. The majority of respondents suggested specific changes to strengthen the policy and supporting text.

The majority of respondents who expressed a view supported Policy HE5 (strongly agree or agree). Key themes from these responses included:

- Support was expressed for the policy principles relating to the conservation and enhancement of archaeological assets within the borough.
- Respondents highlighted the importance of safeguarding sites of archaeological significance, noting that these assets shape both the present and future and therefore require careful protection and support.

Of those who expressed a neutral view, the policy was generally supported, however it was considered that it needs to align with the NPPF.

No respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the policy.

For those who did not answer the sentiment question, key themes included:

- Proposed development locations provide opportunities for archaeological excavations.

- Suggested amendments to the policy and supporting text for clarity, consistency, conformity with national guidance and to reflect best practice.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- **Historic England** agreed with the policy.
- **Kent County Council** welcomed the inclusion of the policy and suggested amendments. These included rephrasing section 1, including adding the term non-designated heritage assets, and sections 2 and 4. Amendments were suggested to section 5 as excavation was not always the most appropriate mitigation for development with archaeological impact. The reference to 12,500 hectares of land with archaeological potential in paragraph 8.56 should be removed as it is considered that this does not have a firm basis. The reference to consulting the Historic Environment Record in paragraph 8.59 should be strengthened to align with the NPPF. Written schemes of investigation referred to in paragraph 8.61 should be approved by the local planning authority.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- **Maidstone Borough Council** were neutral regarding the policy.

Summary of feedback from Parish Councils

- **Aylesford Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy.
- **West Malling Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy, highlighting the role played by sites of archaeological significance in the parish and borough in shaping the present and future and the need to preserve, protect and support them.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments on Policy HE5. A number of representations were received from residents, land promoters, parish councils, statutory bodies and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the policy.

Policy HE5 is intended to set out the borough's approach to archaeology that will support our vision of conserving and enhancing heritage assets. Officers consider that Policy HE5 remains appropriate and balanced.

However, a number of refinements will be made to the supporting text to address concerns about clarity, interpretation and application and also to the policy itself to ensure matters raised are included. This will include:

- a) Amending the policy and supporting text based on responses where this is consistent with national policy, for clarity, consistency and to reflect best practice.

Question 49 – Do you agree with Policy HE6: Enabling Development for Heritage Assets?

Total Number of responses received: 25					
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
1	10	9	1	2	2

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect a range of views, from support for the approach to enabling development and heritage assets to concern regarding enforcement. Of the 25 responses received, just over a third provided comments on HE6. Most respondents considered the policy to be worthwhile but some queried how the process would be managed.

The majority of respondents who expressed a view supported Policy HE6 (strongly agree or agree). Key themes from these responses included:

- Development should add value to maintain and support the heritage asset.
- Policy acknowledges the positive impact that development can have on heritage assets.

A significant minority of respondents expressed a neutral view of the policy. Key themes included:

- Laudable policy but aims need to be maintained and enforced.
- Where the heritage asset is remote, the traffic impact arising from the development on local roads should be considered.
- Policy needs to align with NPPF and make it clear that wilful neglect will not be allowed to build a case for development.
- The list of eligible buildings at risk needs to be published.

A minority of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the policy.

- Concerns were expressed that the absence of currently available alternatives should not justify decisions that could limit options for future generations. Respondents highlighted past examples, such as the loss of the northern end of Tonbridge High Street in the 1960s to emphasise the long-term consequences of irreversible change.

Some respondents did not express a sentiment towards the policy, however, there was an overall general support for the policy. Key themes included:

- A suggestion that there should be enforcement penalties for owners/stakeholders of assets that purposely allow their properties to fall into decline hoping for eventual demolition.
- Broad comments on bringing historic assets back into use.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- **Historic England** agreed with the policy.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- **Maidstone Borough Council** were neutral regarding the policy.

Summary of feedback from Town and Parish Councils

- **Aylesford Parish Council** were satisfied with the policy. Development should add value to maintain and support the heritage asset.
- **West Malling Parish Council** expressed a neutral view, considering the policy to be laudable but suggesting that the policy aims need to be maintained and enforced.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments on Policy HE6. A number of representations were received from residents, land promoters, parish councils, statutory bodies and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the policy.

Policy HE6 is intended to set out the borough's approach to heritage assets and enabling development that will support our vision of conserving and enhancing heritage assets. Officers consider that Policy HE6 remains appropriate and balanced.

However, a number of refinements will be made to the supporting text to address concerns about clarity, interpretation and application and also to the policy itself to ensure matters raised are included. This will include:

- a) Amending the policy and supporting text based on responses where this is consistent with national policy, for clarity and to reflect best practice.
- b) Ensuring the policy and supporting text is aligned with national policy.

Question 50: Is there anything missing from the Historic Environment chapter?

Total Number of responses received: 24			
Yes	Not sure	No	Not stated
10	4	7	3

Summary of issues raised

The comments provided by respondents to this question reflect a range of views on the historic environment chapter policies and its supporting text. Of the 24 responses received, almost half the respondents thought there was something missing from the chapter and almost half provided comments. Whilst the majority support the overall approach to preserving and enhancing the historic environment set out in the historic environment chapter, respondents raise differing views about how this should be achieved and how change to the historic environment should be assessed.

A significant minority of respondents expressed a view that there were matters that should be addressed in the chapter. Key themes from these responses included:

- Concerns regarding the loss of locally significant buildings located outside Conversation Areas. Reference made to the loss of a ‘landmark building’ identified in a character area assessment.
- A request for a local list of non-designated heritage assets.
- How policies and supporting text have been applied to the draft allocation of sites.
- Impact of traffic on local roads and visitors on woodlands arising from heritage assets opened to the public should be carefully considered.
- Housing developments near to heritage assets should be very small and complimentary and impacts, such as increased traffic flow, taken into account.
- Surveys of heritage assets should be a requirement for any significant development.
- There should be provisions for active travel to places of interest.

A number of respondents were either not sure whether there was anything missing from the chapter or did not consider this to be the case. No comments were submitted.

Some respondents did not express a sentiment towards the policy. Key themes included:

- Built heritage greatly informs the distinctive character of the High Weald National Landscape.
- Policies HE1 and HE2 should be more closely aligned with the NPPF, for clarity and the consideration of loss and harm to listed buildings.

- Need for robust and detailed supporting e.g. on historic building materials and form.
- Add reference to conservation and enhancement of public realm, as this is an important part of the historic environment.
- A register of designated and non-designated heritage assets should be maintained and made freely accessible.

Summary of feedback from Statutory Consultees

- No responses were received.

Summary of feedback from District / Boroughs

- No responses were received.

Summary of feedback from Town and Parish Councils

- **Aylesford Parish Council** considered that there should be provisions for active travel to places of interest.
- **West Malling Parish Council** did not consider that there was anything missing from the chapter.

Summary of feedback from other organisations

- **High Weald National Landscape** were generally supportive of policies in the chapter but suggested some amendments. Supporting text should be expanded to state that built heritage greatly informs the distinctive character of the HWNL. Reference to the conservation and enhancement of the public realm, as an important part of the historic environment, should be added.

Officer response to the consultation feedback

The Regulation 18 consultation invited comments to enable respondents to set out whether they considered there was anything missing from the historic environment chapter. A number of representations were received from residents, parish councils, and other stakeholders. The comments have provided valuable feedback on the clarity, appropriateness and deliverability of the chapter.

From the comments received refinements will be made to policies and supporting text to address concerns. This will include:

- a) Amending policies and supporting text based on responses where this is consistent with national policy, for clarity and to reflect best practice.
- b) Ensuring policies and supporting text is aligned with national policy.

Question 51

This question asked on a scale of 1 to 5 how satisfied people are with the historic environment policies. 1 being not satisfied at all and 5 being very satisfied. 26 responses were received to this question.

