

Historic Environment Strategy and Action Plan Consultation Representations

No.	Name	Comment
1	Ben Kirk (Agent)	<p data-bbox="691 376 1326 483">In general I think the action plan is a good document that identifies a logical approach to managing the historic environment within the district.</p> <p data-bbox="691 533 1377 752">I don't necessarily have any specific comments on the document but more general comments on the approach to managing heritage assets within the District that we, as agents, often come across. I hope some of these will be of use in informing the way the council approaches the management of the historic environment.</p> <ol data-bbox="691 801 1377 2027" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="691 801 1377 1102">1. Our general experience of the public's understanding of listed buildings is that it is very limited. Many people buy listed buildings with no real understanding of what that means and what they can and cannot do. Many think that if parts of the building are not what they would consider "old" they can do what they want. I could spell out many common misconceptions that we often come across.<li data-bbox="691 1151 1377 1603">2. The main issue with the above is that too often people take on a listed building assuming they can do works which may never be permitted. I have firmly believed for many years that homeowners should be given a basic "listed building owner's manual" before they purchase a listed building. This would set out the basics of what owning a listed building means. Such a concept might be hard to manage, but I believe education is key and this will make the whole process much less confrontational. I appreciate funds are tight but a mailshot of a well worded "manual" to all listed building owners in the District would pay huge dividends<li data-bbox="691 1688 1377 2027">3. The council, like most, has a heavy workload and stretched resources. However this has led to a feeling among many applicants and agents that pre application advice is simply not worth bothering with as it takes too long to get a response. If there was a way of providing simple pre application advice in a short timescale (3-4 weeks) then this would be a route used more often and would save significant resources when dealing with formal applications.

4. We are often asked to come in half way through the process of an application to provide specialist reports, details etc where a more general architect or consultant has failed to make progress with a scheme. The importance of applicants engaging the right consultants from the outset is clear. Not only does it lead to smoother applications but it also ensures less workload with the “back and forth” approach that many applications go through and a specialist will often be able to manage an applicant’s expectations from the outset ensuring schemes are more well considered, justified and realistic. I appreciate the council cannot recommend consultants and for fear of sounding like I am trying to drum up some free advertising, other authorities carry a list of local specialists, available to applicants, which is caveated with the fact the council don’t explicitly recommend them.

5. The setting of listed buildings is often overlooked, purely by process. Often new developments (outside of the curtilage of a listed building, such as neighbouring properties) that are not within conservation areas but are adjacent to listed buildings are not considered properly in context of the listed building by the fact the process does not require proper consideration of the impact on listed buildings. Too often poor quality design which is seen as appropriate on a modern house is accepted or worse still a pastiche attempt at a vernacular style that does not sit well with adjacent listed buildings. I appreciate planning officers have to consider design but the process seems to avoid consideration of neighbouring listed buildings as a default process.

I hope the above does not come across as too critical. These are just observations of the process that we see across most local authorities, not just Chichester and hope they can inform the way the council deal with the historic environment in the future.

2 Genesis Town Planning

We note the intention to prepare a validation checklist/process for Heritage Statements and a suite of Listed Building guidance notes, both of which we welcome and look forward to their publication.

We note the intention to review Conservation Areas and their boundaries and formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of CA's. The provisions of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 set out the duty to undertake reviews 'from time to time'. Historic England's CA Designation, Appraisal and Management Advice Note 1 (2016) advises that appraisals are reviewed regularly as part of the management of Conservation Areas so that they can be developed into management plans. As such it would be useful to see a projected plan for the review of all Conservation Areas in the District as many appraisals appear to be out of date or lack full Appraisals and Management Plans.

3 Historic England

We very much welcome the Council's initiative in producing this Strategy and Action Plan and are pleased to make the following comments.

1. On page 1, reference is made to the positive strategy for the historic environment as recommended by the NPPF. In fact, the requirement of paragraph 126 of the NPPF is for local plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment (as noted on page 7 of the Strategy), which is a separate and distinct matter from a stand-alone heritage strategy such as that on which the Council is now consulting

2. We welcome and support the purposes of the Strategy and Action Plan set out on page 4 and the objectives and priorities on pages 4 and 5.

3. In the first line of the second paragraph of page 6, we suggest "designated" rather than "protected".

3. In the Historic Context – page 11 onwards the timeline is not very specific to Chichester i.e. it is a broad brush statement of prehistoric South East England. The inclusion of some examples of sites to illustrate the different periods under discussion would help.

4. We are aware that Chichester was not covered by the Extensive Historic Town Surveys – perhaps as it was thought a candidate for the more intensive approach of an Urban Archaeological Database (UAD). This may be something that we could usefully revisit. Some reference to actions to enhance understanding and management of the archaeological resource of the historic city would be good.

5. In the Iron Age to Roman section there are some classes of monument which are typical of Chichester and its surrounds i.e. the systems of dykes and these do seem to be worthy of discussion. Similarly the Roman palace at Fishbourne is an outstanding site and should therefore be highlighted.

6. The Saxon and Medieval sections are very general and should be made more relevant to Chichester. The same criticism can be levelled at the next sections on post medieval and Victorian. The statement “By the 18th century Chichester had dwindled to being a quiet market town” begs the question from what status did it decline ? The medieval section does not make this clear.

7. Some examples in the Chichester City section page 13 would help. What physical evidence is there of a stronghold against the Vikings ? Why is the market cross considered unique as a monument type they are not that rare ? A low key medieval status is recorded here and sits oddly with the earlier statement about an 18th century decline – decline from what ?

8. On page 15 there are some examples given of specific sites but these could be worked in earlier in the document. The statement that as a group the heritage assets can be considered to be of outstanding significance may be so, but what assistance will this be when considering an individual heritage asset, including undesignated examples? The text box of significant themes and components is helpful but we suggest could be expanded and or signposting to other sources of information.

9. We consider that it would be helpful to specifically identify the Conservation Areas and Registered Historic Parks and Gardens in the area covered by the Strategy, perhaps in an Appendix with an indication where more information about these can be found and a reference to the National Heritage List for England.

10. The NPPF identifies only two types of heritage asset: designated and non-designated, as set out at the top of page 16. The latter includes those identified by a local authority on a "local list", but the NPPF does not accord any greater weight to assets on a local list to those that are not. It is therefore confusing and misleading to suggest that the local buildings list has "designated" assets on it on page 20 and that these are different to non-designated assets on page 21.

11. Non-designated heritage assets are not only archaeological remains, but include unlisted buildings and non-registered parks and gardens. We are therefore not clear why there is a separate sub-section headed "other assets" on page 22, as many of the examples given are non-designated heritage assets.

12. If "other assets" is intended to refer to elements of the historic environment that do not fall within the definition of a "heritage asset" (i.e. which are not a building, monument, site, place or landscape), then referring to them as "assets" is confusing and the examples cited of such assets needs to be revised to actually exclude non-designated assets.

13. It would be helpful to include a signpost to where an up to date version of the list is to be found and to the Historic Environment Record for non-scheduled archaeological remains.

14. We welcome the reference to historic landscape character on page 22.

15. The Heritage at Risk Register, to which reference is made on page 30, also includes Grade II places of worship, all grades of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas, the information for the latter coming from an annual survey undertaken by Council Conservation Officers and collated by Historic England.

16. We welcome and support the action plan as set out on pages 35-36 but, whilst we appreciate that an Action Plan is a list of time-specific actions, we feel it might be helpful to include some medium to longer term aspirations or targets beyond December 2016. We also suggest that the actions include engagement with the 2017 Conservation Areas at Risk Survey, which is normally undertaken between February and May/June each year.

4 West Itchenor Parish Council

West Itchenor Parish Council supports the Draft Historic Environment Strategy. It welcomes the enthusiasm to produce an Action Plan and offers its help to the District insofar as this village is concerned.

In particular it welcomes the proposal to compile the "Local Heritage List".

The Parish Council will ensure that the Itchenor Society is made aware of all the proposals and will offer its support to the success of completing this Strategy.

5 Martin Chritchley Architects

Whilst we have respect for your conservation staff, experience has shown that, they are very busy people and difficult for us to access.

Will the staff be increased to cope with the additional responsibilities of the new strategy ?

6 West Sussex County Council

P3 Part 1 Intro & Objectives, para 3, line 3 – sense - ...Council's role in its conservation and enhancement etc

P3 purpose of the Strategy, para 1, line 3 'a' missing from end of line

P6 Definition of the Historic Environment, final para of this section, text missing..."In addition (?to the) physical expression..." etc

P13, 2nd para 'Clausetum' vs Clausentum

P14, 1st para, 2nd line "...as (a) whole..."

P23, Introduction (Part Four) 1st para, 3rd line enhances vs 'enhance', 2nd para, 9th line, last word 'it' vs its

P24 (highlighted box) item 4 – “There is a charged for...” perhaps use 'chargeable' as below in discussion of pre-application charges

P24 (2nd highlighted box) 7th bullet point “...use (of) Article 4...”

P25 'Engaging with the Historic Environment' - suggest 'Sussex Gardens Trust' in full

P27 highlighted text (last para) “...the Council will advice...” vs advise and “areas historic character...” vs area's

P32, 2nd highlighted box, item 7. – remove apostrophe from “Council's”

P33 (Highlighted box: Services and Activities) item 2, last line “...in it exploration.” vs 'in its exploration'; item 7. “...communities if” vs 'communities in'

Specific comment

- ?Contents page/ glossary of terms (perhaps useful also for explain terms like Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic etc

- Under 'Objectives' (p4-5) it implies that a further document may be intended in 'identifying key issues and opportunities' but perhaps a link to part Four would cover this

- The Definition of the Historic Environment (beginning on page 5) uses quotation marks in the third line of this paragraph but it is not stated what is being quoted (and no obvious point where the quotation marks are closed) ?NPPF definition in Annexe 2 Glossary any help

- NPPF 132 includes scheduled monuments in heritage assets of the highest significance along with grade I and II* buildings, protected wreck sites and grade I and II* registered parks and gardens

- P9 reference to the impact of the last Ice Age on the coastal plain – surely the processes were the result of a succession of Ice Ages or glaciations

- Timeline – Saxon period – Chichester re-fortified in the 9th and 10th centuries because there were unsettled times with regular threat of Danish raids. In the ‘Medieval’ period the most significant (and symbolic) change in Chichester would be the relocation of cathedral church of the diocese (the diocese itself occupying the extent of the old kingdom of the South Saxons – therefore superfluous to say that it is the “...only cathedral city in Sussex”) from Selsey to Chichester. The building of the new cathedral church within the town and the setting out of the whole south west quadrant for the houses of the bishop, dean and chapter officials (together with the establishment of the castle in the north east quadrant) reinforced the fact that Chichester was reviving and on the map. Had this not been the case it might have suffered the same fate as Silchester.

- Did most of the houses in Chichester in the early 17th century have thatched roofs? (see p13 5th para) . Roy Morgan ‘Chichester a documentary history’ says, p64, of the small rented houses in Chichester in the previous century that “The roofs were mainly tile or slate, but the outbuildings were often thatched and include kitchens, barns, bakehouses and stores.” If the more modest houses were largely tiled or slated then it seems likely that grander houses would also have been (and much less of a fire risk). NB John Ede’s House was marked as Westgate House on 19th century OS mapping but had become ‘Wren’s House’ by the early 20th century.

- As well as locally sourced materials (see p 15) material has always been imported for prestigious buildings: Caen stone from Normandy, Quarr from the Isle of Wight (and Ventnor greensand for the Bell Tower). West Country slate could be shipped to Sussex for roofing material in the middle ages but the availability of Welsh slate from the railway age onwards would transform the appearance of many roofs in terms of texture and colour.

- Do the statistics (in the highlighted box at the bottom of p17) reflect the situation in the Chichester Plan area outside of the SDNP or in Chichester District as a whole? Do the bullet point facts reflect a national 'rule of thumb', the situation in Chichester District overall or just the Chichester Plan area? – it would be helpful to clarify

- The shortcomings of the Statutory List are well known (see p21) but with resourcing issues both with Historic England and local authorities what is the way forward to redress the problem?

- The support for the Chichester District HER is welcome and reflect NPPF paragraphs 128 and 169 – will historic landscape characterisation be incorporated into development management and will additional resource be made available to the District Archaeological Officer to maintain the HER (since the loss of the HER officer post a couple of years' since)?

- P 26 perhaps objective A. in the highlighted box should be to apply the Local Plan policies in accordance with NPPF – the section on Planning Policy Development (p27 below) already states that the Local Plan contains robust policies for protection and conservation of the historic environment.

- Is there such a thing as 'known' potential – either a development site does or does not have potential depending upon past land use and disturbance (or lack of it). The key is to establish sufficiently whether the potential of a site translates into actual evidence of heritage assets so that the appropriate options for protecting the assets or mitigating damage can be considered and applied at the planning application determination stage.

- The advice of 'in house' archaeological expertise is invaluable in managing the impact of development and land use proposals upon the historic environment. It takes many years to acquire a level of understanding which leads to an instinctive approach to caring for the environment of a specific locality. This is based on a breadth of knowledge founded on personal experience of individual case history, the people involved, local topography, geology and detailed factual information. It is possible for external consultants to produce their own assessments of environmental impact but the quality and value of such work can only really be judged by in-house expertise.

General/ concluding remarks:

Should the issue of setting be discussed more fully? The reference to GPA3 is included but can general principles be spelled out or does each proposal have to be taken on its individual merits/ demerits?

7 Chichester Conservation Area
Committee

CCAAC welcomes such a Strategy for managing the considerable historic heritage we have here in Chichester, and the additional protection that it should be able to afford

The Strategy is comprehensive and included some particularly welcome aims such as promoting greater awareness amongst decision makers and building owners of the importance of respecting the historic environment

The aim to publish guidelines to assist owners of historic buildings when making planning applications is laudable. CCAAC have seen suites of guidance issues by other LPAs and the set from Portsmouth was particularly impressive

It is noted that owners are to be encouraged to make more use of the Council's pre-app advice service and to work with officers to achieve satisfactory solutions. However, the fact that it is a chargeable service might prove a deterrent to the small householder. Also, this increased level of service will require more work by already stretched Conservation and Design staff. Will there be adequate resources to deal with this.

Masterplanning is seen as the way to achieve successful placemaking and there is no argument with that, but will masterplan requirements be enforced? There is for all to see the unfortunate example of where an existing masterplan - that for the Southern Gateway - was flagrantly flouted when developments of the Osbourne site at the Canal basin was permitted with disastrous results

Some minor typos

- Page 8 6th Para, 7th line "program" should read "programme"
- P12 last para, the railway to Chichester opened in 1846 not 1844
- P13, 4th para "black friary" should read "Blackfriars Friary" and grey friary should read "Greyfriars Friary"
- P22, last para, 4th line delete "of" after "outside"
- P 25, 2nd grey panel 'Engaging with the Historic Environment' first bullet point - gardens Trust should have a capital G and add "Sussex Industrial Archaeology Society"
- P29, 4th para regarding CCAAC. The wording of this could give the wrong impression of its function and relationship with the Council. I would suggest it be reworded as follows: *The Council makes an annual grant to the Chichester Conservation Areas Advisory Committee who support the Council 's officers by reviewing and commenting on planning applications within Chichester conservation area and providing specialist advice. This helps utilise knowledge and expertise within the local community.*
- P33 "The West Sussex Records Office" should read "West Sussex Record Office"

The Chichester Society welcomes this comprehensive Historic Environment Strategy for all aspects of the heritage of the District in the light of the major changes which will inevitably occur during the lifetime of the Chichester District Local Plan. Development does however provide funding which should be channelled to the protection and enhancement of the heritage of the District.

We endorse the objectives of the strategy and the need to publicise it to developers and to the general public. The definition of Heritage Assets in part 3 explains that these are not only 'identified heritage assets' (i.e. conservation areas, listed or locally listed buildings, ancient monuments, and historic parks and gardens) but also 'non-identified heritage assets.' We are particularly concerned that the Statutory List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest for Chichester City has not been systematically revised since the 1950's and that the descriptions of many listed buildings are extremely sparse and in some cases the importance of a specific listed building is not clarified (e.g. where an early 19th century dwelling is part of a listed terrace.). This makes it all the more necessary for the Council to update its non-statutory List, and also to produce Article 4 Directions for non-listed dwellings in conservation areas.

The variety of geology and of vernacular building materials needs to be understood whenever designing new buildings or extensions to existing ones, wherever they may be located.

The Action Plan for the Management of the Historic Environment is welcomed. However this will place an immense strain on the existing resources of the Council's Conservation and Design service whose staff already provide a high level of expertise. Adequate human resources are essential if the Action Plan is to be implemented within the intended timescale. Protecting, managing and engaging with the historic environment must be carried out in participation with voluntary bodies such as the CCAAC, Chichester Society and residents' associations. The historic environment of the District belongs to us all.

In approving the revised Character Appraisal and Management Proposals for the Chichester Conservation Area, CDC's Cabinet on 6 September 2016 resolved that an assessment of the Summersdale area to assess its potential for conservation area designation be undertaken in connection with the future review of the Graylingwell conservation area. However, we consider that the central part of Summersdale is worthy of designation as a conservation area in its own right. This is particularly desirable in view of the growing development pressures on its early 20th century dwellings and the redevelopment of large properties along the tree lined Lavant Road which is a mature landscaped link between the city and the South Downs National Park. We suggest that priority should be given to assessing Summersdale alone as a conservation area, with the participation of Summersdale Residents' Association who some years ago submitted a character appraisal of the area.

Response

Noted

Noted

Noted

Agreed

Noted

Noted - agree that problems often arise due to lack of appropriate advice at an early stage of developing proposals

Generally impact on setting is taken into consideration where proposals are in close proximity to heritage assets. Consideration of design needs to be objective and local plan policies do require design of development to be based on an understanding of context.

Noted and comments are welcomed.

Noted

Noted and Agreed.

Noted

Noted.

Noted

Agreed

Agreed

Noted: There was never any intention to provide EUS for Chichester because it was to be covered by an IUS, which was to include UAD plus assessment plus a strategy. Because EH funded Chichester's UAD but declined to fund either of the follow-ups they were never done. The UAD is comprehensive, and is included in the HER.

The UAD comprises an intensive database of archaeology and archaeological interventions, to which we added the built heritage.

In order to secure part funding to complete the UAD (from WSCC) we promised to do some basic characterisation of the historic development of Chichester, and this resulted in a series of GIS polygons showing the development of the city from the middle-ages to the early modern period.

We could consider revisiting EUS for the city, but this would require funding and additional staff resources.

Agreed

Noted. Some additional text to be incorporated

Noted. Some additional text to be incorporated

Noted.

Noted

Noted. The local list is clearly within the non-designated assets section. Could clarify further by adding non-statutory to heading

Agreed

Noted

Noted

Noted

Agreed

Noted - The Action Plan sets out a wide range of ongoing work, both long and shorter term and is not time limited. The Action Plan program is mainly a work program for the current year and is proposed to be refreshed annually. We could consider including longer-term projects within the program, when they come forward. For example if funding/resources were made available to pursue an Extensive Historic Town Survey for Chichester City. Longer term work, for example a program for review of conservation areas has been introduced.

Noted

Noted

Noted

It should be possible to access advice from specialist staff via the Council's various and soon to be consolidated pre-application advice schemes. These are described in the Strategy document

The document is not intended to justify budgetary growth in this area. The aim of the strategy is to identify how we can use limited resources in a positive way, for example the provision of more written advice and guidance in relation to the historic environment for both agents and planning officers

Noted

Noted

Noted

Noted

Noted

Noted

Agreed

Agreed

Agreed

Agreed

Agreed

Agreed

Noted. A Contents page will be incorporated and agreed that a Glossary would be useful.

Agreed - is the definition from the NPPF

Agreed add reference to NPPF Para 132

Noted

Noted

Noted

Agree

The box clearly states-"Chichester District, including the area covered by the South Downs National Park". The statistic in the bullet points above relate to national percentages. This has been clarified and the District percentages are added, but include the area of the District covered by the National Park.

Issue is understood. We can work with HE to review Statutory Lists in connection with Conservation Area Reviews, as was done in Midhurst. HE also now have enhanced services for spot listing buildings, which could be referenced.

Unlikely

Agreed - Local plan is subject to review so robust policies need to be maintained and developed.

Noted

Agreed and applies equally to in-house historic building advice

Noted

Noted

Noted

Noted. We are preparing our guidance jointly with Arun DC and it should be short and concise, similar to Portsmouth, but specific to Chichester and Arun.

The householder charges are very small compared with building costs to implement changes to historic buildings. And advice on repairs is still provided free. The aim of the Pre-app service is to iron out issues at an early stage in the process and should help reduce time required at the application stage. The aim of the strategy is to identify better ways of working with limited resources.

Noted - hopefully future masterplans will be subject to robust evaluation and public consultation to attach sufficient weight for assessing future applications. The HE Strategy aims to ensure the interests of the historic environment are taken into proper consideration in the preparation of masterplans.

Noted

Noted. Reference is to use of CIL income towards the Historic Environment. The Localism Act allows CIL to be used for maintenance and on-going costs, of relevance to a range of heritage assets, for example, transport infrastructure such as historic bridges or green and social infrastructure such as parks and gardens. This is something that could be pursued through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Noted. We could approach Historic England to see if a review could be undertaken of the Statutory List in relation to the City, using information from the character appraisal. Support for Article 4 Directions is noted and will be implemented for the Chichester Conservation Area

Agreed, reference to understanding of geology and materials added to Geology Context.

The purpose of the Action Plan is to help address issues of strains on resources by developing a process for prioritising actions within available resources. The ongoing review of the Action plan can allow priorities to be tailored to the resources available and in response to particular demands on the service.

Noted. The review of Graylingwell conservation area will provide the framework for deciding the configuration of both the existing and any potential new conservation area based on Summersdale. The difference in character between the two area, is understood

Appendix 2

Action

No Change

No Change

Scope to improve information on website. Add preparation of a short guide that could be distributed to Estate Agents to explain implication of owning a listed building to Action Plan.

Add preparation of a short owners guide to Action Plan tasks, add "the implications of owning and/or managing heritage assets and" to point 5, page 24.

Pre-Application Advice Service is being reviewed and consolidated into a single service which should hopefully address response time. Need some clearly designed/explained ground rules to overcome pre-application advice being tied up with lengthy exchanges between agent/applicant and authorities. Also clearer guidance on minimum information to ensure proposals are clearly explained

Short owners guide should emphasis the importance of obtaining advice where proposals likely to have a significant affect on an asset are being considered.

No Change

No Change

No Change

Schedule of CA Reviews should be attached as an Appendix to the Action Plan

No Change

Revised text to confirm the document as supporting/providing the evidence base to support the Local Plan.

No Change

Amend protected to designated first line of paragraph 2 on page 6.

Additional text to be added to timeline

Some of the characterisation evidence has been incorporated within the Chichester City Section with the maps.

Should a viable funding/resource proposal come forward, an EUS project could be introduced into the Action Plan as part of its regular review.

Further information on the dykes and Roman Palace incorporated within Iron-Age to Roman Section

Add some additional text, specific to Chichester, within Saxon to Medieval section.

Amend Section on Chichester to include more evidence to support statements and also incorporate characterisation evidence and maps as recommended above.

Some additional text to be incorporated in the timeline sections and sentence regarding group of assets re-worded to "Both individually and as a group"

Add Schedules of Conservation Areas and Historic Parks and Gardens with links to further information as an Appendix. Add reference to NHLE and a link under designated Heritage assets on page 16.

Re name sub heading "LocalDesignations – Local Buildings List" to "Local, Non-Statutory Designations – Local Buildings List"

Relocate text under "other assets" to start of section on non-designated heritage assets.

Relocate text under "other assets" to start of section on non-designated heritage assets.

Add reference to NHLE and a link under designated Heritage assets on page 16, and add links to the local building list and HER under the relevant sections.

No Change

Add "Grade II Listed places of worship, all grades of Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas", after Grade I and Grade II Listed Buildings, first paragraph under Heritage at Risk on page 30.

No Change

No Change

No Change

No Change

No Change

No Change

Text corrected

Text corrected

Text corrected

'Clausetum' corrected to Clausentum
missing "a" added

Text corrected

Text amended

Text corrected

Sussex added before Garden's Trust

Text corrected

Text corrected

Text corrected

Contents Page introduced. Add a Glossary as an Appendix to the Strategy

Add close quotation mark after "flora" and add reference to NPPF - Annexe 2 Glossary.

Add reference to NPPF Para 132 to second paragraph on page 6

Ice age replaced with "a succession of ice ages or glaciations". Could add a referenceto presence of historic sink holes identified in the LiDAR survey photography.

Additional text added to sections on Saxon and medieval periods.
Reference added regarding relocation of Diocesan Church Page 13
"Chichester City", second paragraph.

Text amended to refer to tile and slate roofs and to the presence of a variety of outbuildings, many with thatched roofs. Reference to Edes House amended to include reference to Westgate House and the fact it became known as Wrens House in the 20th century.

Reference to use of imported materials added to paragraph 2 under Chichester District's Historic Environment

Add District data to bullet points on page 18

Add an additional paragraph to refer to opportunities to review statutory listing in connection with CA Appraisals., and to mention availability of HE enhanced services for fast track listing and enhanced listing.

Add reference to Local Plan and "in accordance with the NPPF to objective A.

First two bullet point under "The District Archaeology Officer can advise on, reworded

Add a paragraph on the value of in-house expertise - under advice of development proposals.

Add a short paragraph relating to advice on proposals within the setting of heritage assets under section on "Advice on development proposals (Applications for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent)".

No Change

No Change

No Change

No Change

No Change

All typos corrected

No Change

No Change

Reference added to first paragraph under Historic Context to tgeh way local geology is reflected in building materials and traditions and sentence added on the importance of understanding local geology and vernacular building materials when designing development.

No Change

No Change