Local list SPD Consultation Statement

Introduction

Rochford District Council is producing a Local List Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) identifying buildings and items of street furniture that are of architectural or historical interest.

This Supplementary Planning Document encourages the retention and conservation of the District's Local heritage assets. Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration in the assessment and determination of any planning application submitted for a site contained on the Rochford District Council List. The SPD sets out to achieve a common standard for all Locally Important Buildings.

The government emphasises the need for good design which respects local distinctiveness, including reusing and incorporating existing buildings which contribute to the local distinctiveness and character of an area. The NPPF emphasises that local authorities should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The Local List will help the Council to achieve this goal.

Following the consultation on the Local List SPD Discussion and Consultation Document published in January 2011 the Council has compiled its responses in a Consultation Report that details representations received and the Council's responses.

The Consultation Report consists of three parts:

1. An introduction outlining the consultation processes undertaken in the preparation of the Local List SPD.
2. A section detailing the individuals and organisations that have been consulted during the preparation process.
3. A register of all comments received on the Local List SPD, together with an individual Council response to the comment and the decision as to whether a particular building will or will not be included in the Local List.

Once the Local List is adopted as an SPD it will be treated as a 'living document', meaning that it will be monitored and updated on an on-going basis.

It should be noted that the comments recorded in the table of Consultation Responses are summaries of the comments made by respondents. Respondents full comments can be viewed by visiting Rochford District Council's website using the following link :

http://rochford.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=search

1. The Distinction Between Local Listing and Listed Building Status

If a building or piece of street furniture is of national historical or architectural significance or is a heritage asset they are given listed building status under the planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This is a statutory designation which affords those on the list significant protection under the planning system.

Conservation areas are intended to protect the special character of the nation's historically significant places. This includes the heart of our historic cities and market towns as well as suburban neighbourhoods and rural villages. The designation of conservation areas aims to recognise the features that give the area special character. Designation is not intended to prevent change or adaption but to ensure that the effects on the area are properly considered. Conservation areas provide protection against the demolition of buildings and the cutting down of trees. Article 4 Directions can be used to protect other features such as windows and doors.

A local list differs from listed building status and conservation area designation as inclusion on a local list does not protect a building to the same extent. A local list is intended as a guide to help property owners who wish to alter their properties to do so in a way that does not undermine the special architectural or historical character of the building. As a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the Local List will offer guidance and advice rather than constituting a new policy. It will identify Local Heritage Assets (LHAs) which merit increased protection under the planning system.

Unlike Listed Building Status, the Local List will not afford statutory protection. Instead the Council intends to work with the owners of the properties to provide guidance and advice.

The Council will support the retention and sympathetic enhancement, where appropriate of buildings and items of street furniture included in the Local List.

The Role of the Local List Consultation Document

The Local List SPD Consultation Document was published in January 2011 and consulted on between 7 February 2011 and 6 May 2011.The Consultation Document sought the publics' views on which buildings or items of street furniture should be identified as Local Heritage Assets (LHAs) and included in the final list.

The document mainly consists of a review of buildings and street furniture which formed the 1995 Local List. Informal consultation with local Parish/ Town Councils took place between February and March 2009 which sought views and opinions on the structures included in the 1995 list and any additional structures recommended for inclusion in the consultation document. Buildings and items of street furniture submitted by members of the public or suggested through other consultations as part of the Local Development Framework process were also included where appropriate.

The buildings/street furniture suggested for inclusion by Parish/Town Councils and member of the public and those items on the 1995 list were visited as part of the document's preparation and fed into the Consultation Document.

Responses to the consultation have been fed into the final Local List SPD which will be used when determining planning applications for those buildings or items of street furniture on the list.

2. Overview of the Consultation Process

This section of the document sets out the methods used during the production of the Local List SPD. It covers the methods used to ensure community involvement and shows which specific and general consultees alongside members of the public were invited to make representations.

Rochford District Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement setting out how the Council will involve the local community in the preparation of the Local List SPD. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement surpasses the requirements of existing government policy.

Consultation prior to the Local List Consultation Document	
Consultation Method	**Details**
Robin Carpenter, Senior Consultant, Historic Buildings Place Services Shaping Places Essex County Council	Initial contact – when preparing List. Consulted on the criteria used, format of list and each section as it was completed. Communication with the Senior Consultant has been maintained throughout the consultation process. Mr Carpenter provided advice and guidance on aspects of the historical and architectural issues. Contact was maintained via email and through regular meetings.
Parish/Town Councils	The Council wrote to Parish / Town Councils in December 2008, seeking their views on the items in the 1995 Local List, and whether there should be an additions or deletions. The Parish/Town Councils provided a list of buildings/street furniture which they wanted to be considered for inclusion in the list. The suggestions received were used to inform the preparation of the Local List Consultation Document. The Parish/Town Councils were consulted formally on the Consultation Document.

Consultation following the Publication of the Local List Consultation Document	
Consultation Method	**Details**
Publication of Consultation Document	In January 2011 the Council published a Discussion and Consultation Document on the Local List. This document consisted of a review of the buildings and items of street furniture which formed the 1995 Local List; together with those that had been suggested by Parish / Town Councils and other items that had been submitted by members of the public or suggested through other consultations as part of the Local Development Framework process. This Discussion and Consultation Document listed both items that were considered worthy of inclusion on the Local List, as well as those that were not considered to merit inclusion, with the reasons given in either case.
Consultation letters to specific and general consultees and members of the public	Letters/emails were sent to members of the public and specific and general consultees including all of the bodies listed within Appendix E of the 2004 PPS12. Although this document has since been superseded by the regulations set out in the 2012 Planning Regulations the Local List complies with planning regulations as they were when the document was initially complied. Those on the Council's Local Development Framework mailing list which includes statutory consultees as well as groups and organisations who may have an interest in the development of the District. Members of the public who expressed an interest in being informed of opportunities to participate were contacted

	and informed about the consultation period.
Consultation letters to agents and developers;	Letters/emails were sent out to agents and developers during the consultation.
Properties suggested for inclusion on the local list	Letters were sent out to the owners/ occupiers of properties that were put forward for inclusion on the local list.
Rochford District Matters article	An article was included in the Rochford District Matters publication that sent out the residents of the District in the spring of 2011.
Notices	A notice was issued to local media.
Online consultation system	An online consultation response form was made available on the Council's website.

3. Consultation responses

To be included in the Local List
Not to be included in the Local List

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
The Harvester Pub: Located on the Corner of High Road and Southend Arterial Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included: They commented that the building (although extended) is of significant local historic interest as the A127 was the 1st road in this country built specifically for motorized vehicles and an "Opening ceremony" was attended outside by Prince Henry of Gloucester in 1925.	No	No	The harvester is not architecturally or historically interesting and the historical significance of the road has no bearing upon the listing of the building.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Two pillar boxes: One opposite the Half Moon Pub in Rayleigh, the other near the memorial in Rayleigh.	No	No	The two pillar boxes each have two slots. The design is quite unusual in the Rochford area.	No	Yes	The pillar boxes positively contribute to the street scene and the conservation area in general. They should be included on the Local List.
Old Post Office: High Street, Canewdon	Yes	No	Listed Building	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be considered.
The Salvation Army - 146-148: High Street Rayleigh	No	Yes	Respondent commented that this building should be included.	Yes	Yes	This comment is noted. This building is already included on the Local List. The building on the right of the photo dates from 1884, while the building on the left dates from 1902 (hence the commemoration stones) (RTTLG archives).
46 and 48 Hockley Road, Rayleigh	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included: These are considered to be distinctive and are of local historic importance (They were used as the RAF guard room in	No	No	These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. The buildings are situated in the Rayleigh Conservation Area and are protected under this designation.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			WW2). To have a consistent approach within RDC note page 238 for a similar property they should also be included.			
Brooklands: Hockley Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List: Although it has undergone several alterations it is considered to be of significant local historical importance. In WW2 it was the officers' mess for the RAF and post WW2 the Essex Education Office.	No	No	Despite having had some of its windows replaced with plastic frames it still retains a strong character. The decorative gable is of particular note. Although these features are worth noting, they are not of sufficient value, when considered against the changes to the building, to merit inclusion on the Local List. Although it does not merit inclusion on the Local List the building is still protected as part of the Conservation Area.
Rayleigh County Junior & amp; Infant School: Love Lane	No	Yes	Additional information added: Built in 1895 (school records).	Yes	Yes	This building is already included in the local list. The additional information will be included in the final version of the SPD.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
318 Eastwood Road	No	No	Respondent commented that this should be included: It was commented that this is a very distinctive cottage.	No	No	This site is not architecturally distinctive enough to merit inclusion in the local list. Although the cottage is attractive with decorative weatherboards and windows that are sympathetic to the style of the building, it is set back from the street and does not have a strong impact on the character of the surrounding street scene. Historically and architecturally it is not of any great significance.
10 Trinity Road	No	No	A respondent commented that this should be included: It is believed to have been built in 1894 and is a good example of its type.	No	No	The building should not be included in the Local List as it has undergone significant changes to its structure despite its age. It lacks any striking architectural features or historical significance.
49 Downhall Road	No	No	Respondent commented that this building should be included as it is a detached cottage style chalet with individual style.	No	No	It should be noted that the property has undergone significant changes in the form of a flat roofed first floor extension. The white pebbledash render is likely a recent addition although the exposed timber frames may be original. The windows are not original and detract from the building's character. This building should not be included on the Local List.
89 Downhall Road	No	No	Respondent commented that this should be included	No	No	The building is not of sufficient architectural interest to merit protection under the local list. Neither does it add to any distinctive architectural character to

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			in the Local List as it is very distinctive.			the surrounding area.
25 Crown Hill	No	No	Respondent commented that this building should be included: They state that it was the original house of the Gas Light and Coke Co dating from 1850 and that it is of significant local historic significance.	No	Yes	The building is not of sufficient archaeological or architectural interest to merit listing in the Local List. However its historical value means that it merits inclusion. Additionally it contributes to the diverse character of the surrounding street scene.
3 Great Wheatley Road	No	No	A respondent commented that this building is of local historical significance. They stated that it housed soldiers in WW1 and was connected with the Peculiar People religious group.	No	No	Architecturally the building is not significant. As far as its historical value is concerned the site does not contribute greatly to the historical make up of the District. Many houses were used for billeting soldiers during World War I and there appears to be little or no remaining evidence of this function in the fabric of the current existing building.
12 Station Road	No	No	Detached shop/office building opposite Hockley train station. Distinctive style in this area and of	No	No	Noted – The building is not of sufficient architectural or historical value to merit protection under the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			great local historical value			
75 High Street	No	No	Respondents commented that although the ground floor has been altered the 1st floor is still a building of local historic significance.	No	No	This building is located within the Rayleigh Conservation Area. Significant alterations to the building, particularly on the ground floor means that it should not be listed.
105-111 High Street	No	No	Respondents commented that the building was built in 1881. The building is situated in the Rayleigh conservation area and is of significant local historic interest.	No	No	These buildings have undergone significant alterations to their ground floors as well as having their windows replaced. There is also a significant amount of signage on most of the buildings, which detracts from their character. These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. It should still be noted that these buildings benefit from protection under the Rayleigh Conservation Area.
2 Eastwood Road	No	No	A respondent stated that this two storey brick building is of local significance as it is the last one remaining example	No	Yes	The building already benefits from protection as part of the conservation area. However It is of such individual significance that local listing is justified.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			of its kind in this area.			
41-67 Lower Lambricks	No	No	Respondents commented that these buildings are all that remain of the Brickfields on the site including the cooling tunnels. Note: A planning permission was sought in 1998 and 2010 for 10 houses (outline).	No	No	The significant loss of the original building structure means listing is not appropriate in this case.
Hockley Road: Lych gate of Rayleigh cemetery	No	No	Respondents commented that this feature is of significant local historical interest.	No	Yes	The specific historical value of this feature is not fully known. Lych gates often functioned as the entrances to traditional English churches for a variety of ceremonies. This particular gate is decoratively carved. It forms an attractive feature along Hockley Road. It will be included in the Local List.
Post Box Outside Crown Public House :	No	No	Respondents commented that the post box is situated in the Rayeligh conservation area	No	Yes	This will be Include in the Local List. A site visit was conducted confirming that the post box contributes positively to the character of the street scene.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			and is a rare remaining example of its type in the District.			
London Road junction with Victoria Avenue	No	No	Respondents commented that the milestone at the junction between London Road and Victoria Avenue is of local historical significance despite being a replacement.	No	No	This feature, particularly because it is a replacement, is not of any great architectural or historical significance and should not be included on the Local List.
London Road: Essex County Council Boundary Posts 1 outside no 30, Rayleigh. Ordnance survey grid ref nos. TQ80310/91415. 2 others in front of fence of Sweyne Park School. 2 in front of	No	No	A respondent commented that these 5 Essex County Council boundary posts mark the public highway. They stated that the posts are rare remaining examples and are of significant local historical interest.	No	No	These boundary posts are not of any architectural significance. Their value as historical artifacts is relatively limited. They should not be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
fence of Glebe school.						
Rayleigh Urban District Council boundary post: Arterial Road	No	No	A respondent commented that this post marks the boundary between Southend on Sea and the Rayleigh Urban District Council and that it is a rare example and is of significant local historical interest.	No	No	Rayleigh Urban District Council no longer exists and so technically the boundary post could be said to have some secondary historical significance. However it is important that the quality and significance of the assets identified in the Local List are of a comparable standard. The posts should not be included on the Local List.
Evangelical Church: 36 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh, Essex SS6 7JQ	No	No	A respondent commented that this church was built in the early 1920's. It was the first in Rayleigh for the Peculiar People, religious group and as such is of significant local historical interest.	No	yes	This building has a number of interesting architectural features which make it suitable for local listing. These include decorative brick work and a distinctive architrave in addition to the striking columns which flank the gable and windows with pointed arches.
58 Hockley Road	No	No	A respondent commented that this building is a Scandinavian style chalet built in the early 1960's and is	No	No	This building is not architecturally or historically significant enough to merit inclusion on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			the only one of its type in the town.			
Numbers 63/65/67 Rayleigh Avenue	No	No	Respondents commented that these houses form an attractive terrace of period properties.	No	No	These 1960s properties although well maintained and attractive are not unique to the District and don't form a key component of the areas character.
38 Hollytrees	No	No	Respondents commented that this house is an example of a distinctive local "byford" built property. Additionally they state that the property is well maintained.	No	No	The property is in keeping with the general design of other properties in the area which are not included in the Local List. Although the property is well maintained and attractively designed, this does not guarantee that it should be included on the Local List.
20 Western Road	No	No	A respondent commented that number 20 Western Road, known as the Cotteridge is a very imposing property and was one of the first built on Western Road.	No	No	The building is not of significant historical or archaeological interest and does not merit protection under the local list.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Medical Centre, Eastwood Road Rayleigh	No	Yes	A respondent commented that the Medical Centre was built in the 1930's and is one of only a few properties of this age in the town.	No	No	The medical centre is not of local historical or architectural interest and does not merit inclusion on the local list.
Hockley Railway Station and Platform - Station Approach.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these structures should be included. They commented that the local railway stations are in poor condition and that the government could negotiate a renovation deal with Railtrack. The respondent queried why Rochford station is included in the list yet Rayleigh and Hockley are not. They suggested that none of the stations should be allowed to have unsympathetic alterations or additions, as has	No	No	The railway platform of Hockley Railway Station has undergone significant changes and retains only a small fraction of its original features. This has had a detrimental impact on the character of the station. The Station is not considered to be of such local importance to merit inclusion on the revised list.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			happened with Southend stations. They commented that the existing stations should be preserved until there is sufficient funding to rebuild them.			
18 Church End	No	Yes	A respondent commented that this property contributes to the Group Value.	No	No	This pair of cottages have group value in conjunction with similar buildings along Church End but are not considered to have individual value. This pair of cottages is situated in the Foulness Conservation Area and they are protected under this designation. Local Listing would not provide any additional protection. They should not be included on the Local List.
Foulness Heritage Centre: Church End	No	Yes	A respondent commented that there are a limited number of buildings on Foulness and as it is a Heritage Centre it should be protected and maintained.	No	No	The building is situated in Foulness Conservation area. It is not architecturally or historically significant enough to merit inclusion on the Local List. As It is already protected within the Conservation area and does not require additional protection.
1 Timber Wharf Cottages: Beeches Road	No	Yes	A respondent commented that all of the Cottages	No	No	These buildings fall within the Battlesbridge Conservation area. As they are protected under this designation it is not necessary to include them on

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			should all be protected by the local list.			the Local List.
Outbuilding: Rouncefall, The Chase.	No	No	A respondent commented that the building forms a part of the overall character of Rouncefall and it should be protected by the local list. The respondent commented that It also has close historical association with the main building.	No	No	This structure is not architecturally or historically significant and does not merit inclusion on the Local List. Furthermore the outbuilding does not contribute greatly to the character of Rouncefall.
Old Hall Farm: Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Old Hall Farm should be included in the Local List.	No	No	Although the property dates back to the 1850s it has undergone some unsympathetic alterations including UPVC sashes and a mono-pitched glazed porch between the ground floor windows. It is primarily white render and there is evidence of alteration to the original building which is not sympathetic. The building should not be included on the Local List. It should also be noted that the Old Hall Farm building is protected as part of the Foulness Conservation Area.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
20 and 21 Church End	No	Yes	Respondent commented that these buildings should be included in the Local List.	No	No	These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. Additionally they are protected within the Foulness Conservation Area.
7 and 8 Church End.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these two buildings have distinctive charm.	No	No	Numbers 7 & 8 Church End have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. Numbers 7 & 8 Church End are protected as part of the Foulness Conservation Area.
24 and 25 Church End	No	Yes		No	No	Numbers 24 & 25 Church End have group value and are situated in the Foulness Conservation Area. Individually they have limited value in terms of historical and design interest. They do not need to be protected by the Local List.
2 Timber Wharf Cottages: Beeches Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that they should all be protected by the Local List.	No	No	The Cottage has undergone some significant alterations however these have not yet had such a significant impact as to undermine the character and coherence of the group of cottages as a whole. It is recognized that the cottages are part of several unlisted but locally significant buildings, which contribute to the traditional character of the area. Because the cottage is valued primarily for its contribution to a group of buildings it is not appropriate to locally list it. 2 Timber Wharf cottages does however receive protected as part of

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
						the Battlesbridge Conservation Area.
1 and 2 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the property is the same style as number 46 on list which adds to overall charm of the village therefore it should be protected.	No	No	These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They notable primarily for their group value. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List.
27 and 28 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these two buildings should be included on the Local List.	No	No	These two cottages have group value in conjunction with several other buildings along Church End. These help to form a distinctive local architectural style in the village. These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They are notable primarily for their group value. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. They are protected as part of the Foulness Conservation Area.
19 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	No	The building is situated within the Foulness Conservation Area. It has group value in conjunction with other similar buildings along Church End. It is not considered to have great individual value and should not be included in the Local List. It should be noted that the building is protected

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
						under the Foulness Conservation Area.
3 and 4 Timber Wharf Cottages: Beeches Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that both buildings should all be protected by the local list.	No	No	These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They are notable primarily for their group value. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. The Timber Warf Cottages are situated in the Battlesbridge Conservation Area.
5 and 6 Timber Wharf Cottages: Beeches Road	No	Yes	They should all be protected by the local list.	No	No	The Timber Warf Cottages are situated in the Battlesbridge Conservation Area and while they are of group value, they do not have individual value. They should not be included in the Local List. These buildings are protected under the Conservation Area.
15 Church End	No	Yes	Respondent commented that this building should be included in the Local List	No	No	The building is protected as part of the Foulness Conservation Area. It has group value along with several similar two storey brick buildings on Church End. However its individual value is limited. It is not necessary for 15 Church End to be added to the Local List.
Lodge Farmhouse :Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the Lodge Farmhouse should be included on the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historical value to merit inclusion in the local list.
26 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents	No	No	This building is situated within the Foulness

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			commented that 26 Church end should be included on the Local list.			Conservation Area. It differs in design from the other weatherboard buildings along Church End. Individually it is not of sufficient architectural or historical interest to merit inclusion on the Local List.
7 Timber Wharf Cottages: Beeches Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that 7 Timber Wharf Cottages should all be protected by the Local List.	No	No	The building contributes to the group value of the area although it does differ architecturally from the surrounding buildings. It is not of sufficient local historical or architectural interest to merit inclusion on the Local List. The building is located in the Battlesbridge Conservation Area.
22 and 23 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This pair of cottages is located in the Foulness Conservation Area. They have group value with similar buildings along Church End. However as they lack individual value they should not be included in the Local List.
Hyde Wood Farmhouse: Hyde Wood Lane	No	Yes	It should be protected by the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be of local historical or architectural importance. It should not be included in the Local List.
Old Hall Farm Cottage: Church End	No	Yes	Respondent Commented that this is a delightful building and should be considered for inclusion in the Local list.	No	No	The building is of local historical importance however alterations have had a negative impact on its character. It does not merit inclusion on the Local List. This building is situated within the Foulness Conservation Area and is afforded protection under this designation.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
29 and 30 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included on the Local List.	No	No	This pair of cottages is located in the Foulness Conservation Area and are of local importance. They contribute to the wider character of the Conservation Area. Because the cottages are protected under the Foulness Conservation Area it is not necessary to protect them under the Local List.
Ashingdon Primary School: Fambridge Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be protected by the Local List.	No	No	The building is a fairly typical example of its style. It has also undergone significant alterations which have further reduced its historical and architectural value. It is not of sufficient quality to merit inclusion on the Local List.
Barling Hall: Barling Hall Farm, Church Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the building should be protected by the Local List.	No	No	The building has undergone significant alterations and therefor does not merit Local Listing.
The Victory Inn - 485-487 Ashingdon Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that as a centre of the community embracing parts of two parishes the Inn should be protected by the Local List.	No	No	Although the building is a distinctive part of the street scene, it is not of such local architectural or historic importance to be included on the Local List.
16 and 17 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included in the Local List on the grounds that	No	No	These buildings are similar to other two storey brick buildings along Church End. Their individual value is limited; however they do have group value. These two cottages are located within the Foulness Conservation Area. It is not necessary to include

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			they have collective value to the area.			them on the Local List their value pertains to their contribution to the wider Conservation Area.
31 and 32 Church End	No	Yes	Respondents commented that as with all the buildings in Church End, individual buildings form part of a group so should be protected as loss of any could diminish the attractiveness of the Island.	No	Yes	These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They are notable primarily for their group value. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. The loss of buildings should indeed be avoided however as the buildings are protected under the Foulness Conservation Area it is not necessary to include them on the Local List.
United Reform Church: Chapel Lane	No	Yes	Respondent commented that the United Reformed Church should be retained.	No	No	This building is situated in the Great Wakering Conservation Area. There are many examples of this style and it should not be included in the Local List. The United Reform Church will continue to benefit from protection under the Great Wakering Conservation Area.
The Red Lion Pub: 69 High Street Great Wakering	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the Pub should be retained.	No	No	The Red Lion Pub is located within the Great Wakering Conservation Area as well as standing adjacent to a number of Grade II Listed Buildings. As such the building has group value and contributes to the character of the area. It is not necessary to include the Red Lion Pub on the Local List because the Pub will continue to be protected within the Great Wakering Conservation

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
						Area.
9 High Street Great Wakering	No	Yes	Respondents Commented that this is a striking building.	No	No	The cottage is adjoined to Anchor Cottage which is a Grade II listed building. In itself it is not of sufficient architectural or historical importance to merit local listing. It is within the Great Wakering Conservation Area and receives protection under this designation.
Prospect Cottages - 66-68 High Street Great Wakering.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included.	No	No	These buildings are not of sufficient historical or architectural significance to merit local listing despite being built in 1878. They are however protected as part of the Great Wakering Conservation Area.
Prospect Cottages: 70-74 High Street Great Wakering.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be retained.	No	No	This row of cottages are situated in the Great Wakering Conservation Area and are of group value in helping to retain the uniform appearance of the High Street. Individually they don't merit inclusion on the Local List.
Great Wakering Evangelical Church: High Street Great Wakering.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the building should be included.	No	No	This building is prominent in the street scene but it is not of sufficient architectural or historical importance to merit inclusion on the Local List.
6-8 High Street Great Wakering	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings are part of an identical pair, worthy of	No	No	These buildings retain several valuable features including traditional recessed doors and eight over eight vertical sash windows. They are situated in the Great Wakering

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			retention.			Conservation Area but are not considered to be of such local historical or architectural importance to merit local listing.
10-12 High Street Great Wakering	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included.	No	No	This building is protected under the Great Wakering Conservation Area. It is not of such local importance to merit being Locally Listed.
The Anchor Pub 32 High Street Great Wakering	No	Yes	Respondents commented focal point and local for residents, should be included.	No	No	The building is protected as part of the Great Wakering Conservation Area. It is not considered to be of such special interest as to merit inclusion on the Local List.
The Royal British Legion 204 High Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included.	No	No	This building is not considered to be unique enough to include on the Local List.
Laurel Cottage - 3 High Street	No	Yes	Charming cottage should be protected.	No	No	The building, built in the 19th Century retains many of its original features and is an interesting building. It is not of great architectural or historical interest. It is protected under the Great Wakering Conservation Area meaning that it does not need to be locally listed.
Prospect Cottages 76-78 High Street Great Wakeing	No	Yes	All Prospect Cottages form part of a group and should all be included.	No	No	This row of cottages are situated in the Great Wakering Conservation Area. They do not have individual value but do contribute to the uniform appearance of the High Street. As the buildings are already within the Great Wakering Conservation Area there is no need to include them on the Local List.
331 Rectory Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be	No	No	The building has undergone significant alterations and is not considered to be of such local architectural or historic importance to merit

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			included.			inclusion on the Local List.
5 Highams Road	No	Yes	Should be included.	No	No	The building was originally of an unusual design but has since had its exterior altered significantly to include pitched tiled roofs and replacement windows. This building should not be included on the Local List.
Beckney Wood House: Lower Road	No	Yes	Should be included.	No	No	The building appears to have undergone significant alterations. It is not of sufficient architectural or historic interest to merit inclusion on the Local List.
Hockley Cottage: 20 Southend Road Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that although it has been altered it should still be included.	No	No	Significant alterations detract from the value of the property. It should not be included on the Local List.
237 Rectory Road Hawkwell	No	Yes	Should be included.	No	No	Although the building is imposing it is not considered to have enough architectural or historic importance to be included on the Local List.
Finger Post at Hall Road/Main Road/Rectory Rd junction.	No	No	Respondents commented that these features should be included in the Local List.	No	No	The Finger Post is not particularly old and does not have any special design value. As such it should not be included on the Local List.
Hawkwell Hall Farm House: Rectory Road Hawkwell	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Hawkwell Hall should be included.	No	No	The building, constructed in1833 replaced the old Hawkwell Hall which was demolished. It is not of sufficient historical or architectural value to merit being locally listed.
The Grange: Ironwell Lane Hawkwell	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the Grange should be	No	No	This building is not considered to be of enough architectural or historical significance to merit inclusion on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			included in the Local List.			
112 Main Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that it should be included: Costard Woodwords, 112 Main Road SS5 4RL Of 18C origin, lending character to Main Road, it is regrettable to leave it off the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be particularly distinctive in appearance and is not of local architectural or historic importance. It should not be included on the Local List.
Black Cottage - Gusted Hall Lane	No	Yes	A respondent commented that although the building is altered it should still be included.	No	No	Alterations to this building are significant and detract from the character of the original building. It should not be included on the Local List.
Elmsleigh - Church Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Elmsleigh should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building, although interesting, is not considered to be of sufficient historical or architectural interest to be included on the Local List.
The Castle Inn Pub - 181 Little Wakering Road	No	Yes	Respondent commented that the Castle Inn Pub should be included in the Local List.	No	No	The building is a typical example of a 'roadhouse' dating back to the early 20th Century. It is not considered to be of such local architectural or historic importance to merit inclusion on the Local List.
Boarded Row: Boarded Row (off Waterside	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Boarded row should	No	No	These cottages are located within the Paglesham East End Conservation Area. The cottages are locally significant and have group value as well as

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Road)			be included.			an unusual character. The special character of Boarded Row comes from its collective value rather than the individual value of any one building.
Barn at East Hall: East Hall Road Rochford.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the barn is well preserved and should be included on the Local List.	No	No	The structure is not particularly unique within the district and is not of sufficient architectural or historical value to require protection on the Local List.
Shop Row: Waterside Road Paglesham	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Shop Row Cottages make an important contribution to the charm of Paglesham.	No	No	These cottages are included within the Paglesham East End Conservation Area. The cottages help to maintain the uniform character of the street scene. They are of local historical significance having been built by James Wiseman in 1873. They are not of individual value and as they are already protected through conservation area stratus there is no need to include them on the Local List.
Old Burrells: Chruch Road Barling.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Old Burrells should be included on the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be of such local architectural or historical importance to merit inclusion on the Local List.
School and School House: Church Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building is of a typical style for school buildings from this period. It should not be included on the Local List.
Barn at Witherdens	No	Yes	Respondents Commented that this	No	No	This building is not considered to be of such local architectural or historic importance to merit

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Farm Chelmsford Road			building should be included in the Local List.			inclusion on the revised list.
Carpenters Arms Pub : London Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the Carpenters Arms Pub should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be of such local architectural importance to merit inclusion on the revised list. The pub has replacement plastic windows in several places, it is rendered and while the red roof tiles are not a modern feature they are not an uncommon feature in the district.
Chase Cottage (former coachman's cottage):The Chase	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Chase Cottage should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building was formerly attached to Orchard Cottage, which has now been demolished and replaced with a detached bungalow. It is not considered to be of local historical or architectural importance and does not contribute to the street scene. It should not be included on the revised list. It should be noted that this building is protected within the Paglesham East End Conservation Area.
Buckland Cottages: Paglesham Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that Bucklands Cottages should be included in the revised list.	No	No	These cottages are situated in the Paglesham East End Conservation Area. They have group value and add to the street scene. The buildings themselves are well preserved and are of local importance because they were built by Frederick Wiseman, cousin of James Wiseman who owned much of East End Village, in 1849. As their value comes from their status as a group and because they are protected as part of the Paglesham East End Conservation Area it is not appropriate to include them in the revised list.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
New Row: Waterside Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that New Row should be included in the revised list.	No	No	These cottages are situated in the Paglesham East End Conservation Area. Their primary value comes from the fact that they are a uniform group which enhances the character of the Conservation Area. They do not have individual value and should not be included on the Local List.
25-27 Bellingham Lane	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be retained.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rayleigh Conservation Area. It is a common style of house and is not of sufficient local historic and architectural importance to merit local listing. They will however be protected as part of the Conservation Area.
29-31 Bellingham Lane Rayleigh	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rayleigh Conservation Area and is protected under this designation. It is not of sufficient local importance to merit local listing. It has been extended and has several replacement UPVC windows replacing the originals.
23 Bellingham Lane Rayleigh	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	Yes	This building is situated in the Rayleigh Conservation Area. It is locally distinctive. It is a very good example of this type of building and as such it should be included on the revised list.
1-6 Rochford Hall Cottages, Hall Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these cottages should be included in the revised Local List.	No	No	This row of cottages are situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. They are not considered to have individual value and as they are already protected through Conservation Area Status, they should not be included on the revised Local List.
38-44 South Street	No	Yes	Should be included.	No	No	This row of cottages is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. The different painted brickwork

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
						detracts from the uniformity of the building although the row has group value and adds to the street scene. They are protected as part of the Conservation Area status. They should not be included on the revised Local List.
69-75 North Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented should be retained.	No	No	These houses are protected under the Rochford Conservation Area. These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They are notable primarily for their group value. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List.
Great Brays Fruit Farm Brays Lane Rochford SS4 3RP	No	No	Respondents commented that Great Brays Fruit Farm is not particularly old being constructed in the early 1950s, but it is true to the integrity of vernacular Essex architecture. It was designed by the architect David Rodney Burles of Burles & Newton, Southend and commissioned by the then owner Mr and Mrs Bull.	No	Yes	Architecturally this building is a good example of a building style that was popular in Essex in the 1950s. It is a good example of its type and should be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			David Rodney Burles has designed several churches in the area of Southend together with additions to two Cathedrals. He was the son of David Henry Burles, also an architect and artist who lived and worked in Southend. He was killed in a bombing raid on Southend and because of his lifelong connections with the Essex Yeomanry was buried with full military honors, the coffin being carried on a horse drawn gun carriage through the High Street in Southend with a full military regimental escort. Henry like Rodney had designed several			

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			public building in Essex.			
Historical feature. Right of way that runs between The Drive and Grassmere Avenue Hullbridge	No	No	This row pre-dates the layout of the Hullbridge estate 1925 plan (part of the old field structure).	No	No	This feature should not be included on the Local List. It is of limited local historical significance.
Charterers Cottage, 56 West Street Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List. They commented that surely replacement windows do not warrant excluding this otherwise interesting building.	No	Yes	This building has a positive impact on the street character and the replacement windows do not detract overly from the character of the building. The cottage is protected within the Rochford Conservation Area but local listing is still reasonable.
8-10 North Street Rochford	No	yes	Respondents commented that this group of buildings should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This group contributes to the character of the street scene and is architecturally distinctive. They are within the Rochford Conservation Area and have group value. Individually they are not considered to be architecturally or historically significant and as they are protected through Conservation Area status they should not be included on the revised list.
32-36 South Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented that	No	No	This row of buildings is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. It forms a strong building line

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Rochford			these buildings should be included.			along South Street, which helps to preserve the character of number 30 South Street which is a grade II listed building. They are not considered to have individual value and different windows and treatment to the exteriors are considered to detract from the uniform character of the buildings. Because the row is located within the Rochford Conservation Area it is not necessary to include it on the Local List.
20-22 West Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included.	No	No	These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They are notable primarily for their group value. However, individually they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List. It should be noted that the group is protected as part of the Rochford Conservation Area.
36 West Street Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included.	No	No	This building has been significantly altered. It is considered to be out of character with other buildings in the locality which frame the market Square. The building is located within the Rochford Conservation Area.
Essex County Council Office, 57 South Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rorchford Conservation Area. It is not well preserved although it still adds character to the street scene. However it still does not merit inclusion in the local list.
Hatfield House - 21 East Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. The replacement windows to the first floor detract from the original character of the building. It is not considered to be of such local historic or architectural importance to merit local

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
						listing.
5-11 North Street Rochford.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This row is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. The row adds to the street scene along North Street and has group value. As they are protected by conservation area status and do not have any great value individually, they should not be included on the Local List.
Blatches Cottage Blatches Chase	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be of such local architectural or historic importance to merit inclusion in the Local List.
14 West Street Rochford	No	Yes	Should be included.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochord Conservation Area. It has been much altered, and it is not considered to be of such local architectural or historic importance to merit local listing.
Shepherds Cottage, Hall Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be retained.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. It is thought to have been constructed in the 1970s. The building is not is not of sufficient local architectural or local historical interest to merit inclusion on the Local List. However ii does benefit from protection under the Rochford Conservation Area.
The Horse and Groom Pub, 1 Southend Road Rochford.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the Horse and Groom Pub should be	No	No	This building is within the Rochford Conservation Area. It is quite well preserved although it is not of significant architectural or local historical importance. It should not be included on the Local

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			included on the Local List. They state that it is a focal point as you enter or leave Rochford.			List.
Veterinary Surgery: 19 East Street	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included on the Local List.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. It is not of such local architectural or historic importance to merit inclusion on the Local List.
Rochford Kingsmead: 23 East Street Rochford.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this site matches Hatfield House and should be included.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. It is not of enough local historic or architectural importance to merit local listing. As the building is located within the conservation area it will still be protected under Conservation Area status.
52 and 54 East Street Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these should be included.	No	No	This property should not be included in the Local list as the replacement windows detract from the character of the original building and it is not considered to be of such local historic or architectural importance to merit inclusion on the revised list.
46-56 North Street Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this is an important group of terraced houses and should be retained.	No	No	This row of houses is located within the Rochford Conservation Area. They are well preserved, retaining many of their original features and their uniform decoration enhances their group value. These buildings have a positive impact on the character of the surrounding area. They are notable primarily for their group value. However, individually

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
						they are not of great value and do not merit inclusion on the Local List.
The Before/After School Club/Rochford Day Nursery: 4 Ashingdon Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this was formerly the school masters house and should be retained.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area and is protected under this designation. The replacement UPVC windows detract from the character of the building. A section of the building has also been rendered. Although it may once have been the school masters house, this is not a significant reason for listing. It is not appropriate to include this building on the Local list.
8 East Street	No	Yes	Should be included.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. The plate glass window on the ground floor detracts from the character of the building. It should not be included on the Local List.
Rochford Day Nursery: 2 Ashingdon Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included on the Local List.	No	No	Although the building is situated in a conservation area it is not considered to be of such local architectural or historical importance to merit inclusion on the revised Local List.
Rochford Primary and Nursery School 6 Ashingdon Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that although it has been altered this building should be retained, partly because of its prominent position.	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. There have been a number of significant alterations to the structure meaning that it does not merit inclusion on the Local List.
6 East Street Rochford.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this	No	No	This building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area but it is not considered to merit

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			building should be included on the list.			inclusion in the Local List. The building still receives protection as a part of the Conservation Area.
Doggetts Cottage, 35 Stambridge Road.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building is not of sufficient architectural or local historical value to merit being included on the Local List.
11 and 15 East Street Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the building should be included on the list.	No	No	These buildings are situated in the Rochford Conservation Area. They have a uniform appearance but are not considered to be of such local architectural or historic importance to merit local listing.
Barn - Hampton Barn, Stambridge Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included: These 3 buildings are of local interest as a group and all should be retained.	No	Yes	The building is of significant local interest as well as being well preserved and should therefore be included on the Local List.
Winters: Stambridge Road Stambridge	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included.	No	No	The building is imposing although it has undergone some significant unsympathetic alterations, the two storey flat roof extension and additional rear extensions are particularly evident. It should not be included in the Local List.
21-32 St Thomas Road	No	Yes	The fact that the windows and doors have been individually altered does not detract from the interest of the row of cottages.	No	No	This row of cottages differ in the colour of their windows and doors, recesses and surrounds to windows and doors. This detracts from their uniformity. From a historical point of view the buildings do not have any significant value and do not merit inclusion in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Grapnells Farm House: Grapnells Farm, Wallasea Island	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included on the revised list.	No	No	The building is a fairly standard example of a 19th Century farmhouse. The building has undergone some alterations, including replacement windows on the first floor. It is also missing many of its decorative features. The building should not be included on the Local List.
Stambridge County Primary School: Stambridge Road	No	Yes	Should be included, though ordinary it represents a focal point in the village.	No	No	The building would need to be of some kind of local historical or archaeological interest in order for it to be locally listed. The building does not merit inclusion in the local list.
The Royal Oak Pub - Stambridge Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building although not architecturally unique represents a focus in the village and should be included on the list.	No	No	This building is not of any great local historical or architectural value and does not merit inclusion on the Local List.
Brickhouse Farm: Fambridge Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the fact that the windows have been replaced does not warrant exclusion from the list.	No	No	This building is not of sufficient local architectural importance to merit inclusion on the Local List.
Ark House: Ark Lane.	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building is not 1960s	Yes	Yes	Noted- This may require correction in the updated local list.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			or earlier, it is 1960s or later. Based on the size of the windows it was built after the invention of float glass which makes it 1960 at the earliest.			The building is still a good example of buildings of this type and style and to be retained in the local list.
Linden Lea: Lower Road	No	No	Respondents commented that this building should not be included: The respondents do not agree that all of the features which have been mentioned under the general description are original and in keeping with the work that was carried out to the house since they moved in. They do not agree that the building warrants inclusion in the list. They state that the rear elevation has been considerably	Yes	Yes	It is important to bear in mind that local listing does not carry the same weight as Listed Building Status. As such inclusion of the building on the Local List would not prevent sympathetic alterations to the building in future. It is acknowledged that some of the features may not be original although they do not detract significantly from the character and architectural value of the building. This building should be included in the Local List on the grounds that it is of local architectural value.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			altered over the years but they understand that most of the front elevation is as originally built. They state that the top flat dormer with tile hanging to the sides is not, to them, an attractive feature of the property and they have had to replace the old metal windows as they had reached the end of their life but they have always hoped to be able to redesign this part of the property and the end of the roof section with something more in keeping with the rest of the front of the house.			
Rayleigh Lodge The Chase	Yes	No	Note- this building does not need to be considered for local	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be considered for inclusion on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			listing.			
Dutch Cottage Crown Hill	Yes	No	The building is listed and does not need to be considered.	No	No	This building is listed and does not need to be included on the Local List.
Old School House Church Road (next to the church, Hockley)	No	No	Respondents suggested that this building should be included in the local List.	No	No	This building is not of significant architectural or local historical value. It should not be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
St Peters and Pauls Church Church Road Hockley	Yes	No	This building does not need to be considered for inclusion on the Local List.	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be locally listed.
Old Post Office High Street Canewdon	Yes	No	This building does not need to be considered for inclusion on the Local List.	No	No	The building is listed and does not need to be protected by local listing.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Smugglers Den Club	No	Yes	Respondent commented that this building should be included in the Local List they stated that: The original building was a storage barn which received goods, from Thames Barges, which later transported the goods further down river to Battlesbridge Mill. The barn pre dates 1800. The barn was converted late 1800's into Hullbridge Pavillion which along with the Anchor Cottages were the final destination of tourists on Mystery Tours running from Southend Seafront. The building still has some of the original beams of the barn	No	No	The building has undergone significant alterations. These include the addition of Perspex windows and a single storey front extension. It is not appropriate to include this site in the local list.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			and the landing jetty still exists although erosion has taken its toll. Hullbridge Parish Council stated that It dates back to the 1930s.			
The boat (used as a planter) outside the Pooles Lane car park.	No	No	No	No	No	Although it is an interesting feature it does not have any local architectural or historical value and should not be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
White Bridge Corner (the meeting of Lower and Hullbridge Road)	No	No	Respondents commented that the white railing either side of junction should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This feature has no local architectural or historical significance and should not be added to the Local List.
The Hollow Oak Tree at the top end of Windermere. Hullbridge	N/A	No	Respondents commented that this feature should be included on the Local List.	No	No	Local listing is not applicable to this feature. In addition it is protected by a tree preservation order (TPO).

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Kendal Park Hullbridge	N/A	No	Respondents commented that the park is named after Dr. Kendall. It is not applicable to the Local List.	No	No	Local listing would not be applicable to this feature because the local list does not deal with parks and areas of public open space.
The popular trees at Halcyon Caravan Park	N/A	No	These features are not applicable to the Local List.	No	No	These features are not applicable to the Local List. There are many TPOs and TPO areas designated around this site.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Willow Trees, Hullbridge, Community Centre, Ferry Road.	N/A	No	Respondents commented that these features should be included on the Local List.	No	No	This feature is not applicable to the Local List. The Local List does not deal with trees.
The curtilage of Malyons Farmhouse (the secret underground tunnel and the Priest Holes)	No	Malyons Farmhouse itself was considered.	Respondents commented that the secret tunnel and Priest Holes connected to Malyons should be included.	No	No	Malyons farm was considered for inclusion on the Local List and was subsequently approved. The priest holes and the general curtilage of the farm complex are not structures in themselves. They may be of historical interest but do not merit inclusion on the local list as independent structures in their own right.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Toad Hall Battlesbridge	Yes	No	Also known as Granary and Drying Kiln now a house, to west of Old Tide Mill. Does not need to be considered	No	No	This building is listed and as such does not need to be protected by local listing.
SkeeTex building	Yes	No	Also known as Old Tide Mill and Dam Wall attached to north. Does not need to be considered.	No	No	This building is listed and does not need to be protected under the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Anchor Cottages Ferry Road (opposite the Anchor Pub)	Yes	No	Respondents commented that the cottages date back to 1793. They are also known as Nos. 307, 309 and 311	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be protected by local listing.
Timber stubs in the River Crouch.	No	No	Respondents commented that the timber stubs stretch the width of the river between the Ferry roads in Hullbridge and Woodham.	No	No	These features have no strong architectural value and are largely degraded. They should not be locally listed.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
China Cottage 44 Spa Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that it should be included: This building should be listed as Local Historical Asset. Only a few years ago the walls were covered in china pieces. It is in a most prominent location and has great character. The thatch and chimney stacks are important. It has been on the market for quite a large sum of money and should be protected from any further alterations by anyone. Of 18C origin, its plain exterior and thatched roof remain. Change - only replacement windows, and once added china pieces, now removed -	No	No	This building does have some remaining historic features such as the chimney stacks and the thatched roofing. However significant alterations have been made to the fabric of the building, detracting from its character. The most major alterations have been made to the rear of the property but as the 'china pieces' that gave the property its name have been replaced by render, it is not reasonable to include the property in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			hence its name; 'China Cottage'. It lends character to central Hockley and should stay on Local List.			
Rochford Railway station Rochford	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be retained.	No	Yes	There have been significant changes to the frontage although much of the ironwork is still intact as is the railway bridge. Unlike the other two stations in the District Rochford Station retains much of its former character and features. As such it should be locally listed.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Number 5 Woodlands Road two storey double fronted red brick building	No	No	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	No	The building is not of strong local historical or architectural interest. It is not a rare example of its type and does not have any unique features. It does not merit inclusion in the Local List.
The Bull Pub Hockley	Yes	No	This building does not need to be considered.	No	No	The Bull Pub is a listed building and does not need to be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Pumphouse (colloseum type fronted building next door to the new townhouses opposite Eldon Way).	Yes	No	The Pumphouse is also known as No. 54 (Hockley Spa Rooms), Spa Road.	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be included on the Local List.
112 Main Road	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This building is not considered to be of great note architecturally or locally and should not be included on the local list.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
4 East Street Rochford	No	Yes	Respondent commented that it should be included.	No	No	The building is situated in the Rochford Conservation Area but it is not of significant historical or architectural value to merit local listing. As it is within the Rochfrod Conservation area it will still receive protection as part of it.
Essex County Council Office, 57 South Street Rochford.	No	Yes	Respondent commented that this building should be included.	No	No	The building is protected within the Rochford Conservation Area but is not architecturally or historically valuable enough to merit inclusion on the Local List. It will still receive protection as part of the Conservation Area.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Rose cottage, (near to the Cherry Tree pub) Rochford	Yes	No	Respondents commented that this building should be included on the Local List.	No	No	This building is listed and does not require protection under the Local List.
Wharf Cottage, Ferry Road	Yes	No	A Respondent commented that the building was built in the late 1800's and is also known as No. 313 Ferry Road.	No	No	This building is listed and does not need to be included in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Bricklayer Cottages, Pooles Lane, Hullbridge	No	No	Respondent commented: early 1900s. Assumed to refer to 1-10 Pooles Lane.	No	No	The houses do not have any significant architectural value. The windows also appear to have been replaced which reduces their contribution to the street scene. The rendering and treatment of the cottages is also quite modern. The houses are all well maintained and do share a similar character. Nevertheless they should not be included on the Local List.
George 6th Post Box outside Hullbridge Post Office	No	No	Respondent commented: This was the first post box in Hullbridge and should be locally listed.	No	Yes	This post box is not of any architectural or design significance however it does have historical value and forms a key part of the street scene. It should be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Brandy Hole Yacht Club Hullbridge.	No	No	A respondent commented that although the yacht club is recent, Brandy Hole is mentioned in historical Archives as far back as 1500 (see page 274 in history of Rochford Hundred).	No	No	The original building appears to have been replaced. As such the site should not be locally listed.
Cracknells Farm Hullbridge	No	No	Note: Permission was granted in 1994 to demolish and rebuild the farm house.	No	No	The original farm building was demolished in 1994 and was subsequently replaced. As such the building can no longer be considered for local listing.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Hullbridge Free Church Lower Road	No	No	Respondents commented that the building was constructed in the early 1900s.	No	No	The building has some pleasant features including the stained glass window at the centre of the second storey, framed by a two-centred arch. The building itself is made of common red brick and is not very old. It is set back from Lower Road and has only a limited impact on the street scene. Historically it is not of significant value. It should not be locally listed.
Rayleigh Railway station Rayleigh	No	Yes	Respondents commented that the Rayleigh train station should be included: The station buildings have a varied roof line which adds to the character and are very much part of the sky line. In the history of the railway surely the building plays a part. It is of considerable local historical significance as the railway was responsible for	No	No	The station has been altered significantly since it was built. Most of the ground floor windows have been replaced and are now also barred. The main entrance has been replaced with automatic doors and a flat canopy supported by black iron posts. Although some of the original features still exist, such as the exposed beams on the gable and decorative barge boards. The alterations to the building are too significant for it to merit local listing.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			changing Rayleigh from an agricultural village to a prosperous residential town. For consistency if Rochford Railway Station (page 251) Is included why not Rayleigh (and Hockley). The 2 storey house on the right was the Station masters house.			
Footbridge at Rayleigh Railway Station	No	Yes	Respondent commented that the footbridge should be included as it is a good example of craftsmanship for that period and therefore of historical interest.	No	No	This is an early 20th Century iron footbridge. It has been greatly altered and is not historically or architecturally significant enough to merit inclusion in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
36 High Road, Hockley	No	Yes	Correction: Comment from the owner of this house: the ground floor windows to this house are not made of plastic. They are casement in style and are the original wooden frames.	No	Yes	The building has a number of architecturally interesting features. The dentil moulding below the eves is particularly noticeable. It is also noted that the ground floor windows are not made of plastic but are in fact the original wooden frames. It should be included on the local list.
Trough and Fountain, Hockley	No	Yes	Correction: From the owner of the trough and fountain: The justification states that the trough and fountain were donated to the community by Ms Tawke. This statement is somewhat misleading and should be clarified as both of these are in fact owned by myself and my husband (Edward Stark), having purchased them from Essex Council	Yes	Yes	The Correction is noted; The trough is in fact owned by a Mr & Mrs Stark who purchased it in the 1980s.The trough itself was originally donated to the community by Mrs Tawke and has local historical significance as well as having a number of interesting design features.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			back in the late 1980's.			
Moats and Springs Farmhouse & adjacent barn Stambridge Road	No	No	Respondent commented that it should be included: there is access and should be included as this property is a fine example of a 17th century building.	No	Yes	This building has undergone some unsympathetic alterations including the addition of Perspex windows and a single storey extension. However it is still architecturally interesting and has a great deal of character. The Farmhouse should be included in the Local List. The barn in this location is not of sufficient architectural or historical significance to merit inclusion on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Stambridge Memorial Hall, Stambridge Road	No	No	Respondents commented that This is a WW1 Memorial Hall with Memorial Stone and has a vaulted oak ceiling.	No	No	The exterior of the hall appears to be in considerable disrepair. The original hipped roof is intact and the interior does boast a considerable vaulted oak ceiling that is worth retaining. The presence of the memorial plaque also adds local historical value to the building.
The original stone bridge sited on the Stambridge Road as you enter the Village Centre.	No	No	A respondent commented that Stambridge was originally known as Stone Bridge after this bridge. Therefore it has some historic value.	No	No	Although the bridge site can still be identified it appears to have been replaced by a more modern structure which is of little historical value. The site should not be included in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Ivy Cottages, Creaksea Ferry Road	No	Yes	Respondent commented that it should be included.	No	No	The buildings are in good condition and retain many of their original features and character. The alterations to the windows of the buildings do however detract from their value and as such they should not be locally listed.
WW2 radar station, Gardiners Lane	No	No	Respondent commented that it should be included.	No	No	The structure is in a state of advanced disrepair and does not retain a many identifiable features beyond the original brickwork. It is heavily overgrown and does not add value to any street scene. It should not be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Tapps Cottage, Kingsmans Farm Road, Hullbridge	Yes	No	Respondents commented that this building should be added to the Local List.	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be considered for inclusion in the Local List.
Kingsmans Farm Kingsmans Farm Road Hullbridge	Yes	No	Respondents commented that Kingsmans Farm should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This is a listed building and does not need to be considered for local listing.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Rectory Farm House, Fambridge Road, Ashingdon	No	Yes	Correction. Respondent commented: The Parish Council wish to inform that the windows in this property are timber double glazed and not plastic as stated in the document.	No	Yes	This building was already locally listed in the previous version of the Local list. The correction is noted and the appropriate amendment will be made in the final document.
Ashingdon Village and South Fambridge Village signs	No	Yes	Respondent commented that the village signs should be included.	No	No	These signs are reasonably modern and are not suitable for inclusion in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Community Centre, Ferry Road	No	Yes	Correction: this is actually the Old School Building currently named The Saltings now used by ECC as a youth centre and not the community centre.	No	Yes	This building was listed in the previous version of the Local List. The correction is noted.
301 Ferry Road Hullbridge SS5 6NA	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included in the Local List. They state that it used to be the Wayfarers Cafe and soldiers from WW2 were lodged there.	No	No	The building has had many alterations over the years. These detract from its original character. It is not of enough architectural or historic importance to merit local listing.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Hullbridge Monument Junction of Hullbridge Road and Lower Road	No	No	Respondents commented that the monument should be included on the Local List.	No	No	Although local listing can cover monuments this particular monument is not of sufficient historical value in itself to merit inclusion within the list.
Hullbridge Village sign - Lower Road (near junction of Pevensey Gardens)	No	No	Respondents commented that this feature should be retained. Note: There is no notable village sign in this location.	No	No	There is no identifiable village sign in this location.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Former Fire Station 36 High Street Great Wakering	No	Yes	A respondent commented that the former fire station should not be included. They state that the front of the building has been badly altered by previous owners by having the windows and doors replaced and therefore the building no longer bears any resemblance to a traditional fire station. They state that it is a commercial building of little consequence. The building should be allowed to move on and be refurbished in keeping with adjoining property.	Yes	Yes	The building is a good example of this type of structure. It has been somewhat altered, with replacement stained glass windows in the front of the building. These additional features do not significantly detract from the uniqueness of the building or its impact on the street scene. It should be included on the Local List. Under the Local List, refurbishment of the property would not necessarily be opposed so long as the alterations were in keeping with the style and character of the building. Local listing is intended as a guide for appropriate development and supports sympathetic changes.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
K6 telephone box, High Street, Great Wakering	No	Yes	A respondent commented that this feature should not be included. They sate that it is an eye sore in the high street and is an attraction to vandals and the like to loiter in that area. They add that it stands on land occupied by the RDC public toilets and the cost of vandalism in the past 6 months to the council is over £37,000. A BT representative stated that they would prefer to remove it rather than have the constant cost or replacing broken windows. This is not used and is just an attraction	Yes	Yes	The telephone box is of local importance and adds to the character of the area and street scene. The fact that it may or may not have come to the attention of vandals does not diminish its value as a feature of the local street scene.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			to vandals. The repair costs out way the usage.			
The Exhibition Inn - 241 High Street, Great Wakering	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included: This is a traditional village inn and one of the main landmarks for the area. Focal point for residents, should be included. Additional information was added: I think you should reconsider this. I agree that it has been spoilt by the plastic, false-leadlight, windows and it is away from	No	No	The Exhibition Inn though not unattractive, has undergone significant changes in the form of the replacement false leaded windows to the ground floor and the rendered and painted façade. It does not have enough local historical or architectural value to merit being included in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			the group of more interesting buildings further down the street, but as you approach Great Wakering from the West this is the first distinctive landmark that you see.			
The Old Spa Pump Room Spa Rd Hockley	Yes	No	This building does not need to be considered	No	No	This building is listed and does not need to be included in the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Boundary Stone, Hockley	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included: A well-known landmark and an important reference point to old boundaries. The following were previously recommended by HPC but not agreed by RDC and the parish council now ask that they be reconsidered.	No	No	This item of street furniture is not of such great local importance to merit inclusion on the Local List.
19-21 Bellingham Lane	No	Yes	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included on the Local List. They state that it would be a shame to lose all the old buildings in this road.	No	No	The Local List provides guidance on buildings and items of street furniture that are of local historical or architectural interest. It does not guarantee that a building on the list cannot be altered or even demolished. Such a level of protection would require listed building status. These buildings are not of sufficient local historic and architectural importance to merit inclusion on the Local List they are situated in the Rayleigh Conservation Area and are protected under this designation.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
The Crown public house Rayleigh	Yes	No	Respondents commented that this building should be included on the Local List.	No	No	The building is listed and therefore does not need to be included on the Local List.
The water trough and marters monument	Yes	No	Respondents commented that this feature should be included in the Local List.	No	No	This feature is listed and does not need to be locally listed as well.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
The small group of cottages at the top of London Hill Also known as 13, 15 and 17 London Hill.	Yes	No	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included on the Local List.	No	No	These buildings are listed and as such they receive greater protection than would be provided under the Local List The buildings do not need to be locally listed.
Sheepcotes Farm, Lower Road, Hullbridge.	No	Yes	Respondent commented that this should not be included: 1) The dwelling is typical and traditional form of construction which is used in the majority of dwellings prior to 1940. 2) Many of the original features of the dwelling have been altered. 3) No design or decorative feature are reflective of the time the dwelling	No	No	This building cannot be included on the local list as it has been demolished.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			was built. 4) it is structurally unsound 5) architectural interest is not just based on external appearance. (for further details see rep).			
No. 6 Southend Road Hockley	No	No	Respondent commented that this should be included: No. 6 Southend Road Hockley was designed by a noted local architect and well known Southend figure, Mr Daved Henry Burlse [1866-1942], of the firm Burles & Harris for his son in law and daughter, Mr Stanley and Mrs Violet Yeadell. The house was built in 1925. (see rep for further details)	No	No	The property is attractive and in very good condition however is not of sufficient historical or architectural value to merit inclusion on the Local List, such as may be the case with other buildings designed by Mr Burlse. It should be noted that the Local List is intended as a guide to owners rather than as a restrictive designation which is the case with listed buildings and conservation areas. As such there is nothing to prevent a building from being maintained in its original style despite not being included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Hockley Public Hall Hockley	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this building should be included. The following were previously recommended by Hockley Parish Council but not agreed by Rochford District Council and the parish council requested that they be reconsidered. They state that the building was built in the late 19th century, and that it was erected on land given for that use by a Mrs Tawke who was a noted local figure. It was central to local activities, and was for most of the 20th century the only hall where all public meetings were held.	No	No	The purpose of the Local List is to encourage the protection of buildings with special architectural or local historical significance. The fact that the Hall has been a gathering point of the community does not necessarily mean that the building should be locally listed. From an architectural point of view the building does not have any outstanding features. The decorative barge boards and the red brick coursing are attractive but not architecturally or historically significant. As such this building should not be included on the Local List.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
			For this reason they wish to see the building included on the Local List.			
Finger Post, Junction of Church Road / Lower Road	No	No	Respondent commented that this should be included: The following were previously recommended by HPC but not agreed by RDC and the parish council now ask that they be reconsidered.	No	No	This feature is too recent to merit inclusion on the Local List and has no significant historical or design value.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
Brooks Cottage, Greensward Lane, Hockley	No	Yes	Respondents commented that this should be included: Brook Cottage is a pretty and very well maintained building. Its character, location and age make it worthy of LHA status. This was an agricultural cottage attached to Pulpits Farm, itself on the statutory list. It seems anomalous to leave it off the Local List.	No	No	It is acknowledged that the building is well maintained and attractive. However its features are not of unique architectural value and it is not of specific local historical interest. It should not be locally listed. The Local List seeks to provide advice and guidance to owners and encourages them to retain and enhance historically or architecturally significant properties. If a building is in the vicinity of a locally significant historic building but is not itself locally significant then there is not a sufficient justification to include it on the list.
Rayleigh House: 36 High Road, Rayleigh	No	Yes	Respondents provided additional information: The house was built in 1873 (Rayleigh through the looking glass archives).	No	Yes	This comment is noted. This information will be included in the final submission document.

Name & Location	Listed Building?	Included in consultation?	Comments & Notes	Approved for listing in previous Local List	Include in final draft? Yes/ No	Justification
2 & 4 Marina Avenue Rayleigh	No	No	Respondents commented that these buildings should be included: They stated that the building is of a distinctive art deco style and is representative of its type.	No	Yes	This building is a rare example of the art deco style and is likely to be the oldest building in the area, potentially dating to the inter war period. There are few examples of such buildings in Rochford District. The buildings have undergone some alterations which detract from their original design. Never-the-less these buildings should be included on the Local List.