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PART 1

Heritage at Risk Strategy: Creation of a Local Heritage at Risk Register

This document sets out the process by which the Council will create and maintain a Buildings at Risk register in accordance with national guidance. It sets out how the Council will achieve the requirements of the NPPF in identifying buildings at risk, identifies known data and suggests a strategy for identification of potential at risk buildings and post identification action.

AIMs of the Local Heritage at Risk Register

- To protect and manage the historic environment within the Tunbridge Wells Borough, in order to reduce the overall number of heritage assets that are ‘at risk’ or vulnerable of becoming so. ‘Buildings at Risk’ are buildings deemed to be at risk of deterioration or even loss.

- To achieve the repair and restoration of historic buildings, which would otherwise have undoubtedly been lost. Dealing with buildings ‘at risk’ is particularly time consuming, but essential, as it is cost-effective in the long run. The greater the deterioration in a building, the greater the potential building grant, staff and legal costs become. Furthermore, once a building becomes seriously derelict, its chances of survival are reduced and the subsequent repairs can often result in substantial reconstruction, with loss of much of the building’s intrinsic value.

BACKGROUND

National Policy and Guidance

The term ‘Buildings at Risk’ came about as a result of an English Heritage initiative launched in 1980 to increase the awareness of the problems of historic buildings falling into disrepair and assess buildings on a nationwide basis. More recently, in light of changes to national planning policy and terminology relating to the historic environment, all assets within the historic environment are now grouped under the term ‘heritage assets’, designated or undesignated. However, this strategy deals only with heritage assets that are listed buildings or structures at risk.

Historic environment planning policy and legislation shows that local planning authorities are seen as principal players in the protection of the historic environment, a role that extends beyond that of the statutory planning and listed building consent systems.

The creation and maintenance of a local heritage at risk register is a vital role of local authorities and is recommended through national planning policy, the Government’s advisor on the historic environment (English Heritage), and through the legislative tools provided to local authorities to take action against the deterioration of heritage assets. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:
‘Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.’

This is in recognition of the fact that heritage assets are a finite resource and are irreplaceable. Frequent and minor maintenance helps to prevent heritage assets from reaching a point where repairs become extensive and may require significant expense to carry out. Assets could reach a point where they may be considered incapable of re-use, and this is a message that will be at the centre of communicating the results of a survey to owners and occupiers of heritage assets deemed to be at risk. The authority may also consider taking formal action where appropriate, such as the serving of urgent works notices to make an unoccupied listed building, or unlisted building in a conservation area, temporarily safe from further deterioration or unauthorised access.

English Heritage advises that the role of a local authority, in this case Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, in creating its own buildings at risk strategy, is to carry out the following functions:

- Regular monitoring to identify vulnerable buildings before they become at risk;
- prompting, encouraging and if necessary using statutory powers to try to ensure that owners maintain them adequately, or at the very least keep them wind and weather tight;
- addressing functionally redundant and other problematic buildings before they reach crisis point, and where possible before they become vacant.

In order to determine what level of risk any particular building might be in, a standard method of calculating the level of risk is required. In recognition of the importance of dealing with the problems of buildings at risk, and in order to monitor problems on a national basis, English Heritage formulated a grading structure to allocate to each property a numerical category of risk based upon physical condition and degree of occupation.

This is a fairly simple, effective way of analysing the potential of a heritage asset to be at risk, but the lack of detail regarding condition that is the result of a simple, visual survey means that there may
also be a lack of consistency. Many buildings may have hidden defects that can only be identified through a thorough survey. This has resource implications if it is to be considered at a second stage as part of the strategy.

**Current Data Held at Tunbridge Wells Borough Council**

Occasional and sometimes thorough surveys of buildings at risk have been carried out by the Borough in the past. The last major survey of all listed buildings in the Borough was carried out in 2004, 9 years ago. This was based on an original list of buildings at risk compiled in 1998. In November 1996, TWBC identified the need for a more structured approach to listed buildings at risk. A new strategy was adopted and a condition survey of all of the Borough’s 3,000 listed buildings was carried out between 1997 and 1998 using the English Heritage nationally recognised criteria to identify ‘Buildings at Risk’. An additional layer was added to the analysis to establish whether or not the heritage asset was capable of occupation, which was not considered by English Heritage. All list entries were categorised according to this and a list produced, by parish. Assets not capable of occupation were primarily classed as ‘monuments’ as opposed to ‘buildings’. This list will be slightly out of date as, due to a process that allows for amendments to the list compiled at the last survey for each parish, known as ‘spot listing’.

Following the survey:

- 36 buildings (capable of occupation) were identified
- 90 buildings (incapable of occupation) were identified

In December 1998, Borough Council Members approved the implementation of a new 5-year project with three main objectives:

- to reduce the number of Buildings at Risk from 36 to 11 over the five year period
- to prevent others from becoming Buildings at Risk,
- to target gravestones through a new project

The project had three main strands:

- Buildings at Risk Grant scheme (50%) in partnership with owners
- Grave Risk Project (90%) in partnership with Church Councils
- continuation of the Council’s long-established Listed Building Grant scheme (25%)
  
  *(Figures represent the percentage of grant support offered to owners by the Borough Council.)*

By Summer 2002, twenty of the thirty-six buildings had been removed from the original list using a combination of the activities listed above, conversion of the buildings to other uses, or de-listing.

Fifty-nine of the seventy gravestones and tombs in churchyards had been removed from the register through the Grave Risk Project.

The 2004 re-survey of target buildings identified:
• 20 buildings at risk
• 19 monuments at risk.

On 16 December 2004, following the Cabinet’s agreement to a revised approach to Buildings at Risk, a series of measures were approved with the following five-year targets:

• To reduce the number Buildings at Risk and capable of use from 20 to 5;
• To reduce the number Monuments at Risk from 19 (later increased to 20) to 5;
• To process 100% of standard grant applications within 20 working days.

A number of buildings were removed from the register after the last review due to a campaign of grant funding for repairs, and use of statutory powers, but this five-year strategy was superseded.

The 2006-07 Strategy and Development Service Plan set a target of reducing the number of Buildings at Risk then identified from 24 to 15. The number was reduced to 14.

A final small list of buildings and monuments was produced in 2008, including those that remained at risk, and new buildings at risk. This is not given an exact date, but listed the following, without noting what level of risk each was assessed at:

1. Buildings at Risk (capable of occupation)

Rowley Plain Cottage, Cuckoo Lane, Brenchley

Providence Chapel, Stone Street, Cranbrook

Hydraulic ram house, Lillesden, Hastings Road, Hawkhurst

Coach house, walls and outbuilding, Swan Inn, Lamberhurst

New additions

Corner House, Stone Street, Cranbrook

All Saints’ Church, Rye Road, Hawkhurst

Lillesden, Hastings Road, Hawkhurst

Summerhill House, London Road, Tunbridge Wells

2. Monuments at Risk

Gates, piers & quadrant walls, Beresford Lodge, Bedegbury Road, Goudhurst

Sundial, St Mary’s Church, High Street, Goudhurst
The strategy was previously partnered with a targeted grant scheme. A grant fund for repairs to historic buildings is still in place, but, although works to buildings at risk is often granted fund, it is not the primary target of the scheme due to decreased capital. Other measures can be taken by the Council to assist in bringing buildings and structures out of the ‘at risk’ categories, such as advice on maintenance and repairs to owners, and statutory powers, but the success of the previous strategy is clearly shown to be attributed to the grant funding of repairs by the Council. However, once on the list, attention can be given to assets at risk as staff time allows, to try to bring about a resolution. Much can often be achieved by simply recognising the causes of the problems and ‘pushing the right buttons’.

There is currently no strategy for listed buildings at risk that would follow on from the strategies produced over the last 15 years.

**STRATEGY OPTIONS**

**Issues**

An understanding of why buildings either become at risk or are placed on the at risk register is paramount in forming a strategy for dealing with these structures. Understanding what process has led to the decline in the condition of a building will have a direct bearing upon the type of solution used to remedy the building’s situation. There are a number of common reasons why buildings go into decline.

Redundancy of use is often a major factor that puts a building at risk, and the inability to provide an economically viable reuse over a significant period of time leads to decline. Where a building is unable to provide either a useful service or an economical return, owners are unwilling to finance repairs or basic maintenance.
Availability of finance is another significant contributor to building decline. This could be due to local economic climates, where businesses are unable to make sufficient profit to funding anything other than running repairs, or due to personal circumstances where the owner’s ability to fund maintenance and repair is the problem.

There is no specific duty on owners to keep their heritage assets in a good state of repair. However, regular maintenance and repair are the key to the conservation of historic buildings. Modest expenditure on repairs keeps a building weather tight, and routine maintenance (especially roof repairs and the regular clearance of gutters and downpipes) can prevent much more expensive work becoming necessary at a later date. It is a common misunderstanding that historic buildings have a fixed lifespan, and that gradual decay of their fabric is inevitable. On the contrary, unless there are intrinsic defects of design or materials, the lifespan of a historic building may be indefinite provided that timely maintenance, and occasional major repairs such as the renewal of roof coverings, are regularly undertaken. Major problems are very often the result of neglect and, if tackled earlier, can be prevented or reduced in scale.

Many buildings gradually slide into the at risk categories 1 to 3 from the vulnerable category 4 simply due to inadvertent neglect.

Deliberate neglect should not be discounted as a reason for decline. It is sometimes the case that owners perceive the development value of their land would be significantly higher if the restrictions imposed by the presence of a listed structure where not there. In such cases it is the perception of the owners that, by letting their structures decline, or even by causing deliberate harm, they can force a Local Planning Authority to allow demolition on the grounds of economic viability or danger to public safety or to reinforce a case for large scale ‘enabling development’ within the curtilage of a listed building to fund repairs.

The main causes of buildings becoming at risk can therefore be summed up as:

- Redundancy of use or inability to find a new use
- Lack of timely repair and maintenance or neglect
- Deliberate harm, vandalism and theft

Monitoring

Given the evidence from the previous reviews that additional buildings at risk do come to light with each re-survey, it is clear that there will be listed buildings that have fallen into one of the English Heritage at risk categories since the last review. Although we have data on buildings at risk from the 1998 survey up until 2008, the lists produced show only those buildings at level 1 – 3 risk, if the risk scale is shown at all. This means that there is potential for a high number of buildings or monuments being in a poor condition, but occupied – the first part of level 4 – or in a fair condition, but vacant – the second part of level 4 – to have fallen into the first three at risk levels. The last figures, therefore, do not represent a useful data set to commence a second long term strategy. In order to form a useful strategy, additional information needs to be collected.

The following suggested survey strategies and post-strategy action plans includes all methods of intervention that can be considered, but will have resource implications.

- The buildings on the latest version of the TWBC at risk register to be surveyed first by existing resources and this list updated.
• Road show to Civic Society and Parish Councils to scope resources.

• All grade I, II* and II buildings and structures within the Borough to be inspected.

• Publicity of the campaign and subsequent requests by Members, members of the public or fellow officers to look at particular buildings. This is a good way of prominent buildings in poor condition coming to attention, but is unlikely to pick up less noticeable buildings or buildings that are starting to deteriorate.


• The heritage asset’s risk to be assessed by looking at its external appearance and occupancy on the scale reproduced in the ‘Background’ section.

• Visual inspections of all listed buildings in each of the 16 parishes and towns as categorised in the original survey and ‘green backs’, 4 per year over a five year period, including Tunbridge Wells in the first year. Although this is not as thorough as a detailed condition assessment it is a good indicator of the state of the building and meets with the English Heritage method of assessment.

• The 1998 list splitting list entries between those capable of occupation, and those not, is to be updated with new entries to the list (amendments to the latest survey of each parish) since that date.

Prioritisation

The results of the survey will provide the basis for the assessment of the vulnerability of the building:

| The risk rate/priority for action categories following the survey are as follows: |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A                                      | Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; no solution agreed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| B                                      | Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric; solution agreed but not yet implemented                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| C                                      | Slow decay; no solution agreed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| D                                      | Slow decay; solution agreed but not yet implemented                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| E                                      | Under repair or in fair to good repair, but no user identified; or under threat of vacancy with no obvious new user (applicable only to buildings capable of beneficial use)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| F                                      | Repair scheme in progress and (where applicable) end use or user identified; functionally redundant buildings with new use agreed but not yet implemented                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

Those buildings considered to be in risk categories 1 - 4 could then be included on the register.
**Actions**

The key to dealing with Buildings at Risk is to take account of the human dimension of the problem. At one end of the spectrum there is the person who owns a listed building and deliberately allows it to fall into disrepair to maximise the redevelopment potential of the site. At the other end may be the pensioner struggling to maintain their property with insufficient funds. Clearly, each situation requires a different approach.

**Proactive Work and Data Management on Heritage at Risk**

When focusing on individual buildings at risk, it is easy to lose sight of the important pro-active role of preventing buildings becoming at risk in the first place or recognising the early signs and taking remedial action.

In many cases the ability of the Borough to offer grant aid is the key to persuading an owner to restore a building and at least serves as a useful first contact. The ability of the Borough Council to grant aid restoration schemes could be vital in encouraging owners to keep their buildings in a good state of repair.

Other measures that can be taken to organise pro-active work are:

- Establish new database for survey results including ownership details and photos
- Draw up list of buildings at risk (risk levels 1 – 4, categories A, B, C and D) and send letters to owners reminding of statutory powers of LA, including *Stitch in Time* document if appropriate and *Vacant Premises* document if appropriate, and funding sources if appropriate (through HELM/HLF/AHF), and an invitation to an annual event about ‘caring for your historic building’.
- Prioritise those buildings that are about to become at risk.
- Draw up a list of unoccupied buildings that may have the potential to be referred to the Kent Building Preservation Trust.
- Draw up list of priority buildings that are considered to require legal action (level A)
- Set up programme team (policy, conservation and legal) to meet every 6 or 12 months to review progress and recommend action.

**Additional, detailed surveys**

The English Heritage survey is a fairly simple, effective way of analysing the potential of a heritage asset to be at risk, but the lack of detail regarding condition that is the result of a simple, visual survey means that there may also be a lack of consistency. Many buildings may have hidden defects that can only be identified through a thorough survey. This has resource implications if it is to be considered at a second stage as part of the strategy.
Grants

Experience has shown that an offer of grant has been the deciding factor in many cases, where otherwise the only way to proceed would have been the use of the statutory powers outlined below. A dedicated grant scheme would assist in reducing the number of assets at risk, whilst also potentially avoiding the costs potentially involved in the use of statutory powers. However, as the Conservation Grant Scheme has now been reduced, the baseline heritage at risk list may lengthen and the Council may have to consider dealing with these matters increasingly using statutory powers.

Statutory powers

Negotiations usually achieve results often after patience in waiting for owners to find the resources to deal with the problems. Occasionally legal action has to be considered. Very briefly the powers are as follows:

(i) **Urgent Works** - where a notice is served requiring ‘urgent works’ to ‘preserve’ the building (i.e. make it wind and water tight and secure). After at least seven days the Council can instruct a contractor to carry out the works and seek to recover the costs from the owner.

(ii) **Repairs Notice/CPO** - where proper preservation is required a Notice is served requiring repairs and restoration. After two months the Council may proceed to Compulsory Purchase.

(iii) **‘Proper Maintenance’**. These powers, sometimes known as ‘s. 215 Notices’ enable the local authority to require that steps are taken to improve the appearance of land or buildings, and were recently used to good effect on targeted properties in Herne Bay. Potentially very effective, the limitations are that they can only deal with aesthetics not structural problems (unless one is dependent upon the other).

Use of statutory powers is effective, but time consuming and with cost implications. With this in mind, an early intervention approach by pro-actively encouraging owners whose buildings or structures are not yet in the higher categories to carry out timely maintenance and repairs is likely to be the most effective way of reducing the number of heritage assets at risk in the Borough, utilising fewer resources.

Proactive/Reactive Work

The Council can be merely reactive to situations as they arise or proactive to prevent such situations happening, or can do a combination of this. The following table analyses the strengths and weaknesses of either being proactive, or reactive to buildings at risk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proactive</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of risk buildings through survey by Council staff.</td>
<td>Saves expense in terms of cost of repairs and potential urgent works for lower risk buildings, and prevents buildings deteriorating further.</td>
<td>More time intensive as it involves a full re-survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of other volunteer resources for surveying and identifying buildings at risk.</td>
<td>Saves expense in terms of more expensive repairs and prevents buildings deteriorating further.</td>
<td>Staff time involved for recruiting training, and with less experienced volunteers there is potential that lower risk buildings will not be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of consultants for surveying and identifying buildings at risk.</td>
<td>Saves expense in terms of more expensive repairs for those at lower risk, and prevents buildings deteriorating further.</td>
<td>Cost of engaging consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritising buildings that are lower risk.</td>
<td>As above, saves expense and prevents further deterioration.</td>
<td>May require no or little action being taken on higher risk buildings. Staff time in sending out letters and guidance notes on maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw up list of buildings to be referred to the Kent Building Preservation Trust.</td>
<td>Action could be taken by the Trust rather than by the Council, who have access to other funding streams.</td>
<td>Requires full survey and the Trust may not be in a position to take on such work by the end of a survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritising buildings that are considered to require legal action.</td>
<td>Prevents higher risk buildings from being lost.</td>
<td>Heading towards being reactive – would potentially take away resources from preventing future high risk buildings by being proactive in encouraging repairs at an early stage. Involves significant staff time, including Legal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering grants for repairs</td>
<td>Encourages owners to carry out necessary repairs and avoids taking legal action.</td>
<td>Requires Council funding for a grant scheme which allows for a significant percentage to be covered by the grant, often for expensive work depending on the level of risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed surveys of buildings following initial identification of higher at risk level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of statutory powers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent works, repairs notice or section 215.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

In order to have a coherent and effective long term strategy to remove buildings and structures from the at risk register and to prevent currently sound buildings deteriorating to an extent that they become at risk it is necessary to have a two part strategy. A strategy to deal with the buildings and structures that are in categories 1 – 3 and are ‘at risk’, and also a strategy to monitor and act against the further decay of buildings that fall into category 4 and are vulnerable. (the implementation plan)

The object of this is to remove buildings from the at risk register but also to prevent new entrants on to the at risk register.

Although there will be some resource implications for the setting up, implementation and maintenance of a buildings at risk strategy, this is considered to be an essential part of the role of the specialist conservation staff of the Council in order to ensure that appropriate action can be taken to prevent the irreplaceable loss of heritage assets within the Borough. However, the reduced number of staff, and in particular the loss of a member of staff whose work was dedicated to targeting buildings at risk and facilitating the grant scheme, has resulted in this no longer being a priority area of work. Grant resources have also been reduced. It is also acknowledged that work to reduce the number of buildings at risk levels 1 – 3 is likely to be more time consuming and involve legal action.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS AND FURTHER ADVICE**

- SPAB technical advice helpline
- *A Stitch in Time* (SPAB and English Heritage)
- *Vacant Historic Buildings: An owner’s guide to temporary uses, maintenance and mothballing* (English Heritage)
- *Stopping the Rot* (English Heritage)
PART 2

Local At Risk Register Implementation Plan

PRIORITIES

Following analysis of courses of action, the following priorities are recommended.

(1) Review existing list

(2) A survey of all assets will need to be carried out after the small number from the latest data available is dealt with. Subject to additional resources by volunteer, the first four areas by March 2014

(3) Early intervention has been identified as the most cost effective, in terms of both time, staff and monetary resources, way of targeting buildings at risk. A simple framework for establishing priorities, based on English Heritage advice, needs to be produced. This framework however will need to take into account the need to prioritise category 4 buildings and to consider the potential for quick wins. It is likely that a further criteria defining the potential length of time each building at risk might take to be resolved will need to be considered when choosing which building to target.

(4) Following early intervention work to category 4 (vulnerable) buildings, a framework for dealing those on risk scales 1 – 3, the highest priority bands, will need to be established. Due to the more time consuming nature of dealing with these, realistic targets need to be set for the number of buildings subjected to this level of investigation. Providing grants is a key action for dealing with buildings at this level of risk because of the increased amount of expenditure required to bring them out of risk. It has also been demonstrated with the Council’s previous buildings at risk action plans that grants that prevent further deterioration help to decrease the numbers that fall into the higher risk categories. Currently the grant scheme is not specifically aimed towards buildings at risk.

(5) All levels are to be categorised as follows using the English Heritage system for determining priority, when producing the framework.

RESOURCES

Currently there are 1.55 FTE conservation staff.

When the 1998 strategy was implemented, and at each approved subsequent strategy, there were more staff employed within the section, and one whose work was dedicated to buildings at risk and the associated grant scheme. With the reduction in staff numbers it would not be possible to allocate the time required for the survey work within existing resources, given other statutory work pressures.
Given the high number of planning, listed building consent and conservation area consent applications received by TWBC, staff have already had to prioritise those that immediately effect heritage assets (listed building consent and conservation area consent applications) and not those that affect the setting of heritage assets (planning applications), which local planning authorities have a statutory duty to consider (Planning [Listed Building and Conservation Areas] Act 1990). Therefore, it would not be possible to dedicate one officer’s time to the strategy.

Setting up and organising volunteers to carry out the survey work is a possible objective for next year. This can start with presentations to and discussions with the Civic Society and Parish Councils. The details of the strategy would then need to follow a survey of what local groups would be willing to assist with the survey. Technical assistance from within the department would be required for setting up the checklist and the database for photographs and survey results.

Given limited resources, both in terms of grant funding and staff time, work to remove buildings and structures from the at risk categories will need to be prioritised to maximise benefits.

**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>TIMESCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce a survey sheet based on the English Heritage model</td>
<td>Existing staff (please see notes on resources above)</td>
<td>By October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a framework within which prioritisation of BAR can be readily and consistently assessed.</td>
<td>Existing staff – used English Heritage framework</td>
<td>By October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey existing Buildings at Risk list and update</td>
<td>Existing staff</td>
<td>By April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create road show to take to Civic Society, Parish Council and other groups to scope resources. Create list of potential volunteers following this and provide with timescales for the start of the survey.</td>
<td>Existing staff</td>
<td>By October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicise BAR campaign and invite requests from Members, members of the public and fellow officers to look at particular buildings.</td>
<td>Existing staff</td>
<td>Collate list by April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual inspection of suggested buildings.</td>
<td>Existing staff and volunteers</td>
<td>By October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual inspection of all listed</td>
<td>Existing staff and volunteers</td>
<td>By October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish ownership of buildings</td>
<td>Existing staff through Land Searches – will have cost implications</td>
<td>By April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new database for survey results, including ownership details and photos</td>
<td>Existing staff with technical support</td>
<td>By April 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update 1998 list, splitting entries between those capable of occupation and those not, to be updated following surveys.</td>
<td>Existing staff</td>
<td>By October 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send letters to owners of buildings at risk level 4 with advice and maintenance guidance.</td>
<td>Existing staff</td>
<td>By April 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw up a list of priority unoccupied buildings that are considered to require legal action and approach Kent Building Preservation Trust if appropriate.</td>
<td>Existing staff, KBPT</td>
<td>By April 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create action plan for each priority unoccupied building at risk and set up a programme team (policy, conservation and legal) to meet every 6 to 12 months to review progress and recommend action.</td>
<td>Existing conservation, policy and legal staff. Conservation staff to lead on first stages of taking action.</td>
<td>By October 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out more detailed surveys of priority unoccupied buildings, if appropriate</td>
<td>Existing staff and potentially consultants</td>
<td>By April 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review previous survey following additional roadshows to find volunteers, and continue programme</td>
<td>Existing staff and volunteers</td>
<td>From April 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-survey all buildings based on four areas per year.</td>
<td>Existing staff and volunteers</td>
<td>From April 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>