

Respondent	Comments	Response
Westerham Town Council	Approves and supports this Appraisal and Management Plan	Noted
	Map 1 to show relocation of Post Office from London Road to Market Square	The Map 1 does not show the Post Office. The first Map in the document on page 20 is from the Ordnance Survey which often takes a year to update information.
	Various suggested factual inaccuracies	Document amended, where appropriate, to reflect these comments
	Suggested a glossary for architectural terms	To be included within the final document
	Include mention of the Westerham and Crockham Hill Design Statement	To be included within the final document
	Management Plan should say how the proposals can be achieved/funded	The purpose of the Management Plan is to provide an overview of the issues to inform a variety of bodies about the harmful effect on the character of inappropriate development.
	Traffic should have a 20mph speed limit	Traffic management is the responsibility of Kent County Council
	Article 4 Directions – more information on who would prepare these.	Article 4 Directions are prepared by the local authority. An assessment on the requirement was included within the document.
	WTC does not object to the herringbone brick paving	Noted
	Would like an audit of street furniture	Noted
Agrees that excessive road markings are unnecessary but some are important for road safety	Noted	
Westerham Town Partnership	The document omits to mention two other documents 'Westerham and Crockham Hill Design Statements' and the 'SDC Westerham Conservation consultation 2003'. Wants the document to specifically say that it does not	The document has been amended to include specific reference to 'Westerham and Crockham Hill Design Statement'. The document referred to as the 2003 SDC Westerham Conservation consultation' was the previous Westerham

	replace them. If SDC has new policies which alter the meaning of the earlier documents, they should explicitly mention all the specific changes since 2003	Conservation Area Appraisal and this document replaces it. There are no new policies that have altered the meaning of the documents, the update was part of the ongoing work programme.
	The main recommendations relate to shop fronts and shop signs which is thoroughly laudable. Sympathetic to the point raised regarding street signage, but an urgent review of signage is required to help people find somewhere to park.	Noted.
John Edwards	Various factual inaccuracies	Document amended to reflect these comments
Keith Sime	Not viewed the document as unable to view the website.	The letter advised that the document was also available to view in the library and the Town Council Office
	Other amenity concerns regarding Westerham town centre	Noted but not related to the document being consulted on. Quality of painting and dirty frontages are not covered by the planning regime. Concerns relating to traffic will be forwarded to Kent County Council who has responsibility for this area. Parking concerns will be forwarded to the relevant department at SDC.
Mr and Mrs Buckley	Traffic concerns	Noted but not related to the document being consulted on. Concerns relating to traffic will be forwarded to Kent County Council who has responsibility for this area.
Maureen Oakley	Omitted reference to any local historian and concerns over the quality of the historical information used. The workhouse was not demolished and there is no mention of the original market house that is 'Deli de Luca' at the top of London Road.	The purpose of the document is not to provide a historical record of Westerham but to provide context to the character.