

CONSERVATION AREA: Brasted High Street

a) Responses from Online Questionnaire

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Roger Rogowski	Yes	-	-
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Roger Rogowski	Yes	Does not mention that recent developments such as Mulberry Place and Old Bull Mews are too high density and use inappropriate architectural styles and materials.	A higher density development to the rear of plots is not out of character per se and depends on the extent of visibility. There are also some historical precedents in the village. The use of red brick, clay tiled roofs and weatherboarding as seen in the new developments are also typical of the conservation area. The management recommendations in the appraisal and the accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance provide tools for the District Council to ensure future development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area.
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Roger Rogowski	No	The proposed extension of the conservation area along Rectory Lane ought to include land and buildings on the west side of the street up to the Old Rectory itself and the houses on the drive leading to it.	As a result of this comment we have considered whether this area should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it does not merit inclusion. Of the buildings that would be covered by such an extension the Old Rectory is the only one of which has special architectural or historic interest (recognised by its grade II

				<p>listing). The remainder are mostly post-war buildings which would not contribute positively to the character of the conservation area. Those which stand on the drive up to the Old Rectory and the Old Rectory itself stand away from the public road among dense vegetation and are not generally experienced as part of the village.</p> <p>As rectory to St Martin's parish church it has a closer historical connection to the Brasted Church Conservation Area so it may be more suitable as an addition to that rather than to the High Street conservation area.</p> <p>The field immediately north of the river is an attractive feature and does make a strong contribution to the conservation area by defining the northern edge of the village, and the Open Space Assessment has been amended to reflect this.</p>
Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed extensions to the conservation area?				
4.1	Roger Rogowski	No	As it stands it makes no sense to extend the conservation area to include the east side but not the west side of Rectory Lane.	See the response above.
Question 5: Would you like to tell us what you value most about the conservation area? Is there anything about the character, features of interest or potential for enhancement or any threats to the area that you would like to see highlighted?				
5.1	Roger Rogowski		Designation has not prevented inappropriate development in the past.	Recent new development is not considered to harm the character of the conservation area. The Conservation Area Design Guidance has been developed to guide the detailing of future development.

			Failure to include the west side of Rectory Lane would pose a threat to the character of that road.	See the response to 3.1.
Question 6: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
6.1	Roger Rogowski	Yes	-	-
Question 7: Are there any other comments you would like to make?				
7.1	Roger Rogowski	-	-	-

b) Written responses from Public Consultation Event

Question	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	A G Slater	Yes	-	-
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	A G Slater	Yes	<p>Underemphasises impact of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exceptionally heavy traffic on A25; uneven pavements in poor condition; poor maintenance of some buildings on the High Street 	<p>We will forward your comments to Kent Highways.</p> <p>The contribution of pavements is described in the appraisal (section 3.5) and issues with their condition are noted in section 6.0.</p> <p>Where maintenance appeared to be an issue this has been noted in section 6.0 of the appraisal.</p>
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	A G Slater	Yes	-	-
Question 4: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
4.1	A G Slater	Yes	-	-
Question 5: Any other comments?				
5.1	A G Slater	Yes	-	-

c) Other Written Responses

	Name	Comments	Response
1.	Durtnell & Sons (professional report by DowsettMayhew)	The proposed extension on Rectory Lane is not justified and fails to comply with legislation and best practice. The car park north of Bridge Cottage should be excluded because it is a visual detractor. The course of the river should define the northern extent of the conservation area.	<p>As a result of this comment we have reviewed the proposal that this area should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it does merit inclusion, as proposed in the draft appraisal.</p> <p>The conservation area currently stops to the north of Bridge Cottage (1906), with which 1 and 2 Tannery Cottages (1907) are contemporary. At the turn of the road, the two buildings can be seen together. They are part of a larger group spread throughout the conservation area of buildings of vernacular revival character, using traditional materials and forms. It is therefore considered that moving the boundary to include 1 and 2 Tannery Cottages reflects the historic extent of the village better. While one of the intervening buildings is modern, the other is of c.1900 (it is not shown on the 1896 Ordnance Survey, but does appear on the 1909 OS). Both are important to the setting of Bridge Cottage and Tannery Cottages either side of them and it therefore makes sense to include them in the conservation area too. Neither detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area and it is not necessary for every building in a conservation to contribute positively.</p> <p>Our understanding that Tannery Cottages were built by Durtnell & Sons comes from the local historian, and is neither confirmed nor refuted in Dowsett Mayhew's report. Although the Historic England guidance specifies 'architect or designer' in its checklist, the checklist is clearly not intended to be definitive and equal weight could and should be given to others involved in the creation of buildings. Besides, it is quite possible that for simple buildings of this kind that Durtnell & Sons were both designers and builders. Several other buildings, including some</p>

			<p>of earlier centuries built by Durtnell & Sons are to be found in the conservation area and the presence of such a group of buildings by the same, local, building firm – one of the oldest in the country – is important to the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Dowsett Mayhew report for Durtnell & Sons considers the buildings in the proposed extension against Historic England’s checklist. It is clearly stated in Historic England’s guidance that a ‘positive response to <i>one or more</i> of the following may indicate that a particular element within a conservation area makes a positive contribution’. In our view 1 and 2 Tannery Cottages meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it the work of a particular architect or designer of regional or local note? • Does it reflect a substantial number of other elements in the conservation area in age, style, materials, form or other characteristics? • Does it individually, or as part of a group, illustrate the development of the settlement in which it stands? • Does it have historic associations with local people or past events? • Does its use contribute to the character or appearance of the area? <p>It should also be noted that the list is of considerations for positive contributors, not for all buildings to be included in the conservation area. The draft appraisal identifies 1 and 2 Tannery Cottages as positive contributors but not the Old Forge</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>or Tannery Mead and it is not necessary for every building in a conservation to contribute positively.</p> <p>The report also proposes that the car park be excluded from the conservation area. While its current appearance is indeed noted as detracting in the draft appraisal, this represents a good opportunity for enhancement of the conservation area, with positive impacts on the setting of the other buildings on Rectory Lane. As noted above, we feel that the historic extent of the village extends to 1 and 2 Tannery Cottages and therefore includes the car park site.</p>
--	--	--	--

CONSERVATION AREA: Leigh

a) Responses from the Online Questionnaire

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Rod Smith	Yes	-	-
1.2	Glynis Rogers	Yes	-	-
1.3	Margaret Evans	Yes	The cricket pavilion is not a thing of beauty and in need of updating;	Following the comments raised during the consultation process, we have re-assessed the impact of the cricket pavilion in different seasons. The heritage Asset map has subsequently been amended to show the cricket pavilion as a detractor.
			The Scout hut is a valuable asset to the village.	The assessment of the Scout Hut in the appraisal as a detractor is based on its architectural and historic interest and its contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation; it is not a comment on its social value. If an opportunity arose to replace it with a new Scout Hut elsewhere, it could enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
1.4.	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	Yes	The map used is out of date as there is a new house on Powder Mill Lane adjacent to Oak Tree Cottage.	The base map for the appraisal was the latest available from the Ordnance Survey.
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Rod Smith	No	Cricket pavilion has a detrimental effect on the conservation area.	See response to 1.3.
2.2	Glynis Rogers	No	Cricket pavilion detracts from views on	See response to 1.3.

			the green.	
2.3	Margaret Evans	Yes	What should new street furniture look like and who will pay for it?	New furniture should enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, but it is not within the scope of the appraisal to prescribe designs to be used. Guidance on streetscape and street furniture can be found in Historic England's 'Streets for all: Advice for highway and public realm works in historic places'. Street furniture is usually the responsibility of the parish and Kent County Council.
2.4	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	Yes	-	-
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Rod Smith	No	Cricket pavilion should be improved or replaced with something more in keeping.	See response to 1.3
3.2	Glynis Rogers	Yes	Yes, but there should be a management recommendation about the cricket pavilion.	See response to 1.3.
3.3	Margaret Evans	No	Not all.	Noted.
3.4	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	Yes	-	-
Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed extensions to the conservation area?				
4.1	Rod Smith	Yes	-	-
4.2	Glynis Rogers	Yes	-	-
4.3	Margaret Evans	No	The householders affected should be consulted.	All householders of properties proposed in extensions were notified of this public consultation and were invited to comment.
4.5	Leigh Parish Council	Yes	-	Noted.

	(Louise Kleinschmidt)			
Question 5: Would you like to tell us what you value most about the conservation area? Is there anything about the character, features of interest or potential for enhancement or any threats to the area that you would like to see highlighted?				
5.1	Rod Smith	Yes	The village green is especially important.	Noted.
5.2	Glynis Rogers	Yes	The beauty of the conservation area	Noted.
			parking on the green	This is highlighted in section 6.0 of the draft appraisal.
			the cricket pavilion.	See response to 1.3.
5.3	Margaret Evans	-	-	N/A
5.4	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	Yes	The centre of Leigh is magnificent, green with mature and veteran trees many period properties; the wall around Hall Place with its drinking fountain is a special feature as are the church and lychgate.	Noted.
			The cricket pavilion spoils the view of the Green and the Parish Council would support initiatives to improve this building.	See response to 1.3.
Question 6: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
6.1	Rod Smith	Yes	-	-
6.2	Glynis Rogers	Yes	-	-
6.3	Margaret Evans	Yes	What did it cost and who paid?	The appraisal was funded by Sevenoaks District Council on the basis of a competitive tender to ensure value for money in fulfilling its statutory duty to review the management of its conservation areas.
6.4	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	Yes	-	-
Question 7: Are there any other comments you would like to make?				
7.1	Rod Smith	-	N/A	

7.2	Glynis Rogers	-	N/A	
7.3	Margaret Evans	-	N/A	
7.4	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	-	N/A	

b) Written responses from Public Consultation Event

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Jane Baier	Yes	-	-
1.2	Jonathan & Sarah Cook	Yes	-	-
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Jane Baier	Yes	-	-
2.2	Jonathan & Sarah Cook	Yes	-	-
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Jane Baier	Yes	-	-
3.2	Jonathan & Sarah Cook	Yes	-	-
Question 4: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
4.1	Jane Baier	Yes	-	-
4.2	Jonathan & Sarah Cook	Yes	-	-
Question 5: Any other comments?				
5.1	Jane Baier		Home Farm should be included.	While Home Farm has its own architectural and historic interest (recognised and protected by listing), because of its physical distance from the village it does not contribute strongly to significance of the conservation area, the focus of which is the village green and

				the High Street.
			Cricket pavilion if rebuilt needs to be in keeping	Any proposals that might come forward for replacement of the pavilion would be considered in the light of the Conservation Area Design Guidance and the overriding requirement for development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
5.2	Jonathan & Sarah Cook		Trees around the Green and approach to the village are of great importance	Noted.
			The estate stone wall on Hildenborough Road should be repaired and kept in good order – grants?	Thank you for notifying us of the condition of this structure. We will investigate and assess whether there is a case for enforcement action. SDC is not in a position to be able to offer grant aid to private owners for the repair of historic structures.
			The cricket pavilion should be listed as a detractor and when replaced should be single storey in keeping with what was there pre-1960.	Following the comments raised during the consultation process, we have re-assessed the impact of the cricket pavilion in different seasons. The heritage Asset map has subsequently been amended to show the cricket pavilion as a detractor.

c) Other Written Responses

	Name	Comment	Response
1.	Leigh Parish Council (Louise Kleinschmidt)	By email: Could Greenview Avenue and The Green Lane be added to the conservation area? Such developments as the one proposed at Woodlands would have a hugely negative impact on the conservation area and by extending the boundary it would protect The Green from large construction traffic and additional traffic generally.	<p>As a result of this comment, we have considered whether Greenview Avenue and the Green Lane are of the high level of architectural and historic interest to merit being added to the conservation area.</p> <p>The Green Lane follows an historic route which can be seen on the OS map published in 1897. However, the houses and bungalows on the street date to the second half of the twentieth-century and do not have any special interest.</p> <p>Greenview Avenue follows the route of an old footpath. It had mostly been developed by the late 1930s and has a mixture of houses and bungalows of typical inter-war character with several houses of more recent date. While the earlier houses are quite characterful, they do not match the generally high architectural standard of the older parts of the village.</p> <p>The north end of each of these streets, where they meet the village green and where they make a positive contribution to the conservation area is already included.</p>
2.	Chris Rowley	An excellent exercise, well worth continuing in other villages.	Noted.
		The stone wall along Hildenborough Road is badly neglected – could the owners be persuaded to repair it.	Thank you for notifying us of the condition of this structure. An officer of Sevenoaks District Council will investigate and assess whether there is a case for enforcement action. SDC is not in a position to be able to offer grant aid to private owners for the repair of historic structures.
		Strongly support the inclusion of Garden Cottages.	Noted.

		Suggest inclusion of land on the left of Crandalls where it joins the green;	<p>As a result of this comment, we have considered whether this land should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it should, because it is a part of the historic village and because of its proximity to the village green it makes a contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The very top end of Crandalls is already included in the conservation area. The openness provided by its northern section of and the side garden and drive to Chestnuts, the latter enclosed by traditional split log fencing, are clearly visible from the village green and contribute to the character of The Green.</p>
		Suggest inclusion of the first house and green space to the left of the Forstal;	<p>As a result of this comment, we have assessed the contribution of this land to the conservation area and concluded that it should not be added.</p> <p>The proposal in the draft appraisal is to continue the line of the existing boundary eastwards across the entrance to Forstall Close to include the land immediately on the roadside. This will help protect the rural character of Powder Mill Lane.</p>
		Suggest inclusion of playing field at the top of Lealands Avenue	<p>As a result of this comment, we have considered whether this land should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it should not. It is detached from the conservation area and outside the historic confines of the village. It does not have any special historic or architectural interest.</p>
		Suggest inclusion of small space at the beginning of Well Close;	<p>As a result of this comment, we have considered whether this land should be added to the conservation area and</p>

			concluded that it should not. It is detached from the conservation area and outside the historic confines of the village. It does not have any special historic or architectural interest.
		Suggest inclusion of West Lodge	<p>As a result of this comment, we have considered whether West Lodge should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it should not.</p> <p>Unlike the other lodges to Hall Place, which are within the village, West Lodge stands at some distance to the west. While it has its own architectural and historic interest (recognised and protected by listing), because of its physical distance from the village, it does not contribute strongly to the architectural and historic interest of the conservation area, the focus of which is the village green and the High Street.</p>
		Cricket pavilion is disliked by virtually everyone in the village as ugly and out of place.	Following the comments raised during the consultation process, we have re-assessed the impact of the cricket pavilion in different seasons. The heritage Asset map has subsequently been amended to show the cricket pavilion as a detractor.
3.	Alison & James Cook	Agree with comments about clutter around the horse trough and damage to edges of the green.	Noted.
		Scout Hut is a valuable meeting venue for the village and local people regard it as part of the scenery, even though it is of no architectural merit.	Following the comments raised during the consultation process, we have re-assessed the impact of the cricket pavilion in different seasons. The heritage Asset map has subsequently been amended to show the cricket pavilion as a detractor.
		The green space in front of the Forstal should be included as it enables the lane to preserve its open, rural character.	The proposal is for the inclusion of this small piece of land.

		Happy for Garden Cottages to be included.	Your support is noted.
4.	Spurdown (VEA Parker)	Appraisal specifies wrong architect for Garden Cottages. Plans show main architects were Stanley Barrett and Driver. Site built over two phases by two different architects hence differing style between blocks.	Your comments have been noted and the appraisal will be amended to reflect them.
		Agree with the proposed extension. Wish to see the cohesive external detailing of the buildings preserved in future.	Noted

d) Response received via telephone and email in relation to the proposals to include the northern end of Crandalls into conservation area.

	Name	Comment	Response
1.	Liz Wallace	Would the inclusion into the conservation area make any difference to how we use the garden on a day-to-day basis? On the basis it does not make a difference, no objections to the proposal.	There would be no impact in the way the space is enjoyed and maintained as a garden except, you must notify the Council if you wish to cut down, top or lop any but the smallest of tree.

CONSERVATION AREA: Seal

a) Responses from Online Questionnaire

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Nicholas Hills	Yes	-	-
1.2	Janis Thomson	No	It does not address the enormous detrimental impact that vehicles and traffic have on almost every aspect of the conservation area.	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across very strongly in the consultation. The text of the appraisal will be amended to reflect that the traffic affects all parts of the village.
1.3	Sheena Macdonald	Yes	The fact that Seal is a beautiful historic village with many listed buildings is captured well in the appraisal.	Noted.
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Nicholas Hills	Yes	-	-
2.2	Janis Thomson	No	I live in Zion Street and see very little sign that anything is done to uphold the idea that it is in a conservation area.	Noted.
2.3	Sheena Macdonald	No	The appraisal does not capture the scale of the challenges to retaining Seal's special character, which include: volume and speed of traffic on A25 and School Lane, large vehicles using the centre of the village as a 'rat run', lack of parking, ugly signage, garish shop fascia on Seal Kebab house.	See response to 1.2.
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Nicholas Hills	Yes	Areas highlighted for improvement are the same as in 2003 and nothing has changed	The District Council has a statutory duty to review the management of conservation

			since. Will anything be done this time?	areas periodically. The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance will put in place the means to manage change in the conservation area so that its character and appearance are preserved or enhanced in the future.
			The following are all detractors: the former Crown public house; the building next to it which has been empty for many years; Seal Garage.	The former Crown is an important historic building in the village and therefore contributes positively to the conservation area. Empty buildings can be a problem but the building appears to be in fair condition still and as a historic building of characteristic local materials it contributes positively to the conservation area. Seal Garage is considered to make a neutral contribution.
			The village needs a bypass; it is neglectful of the District and County Councils to continue to expose local residents to dangerous levels of noise and pollution.	See response to 1.2.
3.2	Janis Thomson	No	There is no acknowledgement of the impact of cars, lorries, etc.; something should be done to slow down the traffic.	See response 3.1.
3.3	Sheena Macdonald	Yes	Apart from the good point made about limited road-crossing opportunities on the A25, there is no mention about heavy A25/School Lane traffic, parking and HGV access through the village, with the knock on effects of poor air quality, road safety problems, noise, time wasted finding parking spaces and difficulty in walking around the village. These issues	See response 3.1.

			dominate many residents' experience of living here and greatly reduce our quality of life.	
Question 4: Would you like to tell us what you value most about the conservation area? Is there anything about the character, features of interest or potential for enhancement or any threats to the area that you would like to see highlighted?				
4.1	Nicholas Hills	Yes	I love living in the village, but mostly for its surroundings and the areas away from the A25.	Noted.
4.2	Janis Thomson	Yes	I love the idea of the conservation area and I really think it's a good place to live.	Noted.
4.3	Sheena Macdonald	Yes	Seal is a friendly and quaint village which is being spoiled by the traffic; there is a significant consensus about these issues locally.	Noted.
Question 5: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
5.1	Nicholas Hills	Yes	Easy to understand and ultimately pointless: the district council has done little since the last appraisal.	Noted. The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance put in place the means to manage change in the conservation area so that its character and appearance are preserved or enhanced in the future.
5.2	Janis Thomson	Yes	-	-
5.3	Sheena Macdonald	Yes	Very well put together, clear and easy to use.	Noted.
Question 6: Are there any other comments you would like to make?				
6.1	Nicholas Hills	Yes	If no more happens as a result of this appraisal than the last, I think the council is wasting tax-payers' money.	The District Council has a statutory duty to review the management of conservation areas periodically. The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance put in place the means to manage change in the conservation area so that its character and

				appearance are preserved or enhanced.
6.2	Janis Thomson	Yes	Better use and management of the recreation ground car park.	Noted but this is not conservation issue and is therefore outside the scope of the appraisal.
			Alteration of the exit from Zion Street to force people to turn left.	Noted but this is not conservation issue and is therefore outside the scope of the appraisal.
			Bollards matching the rest of the street furniture could be installed quite easily and inexpensively.	The appraisal contains a management recommendation concerning improvement of the public realm.
6.3	Sheena Macdonald	-	-	-

b) Written responses from Public Consultation Event

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Mrs Critcher	-	-	
1.2	Janis Thomson	Yes	It highlights all the positives.	Noted.
1.3	GM Taylor			
1.4	Unknown	Yes		
1.5	Sheena Macdonald	Yes		
1.6	Michael Leahy	Yes		
1.7	Unknown	Yes		
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Mrs Critcher	-	-	
2.2	Janis Thomson	No	It completely ignores the negative visual impact of vehicles – parked and moving. Is there a way of introducing residents' parking?	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across very strongly in the consultation. We will forward the comments made to Kent Highways Department.
2.3	GM Taylor		Very heavy traffic at all times of the day, especially when M26, M20 or Pilgrims Way are closed.	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across very strongly in the consultation. We will forward the comments made to Kent Highways Department.
2.4	Unknown	Yes		
2.5	Sheena Macdonald		It does not take account of the problems with HGVs – vibration and pollution - or lack of parking.	See response 2.3.
2.6	Michael Leahy	Yes	Specific measures to address impacts of HGVs would be an	See response 2.3.

			improvement.	
2.7	Unknown	Yes	Understates the impact of HGVs in the centre of the village on walls and structural integrity of buildings.	See response 2.3.
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Mrs Critcher	-	-	-
3.2	Janis Thomson	-	-	-
3.3	GM Taylor	Undecided	-	-
3.4	Unknown	Yes		
3.5	Sheena Macdonald	Yes		
3.6	Michael Leahy			
3.7	Unknown	-	More specific suggestions for improvement, enhancement and protection measures would improve the recommendations.	The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance put in place the means to manage change in the conservation area so that its character and appearance are preserved or enhanced.
Question 4: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
4.1	Mrs Critcher	-	-	-
4.2	Janis Thomson	Yes	-	-
4.3	GM Taylor		Reasonably	-
4.4	Unknown	-	-	-
4.5	Sheena Macdonald	Yes	-	-
4.6	Michael Leahy	Yes	Clear, well written	-
4.7	Unknown	Yes	This is clear.	-
Question 5: Any other comments?				
5.1	Mrs Critcher		On page 3 the appraisal incorrectly states that Herbert Schwarz set up SGE; in fact it had already been done by Mr Allen Brooks, whose	Thank you for this correction. We will amend the text of the appraisal accordingly.

			family, along with the Schwarz family now run it.	
5.2	Janis Thomson	Yes	Consideration should be given to making Zion Street residents only and the rest pedestrianised	Noted. Pedestrianisation is not primarily a conservation measure, but design of any associated public realm works is covered by the management recommendations in the appraisal.
5.3	GM Taylor		Severe lack of parking for the several shops in Seal. It is a very pretty village and should retain its charm and character.	Parking is not primarily a conservation issue it is outside the scope of the appraisal.
5.4	Unknown		Worried about the speed of in the narrow, upper part of the High Street.	Noted. Since this is not primarily a conservation issue it is outside the scope of the appraisal.
5.5	Sheena Macdonald		I agree there need to be more crossing points on the High Street. I would also like to see more pedestrian-friendly areas.	See response 5.2.
5.6	Michael Leahy		Buildings shake when HGVs cut through the village (Church Rd to Church St), which happens several times a day and walls damaged.	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across very strongly in the consultation. We will review the text of the appraisal to ensure it reflects all relevant aspects of this.
5.7	Unknown	-	-	-

c) Other Written Responses

	Name	Comments	Response
1.	Mr and Mrs Coe	Important aspects are missed: pollution and traffic,	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across

		which is a huge detractor and not covered accurately in the appraisal. Traffic survey needed.	very strongly in the consultation. We agree that traffic affects the character of the conservation area and we will review the text of the appraisal to ensure it reflects all relevant aspects of this.
		Marchants is Grade II but not shown on the map on the flyers	The map will be amended.
		Barrier across Wilderness Avenue makes it inaccessible to the rest of the village and creates an air of 'exclusiveness'.	Although there is a barrier, access and views along the avenue are still possible, so there we do not feel that it detracts from the character or appearance of the conservation area.
		The management recommendations do not address the issues identified in section 6.	The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance, which was also part of the public consultation, put in place the means to manage change in the conservation area so that the issues in section 6.0 can be addressed.
		Pictures should be included to show the traffic problems.	There is limited space for illustrations in the appraisal, but we will consider the scope for including images to show traffic problems.
2.	Joe Ward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pavements of poor quality and unsympathetic repairs Street signage visually unattractive 	This is noted in section 6.0 of the draft appraisal and addressed by a management recommendation regarding the public realm, in section 7.0.
		Heavy traffic on A25 creates a barrier between north and south sides of the High Street.	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across very strongly in the consultation. We will review the text of the appraisal to ensure it reflects all relevant aspects of this.
		Caution over the impact of UPVC windows in the conservation area. Not always harmful and energy efficiency is an important consideration.	The Council strongly supports improving energy efficiency of houses, including improvement to windows. This can be achieved by upgrading existing windows or appropriate well detailed double glazed timber replacement windows. Advice can be found in the Historic England's guidance 'Traditional Windows: their care, maintenance and upgrading.'
3.	Seal Village Allotments and Jubilee Rise Residents Association (Patrick Coffey)	Jubilee Rise and its dwellings are strong candidates for inclusion, and Seal village allotments and Lulworth, part of the front garden of which is already	As a result of this comment we have reviewed the proposal that this area should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it does merit inclusion, for the following

		<p>in the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>reasons.</p> <p>The separation of the historic village from surrounding development is important for the preservation of its traditional rural character. At present the conservation area contains the churchyard, Church Farm fields and Recreation Ground, but omits the Allotments, which would complete the buffer between the north side of the historic village and its twentieth-century extension.</p> <p>The Allotments have been in use for over a hundred years and form an established part of the historic development and social history of the village, along with other open spaces of community value like the Recreation Ground and the churchyard. The separation they provide of the historic village from surrounding development is important for the preservation of Seal's traditional rural character. At present the conservation area contains the churchyard, Church Farm fields and Recreation Ground, but omits the Allotments, which would complete the buffer between the north side of the historic village and its twentieth-century extension along Childsbridge Lane.</p> <p>Jubilee Rise is a 1930s development laid-out as a close between the pre-war northern village edge and the allotments. It added a new typology to the village and included new facilities, such as the purpose-built Telephone Exchange and the small hall for the Seal Boys Club and the Scouts. Lulworth, on School Lane stands adjacent to Jubilee Rise and is contemporary with it (built c.1937). The fine views to the North Downs are typical of the conservation area, and the street affords some of the best views of the church, enhancing appreciation of the conservation area. In views from the</p>
--	--	----------------------------------	--

			<p>church and on the approach from Childsbridge Lane, Jubilee Rises low-scale buildings and roofscape define the edge of the historic village of Seal and have become an established part of the village scape.</p> <p>For these reasons it is considered that Jubilee Rise meets the tests for inclusion in the conservation. The support of the residents of Jubilee Rise for its inclusion has also been noted.</p>
4.	Residents of Jubilee Rise - petition signed by 14 residents	Inclusion of Jubilee Rise within Seal Conservation Area	See above.
5.	Michael Leahy	<p>Issue of HGVs using centre of village as shortcut</p> <p>Kent County Council consider traffic calming measures</p> <p>Volume of HGVs through village centre compromising historical character of village and the structural integrity of listed buildings</p>	The concern of local residents about traffic has come across very strongly in the consultation. We will forward the comments made to Kent Highways Department.

d) Consultation responses received in relation to the proposal to include Seal Village Allotments, Jubilee Rise, Scout Hut and Lulworth on School Lane into Seal Conservation Area.

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Neil Allen	Yes	-	-
1.2	Patrick Coffey	Yes	-	-
1.3	Nick Hubbard	Yes	-	-
1.4	Seal Parish Council (Lorna Talbot)		Parish Council gave views in previous consultation. Appraisal omits harm traffic and parking causes to character and fabric	-

			of CA.	
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Neil Allen	Yes	-	-
2.2	Patrick Coffey	Yes	-	-
2.3	Nick Hubbard	Yes	-	-
2.4	Seal Parish Council (Lorna Talbot)		See comment above.	-
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Neil Allen	Yes	-	-
3.2	Patrick Coffey	Yes	-	-
3.3	Nick Hubbard	Yes	-	-
3.4	Seal Parish Council (Lorna Talbot)	Yes	Seeks confirmation that the erection of polytunnels and small sheds on the allotments will not be inhibited by their inclusion in CA.	Allotments generally do not benefit from permitted development rights and the conservation area status would not change this.
Question 4: Would you like to tell us what you value most about the conservation area? Is there anything about the character, features of interest or potential for enhancement or any threats to the area that you would like to see highlighted?				
4.1	Neil Allen	-	Importance of trees and vegetation. Help mitigate the outline of buildings or hard landscaping	Noted.
4.2	Patrick Coffey	-	Seal CA will preserve the integrity of the village and its community and will, hopefully, defend its unique character against exploitative change	Noted.
4.3	Nick Hubbard	-	Views of North Downs from Jubilee Rise are amazing and should be preserved. Allotments key part of local community and should be maintained for future generations. They are haven for wildlife.	Noted.
4.4	Seal Parish Council (Lorna Talbot)		See Parish Council's response to initial consultation.	-
Question 5: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				

5.1	Neil Allen	Yes	-	-
5.2	Patrick Coffey	Yes	-	-
5.3	Nick Hubbard	Yes	-	-
3.4	Seal Parish Council (Lorna Talbot)	Yes	-	-
Question 6: Are there any other comments you would like to make?				
6.1	Neil Allen	-	-	-
6.2	Patrick Coffey	No	We are happy our original submission dealt with all our hopes and concerns	
6.3	Nick Hubbard	Yes	Agree with the reasons in the appraisal	-
6.4	Seal Parish Council (Lorna Talbot)	-	-	-

CONSERVATION AREA: Shoreham High Street and Church Street and Shoreham Mill Lane

a) Responses from Online Questionnaire

Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?

Question Number	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	James Evans	Yes	-	-
1.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	Church Field should be included in the conservation area.	<p>As a result of the number of comments regarding Church Field we have re-assessed Church Field but have concluded it should remain outside the designated area.</p> <p>Conservation areas are designated for their special historic and architectural interest and Church Field is, and has historically always been, outside the built confines of the village. It is also largely shielded from sight from inside the conservation area by trees and buildings and therefore does not contribute to the way the conservation area is experienced from inside its boundaries.</p> <p>This is not to say that Church Field is not important. In common with the other fields that surround the village, it plays an important part in creating the setting of the conservation area and is noted in the Open Space Assessment as making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Additionally the view of the village across Church Field is noted as a particularly important one.</p> <p>Any proposals for development in Church Field would take</p>

				into account the fact that it is in the setting of the conservation area and the importance of the view across it to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is also designated as Green Belt which brings with it its own protections.
1.3	Daniel Maclaren	Yes	-	-
1.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	-	-
1.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	-	-
1.6	Flanagan	Yes	The appraisal clearly articulates the combined impact of the architecture within the village and the natural landscape surrounding it that gives Shoreham its special feel.	Noted.
1.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	-	-
1.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	-	-
1.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	It is important that the character of an area is protected.	Noted.
			In Crown Road the street scene has been affected by the removal of front boundaries.	This is addressed by the management recommendation for an Article 4 direction covering changes to front boundaries and front gardens.
			I think the appraisal has been thorough and sensitive to the area.	Noted.
1.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	-	-
1.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	-	-
1.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	-	-
1.13	Emma Fischel	No opinion	-	-
1.14	Ann Ball	Yes	-	-
1.15	Mr & Mrs Cockburn	Yes	-	-

1.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	-	-
1.17	James Saynor	Yes	-	-
1.18	Theodore Hofmann	Yes	-	-
1.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	Yes	It is an excellent document that very much captures what is very special about Shoreham.	Noted.
2.20	Unknown	Yes	-	-
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	James Evans	Yes	-	-
2.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	-	-
2.3	Daniel Maclaren	Yes	-	-
2.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	-	-
2.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	-	-
2.6	Flanagan	Yes	-	-
2.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	-	-
2.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	-	-
2.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	-	-
2.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	-	-
2.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	-	-
2.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	The Centenary Wood is a huge additional asset which gives views down the valley that cannot be seen from the High Street.	Noted.
2.13	Emma Fischel	Yes	-	-
2.14	Ann Ball	Yes	-	-
2.15	Mr & Mrs Cockburn	Yes	-	-
2.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	-	-
2.17	James Saynor	Yes	-	-

2.18	Theodore Hofmann	Yes	-	-
2.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	Yes	-	-
2.20	Unknown	Yes	Careful consideration should be given to the use of buildings as well as their appearance. Shoreham would be an unsuitable area for e.g. a nightclub or fast food outlet. Peace and tranquillity is one of the main reasons people choose to live here.	Noted. Change of use is controlled by the planning system and would take into account effect on the amenity of the area.
Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed extensions and merging of the two existing conservation areas to create one Shoreham Conservation Area?				
3.1	James Evans	Yes	-	-
3.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	-	-
3.3	Daniel Maclaren	No	Timberden Farm should also be included in the conservation area to prevent it from being developed.	Timberden Farm is at some distance from the edge of the village. It is, and has historically always been, outside the built confines of the village which is the focus of the conservation area designation. We do not agree therefore that Timberden Farm merits inclusion in the conservation area.
3.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	Church Field should be included as it is of imperative importance to the view of the village from Shoreham Station and the defined boundaries of the village on the eastern side.	Response 1.2.
3.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	-	-

3.6	Flanagan	Yes	-	-
3.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	Excellent idea to include Crown Field as the view from Mill Lane looking at Crown Field is a stunning iconic view.	Your support is noted.
3.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	It would be worth considering Church Field as this is a key view and significantly supports the rural character of the village.	See response 1.2.
			The addition of Crown Field is very welcome.	Your support is noted.
3.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	-	-
3.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	Shoreham is set in beautiful countryside which needs preserving from development.	Noted.
3.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	This is an excellent suggestion. Could Crown Field also be included?	Noted. The management recommendations in the draft appraisal include the extension of the boundary of the conservation area to include Crown Field. Your support for this is noted.
3.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	-	-
3.13	Emma Fischel	Yes	-	-
3.14	Ann Ball	Yes	The field at the junction of Mill Lane and High Street has been called Crown Field from time immemorial so please put this name in all references to it.	Thank you for this information which we will incorporate in the appraisal.
3.15	Mr & Mrs Cockburn	Yes	I think it makes sense to combine the two conservation areas.	Your support is noted.
3.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	-	-
3.17	James Saynor	Yes	-	-
3.18	Theodore Hofmann	Yes	-	-

3.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	Yes	A very good idea that we strongly support	Your support is noted.
3.20	Unknown	Yes	-	-
Question 4: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
4.1	James Evans	Yes	-	-
4.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	-	-
4.3	Daniel Maclaren	Yes	-	-
4.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	-	-
4.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	-	-
4.6	Flanagan	Yes	-	-
4.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	-	-
4.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	-	-
4.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	-	-
4.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	-	-
4.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	-	-
4.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	I would like further extension of permission being needed for increasing hard standing in back gardens as well particularly within the 1/100 year flood zone.	<p>Permitted Development Rights in relation to hardstanding are set out in the General Permitted Development Order (2015). The proposed Article 4 Direction is designed to protect the front gardens and boundary treatments of the conservation area as these impact on this character.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the policy approach for preventing inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding. The NPPF expects local planning authorities, when determining planning applications, to ensure that sustainable drainage is prioritised in areas at risk of flooding.</p>
4.13	Emma Fischel	Yes	-	-
4.14	Ann Ball	No opinion	-	-
4.15	Mr & Mrs	Yes	-	-

	Cockburn			
4.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	-	-
4.17	James Saynor	Yes	-	-
4.18	Theodore Hofmann	No opinion	-	-
4.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	Yes	We strongly support them and they are valuable.	Your support is noted.
4.20	Unknown	Yes	In order to preserve and enhance the use of open spaces, impacts of noise and air pollution should be taken into consideration in any future development.	Such issues are considered in the Development Management process and are outside the scope of the conservation area appraisal.
Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed Article 4 Direction to protect front gardens and boundary treatments?				
5.1	James Evans	Yes	-	-
5.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	-	-
5.3	Daniel Maclaren	Yes	-	-
5.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	The reference to public transport options is laughable. SDC needs to be more creative about the parking pressures.	Shoreham benefits from regular bus and train services, but traffic management is outside the scope of this appraisal.
5.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	-	-
5.6	Flanagan	Yes	Parking is difficult for villagers where their property does not have off-street parking. The cars are unsightly on the road and there can be pinch points due to parked vehicles.	Noted. The impact of parking of car parking on the character and appearance of the conservation area has been highlighted in section 6 of the appraisal.
5.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	We must definitely stop front gardens being turned into car parking spaces and hard landscaping.	Your support is noted.

5.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	I appreciate that crowded parking within the village poses problems for householders with no off-street parking, particularly at weekends.	Noted.
5.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	-	-
5.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	-	-
5.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	-	-
5.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	-	-
5.13	Emma Fischel	Yes	-	-
5.14	Ann Ball	Yes	-	-
5.15	Mr & Mrs Cockburn	Yes	-	-
5.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	-	-
5.17	James Saynor	Yes	-	-
5.18	Theodore Hofmann	Yes	-	-
5.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	Yes	We strongly support the use of Article 4 Directions for this purpose.	Your support is noted.
5.20	Unknown	Yes	-	-
Question 6: Would you like to tell us what you value most about the conservation area? Is there anything about the character, features of interest or potential for enhancement or any threats to the area that you would like to see highlighted?				
6.1	James Evans	Yes	Shoreham Village is a beautiful, largely untouched village and therefore I am in favour of anything that will protect it and maintain it as it is for future generations.	Noted.
6.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	Yes	-
6.3	Daniel Maclaren	Yes	I agree with extending the conservation area in to the field	Your support is noted.

			at the north end of the High Street and hope this will protect the field from any future development. It is important for the view up Crown Road.	
6.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	I particularly enjoy the views of the surrounding hills, and in particular, to the Cross, when I walk around the village. I also enjoy admiring the different architectural styles within the village	Noted.
6.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	The field at the North end of the high street must be protected from development. The view up towards the woods as well as the view down the hill and across towards Mill Lane are unique. I am so glad this area is being considered as an integral part of the conservation area. It is also a haven for all sorts of wildlife.	Your support is noted.
6.6	Flanagan	Yes	Shoreham is fortunate to be nestled in the Darenth Valley with beautiful, accessible views from various vantage points. The walks around the village are much used by dog-walkers, runners, families and visitors to the village and I am particularly happy that Crown Field is proposed to be included.	Your support is noted.

6.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	It's a shame that historically, some buildings have had planning permission despite not fitting at all into the historic landscape, we must also ensure that houses and cottages are not overdeveloped.	Noted. The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance aim to aid the design and detailing of future development in the conservation area so that its character and appearance are preserved or enhanced.
6.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	I love the character of the village and agree that there are distinct characteristics which are Kentish and more local. I've been surprised at how many non-traditional windows have been allowed over the years, though understand how expensive alternatives are. Sympathetic modern buildings should also be considered as they will be the vernacular of the future as long as they use similar materials	See above 6.7. The replacement of windows in single family dwellings is under permitted development rights and as such is not under planning control. The replacement of windows in a Listed Building is likely to require Listed Building consent.
6.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	I value everything about the conservation area. One aspect that hasn't been addressed is the use of lighting on buildings (excluding Christmas lights which the village is very proud of). Apart from Christmas, is there any restriction on the power of lighting permitted, or whether it's on all night or on a sensor? We have very little streetlights and limited light pollution,	Noted. The absence of street lighting is noted as a positive aspect of the conservation area (section 6.0). The external lighting for houses benefits from permitted development rights and as such is not under planning control.

			allowing us to appreciate the night sky. While we may need lighting to reach our doors safely and to identify 'visitors', I am against lights on all night.	
6.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	Shoreham is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and development of properties above the High Street would ruin views and destroy wildlife and damage the environment.	Noted. New development would be subject to planning legislation and policies. Development on previously undeveloped land is strictly control by Green Belt status.
6.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	The parked cars do detract but there is little one can do, even during Thames Water works people did not use car park too far to walk!!	Noted.
6.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	It is a rare discrete example of a contained community so close to London that reflects changing needs over time. It is a resource widely used by teachers and a huge recreational asset enjoyed by the many welcomed visitors from London and wider afield. Proposals to build so many new homes in the surrounding parishes could well threaten the essential asset and purpose of the village: The River Darent	New development would be subject to planning legislation and policies. Development on previously undeveloped land is strictly control by Green Belt status.
6.13	Emma Fischel	Yes	The space, the views, the opportunities for peaceful walks in nature are all things I value every day.	Noted. New development would be subject to planning legislation and policies. Development on previously undeveloped land is strictly control by Green Belt status.

			The continued threat to the protected status of Green Belt land is a serious concern.	
6.14	Ann Ball	Yes	We already have substantial development in Mill Lane despite the conservation area. I wouldn't like any houses on Crown Field.	Noted.
6.15	Mr & Mrs Cockburn	Yes	I am glad to see the field at the end of the High Street being included because this is an important entrance into Shoreham and also provides views down to the Conservation Area.	Your support is noted.
6.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	I love the variety and relatively open nature of the village. As a child growing up here I thought it twee but I now appreciate the small scale of many of the buildings and the front gardens, which you rightly highlight.	Noted.
			I agree that the field opposite the top end of Mill Lane should be included in the revised Conservation Area, not only to preserve the view of the village from above but equally, to preserve the opening up of the view as one comes up Mill Lane.	Your support is noted.

			I am sorry to see that the water meadows to the south of the river path (between Water House and Mill House) are becoming increasingly over cultivated, restricting the views towards White Hill; and that the river path itself is becoming enclosed on both sides, particularly with inappropriate plants such as pampas grass and cultivated bulbs. This path used to be much more open.	Noted, but this is outside the scope of the appraisal.
6.17	James Saynor	Yes	There is a case for adding Church Field, to the east of the church and the Mount, to the conservation area. As with the field to the north end of the High Street, Church Field offers an iconic view - in this case, of the church with the hills and the Cross behind it - while defining a boundary to the village and contributing greatly to its rural setting.	See response to 1.2.
			In addition, the buildings at the station, which date from the mid-19th century, might be considered, if permissible, for inclusion - as might Copt Hall at the top of Station Road.	These buildings are at some distance from the edge of the village, separated from it by Church Field. They are, and historically always have been, outside the built confines of the village which is the focus of the conservation area designation. We do not agree therefore that the station and Copt Hall merit inclusion in the conservation area, even though they have some architectural and historic interest of their own.

6.18	Theodore Hofmann	Yes	I think that making the whole of the High Street into a conservation area is an excellent idea. It has great coherence as a village landscape, despite a few modern buildings.	Your support is noted
			I also think that including the field opposite Crown Lane/Mill Lane is an excellent idea. The whole of the hillside above Shoreham is vital to the village and has remained so since Samuel Palmer's day. The SDC should never have sold this land. It's a pity that there are no sheep any more, but hopefully this may be changed by the new owner of the hillside and the fields at Timberden Farm	Noted.
6.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	Yes	By email: recommend addition of Church Field; Vicarage; School Field; land behind Oxbourne Farm; Bowers Road and Mildmay Place; Meadow House and Darenth House; Centenary Wood.	<p>As a result of these comments we have reviewed the proposed new boundary for the conservation area, but concluded that it should not be extended any further than already proposed in the draft appraisal.</p> <p>The proposed boundary reflects the historic built confines of the village so as to protect the parts of the village which have special architectural and historic interest. This therefore excludes areas that are outside the historic built confines, such as Bowers Road or Centenary Wood, and also infill development within the village such as Boakes Meadow and Palmers Orchard which do not meet the test of special</p>

				architectural or historic interest.
6.20	Unknown	Yes	I value: The beautiful green valley setting, peace and tranquillity, no road markings of street lamps, relatively unpolluted air, accessible footpaths and historic buildings and the variety of wildlife which all this encourages and nurture.	Noted.
			As mentioned previously I would like to see strict planning enforcement to ensure future developments or change of use fit in with the rural setting and conserve the character of the village.	Noted. The management recommendations and accompanying Conservation Area Design Guidance aim to aid change in the conservation area so that its character and appearance are preserved or enhanced in the future.
			I do not agree with providing more parking outside of the conservation area as I think the limited parking which is available serves to limit the number of cars driving through the village which is a good thing. I agree people should be encouraged to use the train service more or for visitors to park at Lullingstone or Otford car parks and walk - it's good for mind, body and the environment! The character of Shoreham will be spoilt by too much traffic or unsightly car	Noted. The impact of traffic is highlighted as an issue but solutions to traffic management are outside the scope of this appraisal.

			parks. Maybe there is a need for a few reserved disabled parking spaces for those unable to walk far?	
Question 7: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
7.1	James Evans	Yes	-	-
7.2	Duncan Wood	Yes	-	-
7.3	Daniel Maclaren	No	The map that came through the door was easier to understand than the consultation document. On the online version I could not see the areas proposed to extend into.	Different map layers can be viewed in the online document by selecting the button to access the layered map. Instructions of how to use the interactive map are set out in the draft 'Introduction to the appraisals'.
7.4	Elizabeth Stopford	Yes	-	-
7.5	Elizabeth Townshend	Yes	-	-
7.6	Flanagan	Yes	-	-
7.7	Neil Vickers	Yes	-	-
7.8	Sarah Newman	Yes	-	-
7.9	Geraldine Field	Yes	-	-
7.10	Anna Fischel	Yes	-	-
7.11	Marion Parkes	Yes	-	-
7.12	Lesley Spence	Yes	-	-
7.13	Emma Fischel	Yes	-	-
7.14	Ann Ball	Yes	-	-
7.15	Mr & Mrs Cockburn	Yes	-	-
7.16	Elizabeth Horsley	Yes	-	-
7.17	James Saynor	Yes	-	-
7.18	Theodore Hofmann	Yes	-	-
7.19	Shoreham Society	Yes	An excellent document	Noted.

	(John Saynor)			
7.20	Unknown	Yes	Thank you for the chance to comment.	Noted.
Question 8: Are there any other comments you would like to make?				
8.1	James Evans		-	-
8.2	Duncan Wood		Church Field should be included in the conservation area.	See the response to 1.2.
8.3	Daniel Maclaren		-	-
8.4	Elizabeth Stopford		-	-
8.5	Elizabeth Townshend		-	-
8.6	Flanagan		-	-
8.7	Neil Vickers		Including Crown Field is a must.	Your support for this recommendation is noted.
			I would like to see Church Field also included, as turning into Station Road and looking towards the village you have an iconic view of the Church tower. Stunning.	See the response to 1.2
8.8	Sarah Newman		Well done!	Noted.
8.9	Geraldine Field		-	-
8.10	Anna Fischel		-	-
8.11	Marion Parkes		-	-
8.12	Lesley Spence		-	-
8.13	Emma Fischel		-	-
8.14	Ann Ball		Large trees in the village are a real problem for their owners so any new planting needs to be of a smaller type of tree. I refer particularly to the huge trees at Reed Beds.	Trees generally make a positive contribution to the conservation area and their contribution would be assessed in response to any notification for works to a protected tree.
8.15	Mr & Mrs		-	-

	Cockburn			
8.16	Elizabeth Horsley		I strongly support the idea of providing additional car parking space in the village, with some space reserved for residents. Unless public transport improves there will continue to be a traffic problem. The train service is good, but not for people who have mobility issues.	Your support for the recommendation is noted.
8.17	James Saynor		-	-
8.18	Theodore Hofmann		-	-
8.19	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)		-	-
8.20	Unknown		-	-

b) Written responses from Public Consultation Event

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Geoff Mallett	Yes	Yes I think it does	Noted
1.2	Anne Rushton	Yes	Shoreham has a sense of place originating in its three entrances which are unencumbered and mark the beginning of the village.	Noted
1.3	Ann Williams	No	-	-
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Geoff Mallett	Yes	It is a good reflection	Noted
2.2	Anne Rushton	Yes	As far as I can tell.	Noted
2.3	Ann Williams	No	-	-
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Geoff Mallett	Yes	-	
3.2	Anne Rushton	Yes	-	-
3.3	Ann Williams	No	-	-
Question 4: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
4.1	Geoff Mallett	Yes	Very clear, lots of good information.	
4.2	Anne Rushton	Yes	No photo of Holly Place, the oldest house in the village.	There is limited space in the appraisal for illustrations but we will consider the scope for including an image of Holly Place, which is indeed an important contributor to the conservation area.
4.3	Ann Williams	No	-	-
Question 5: Any other comments?				
5.1	Geoff Mallett		The extension of the conservation area is a very good idea. Including the field makes sense as it is integral.	Your support for the recommendation is noted.

5.2	Anne Rushton	Yes	<p>What is missing is the inclusion of Church Field. It helps to set the scene; the cross on the hill can be seen from there and it is therefore important to the sense of place of the village.</p>	<p>As a result of the number of comments regarding Church Field we have re-assessed Church Field but have concluded it should remain outside the designated area.</p> <p>Conservation areas are designated for their special historic and architectural interest and Church Field is, and has historically always been, outside the built confines of the village. It is also largely shielded from sight from inside the village and therefore does not contribute to the way the conservation area is experienced from inside its boundaries.</p> <p>This is not to say that Church Field is not important. In common with the other fields that surround the village, it plays an important part in creating the setting of the conservation area and is noted in the Open Space assessment as making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Additionally the view of the village across Church Field is noted as an important one.</p> <p>Any proposals for development in Church Field would take into account the fact that it is in the setting of the conservation area and the importance of the view across it to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is also designated as</p>
-----	--------------	-----	--	--

				Green Belt which brings with it its own protections.
5.3	Ann Williams	Yes	Proposed additions: Crown Field must be included because this area must be conserved in the name of Samuel Palmer.	Your support for this recommendation is noted.

c) Other Written Responses

	Name	Comments	Response
1.	Neil Vickers	The proposal for the extension of the conservation area looks a great piece of work, especially Crown Field – the view from Mill Lane is absolutely stunning.	Your support is noted.
2.	Polly Freeman	I urge you to include Crown Field.	The management recommendations in the draft appraisal include the extension of the boundary of the conservation area to include Crown Field. Your support for this is noted.
3.	Shoreham Parish Council Planning Committee (Sarah Moon)	Extend the conservation area to include Crown Field, Church Field, Centenary Wood and the School Field as well as land immediately behind Oxbourne Farm. Streets and properties such as Bowers Road, Mildmay Place, Meadow House, Darenth Lodge and the Vicarage should also be included.	<p>As a result of the number of comments regarding Church Field we have reviewed our decision not to include it in the conservation area, but we have concluded that it should remain outside the designated area.</p> <p>Conservation areas are designated for their special historic and architectural interest and Church Field is, and has historically always been, outside the built confines of the village. It is also largely shielded from sight from inside the village and therefore does not contribute to the way the conservation area is experienced from inside its boundaries.</p> <p>This is not to say that Church Field is not important. In common with the other fields that surround the village, it plays an important part in creating the setting of the conservation area</p>

			<p>and is noted in the Open Space assessment as making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Additionally the view of the village across Church Field is noted as an important one.</p> <p>Any proposals for development in Church Field would take into account the fact that it is in the setting of the conservation area and the importance of the view across it to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is also designated as Green Belt which brings with it its own protections.</p>
4.	Shoreham Society (John Saynor)	By email: recommend addition of Church Field; Vicarage; School Field; land behind Oxbourne Farm; Bowers Road and Mildmay Place; Meadow House and Darenth House; Centenary Wood.	<p>As a result of these comments we have reviewed the proposed new boundary for the conservation area, but concluded that it should not be extended any further than already proposed in the draft appraisal.</p> <p>The proposed boundary reflects the historic built confines of the village so as to protect the parts of the village which have special architectural and historic interest. This therefore excludes areas that are outside the historic built confines, such as Bowers Road or Centenary Wood, and also infill development within the village such as Boakes Meadow and Palmers Orchard which do not meet the test of special architectural or historic interest.</p>

CONSERVATION AREA: Swanley Village

a) Responses from Online Questionnaire

Question Number	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	Stephen Wallis	Yes	-	-
1.2	Christine Evans	Yes	-	-
1.3	Laura Evans	Yes	-	-
1.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	Yes	The summary of special interest which identifies the character as that of a Kentish rural hamlet with a well-defined village boundary is particularly important.	Noted.
1.5	Martin Collard	Yes	-	-
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	Stephen Wallis	No	An essential part of the village are the roads that support village life. Increasingly these roads are becoming congested and the village is experiencing increasing traffic volumes. Proposed extensive development immediately adjacent to and in close proximity to the existing conservation area threatens an increase in traffic and should be restricted.	<p>We agree that traffic affects the character of the conservation area and we will review the text of the appraisal to ensure it reflects this.</p> <p>The management recommendations in the draft appraisal set out how development in the setting of the conservation area should be assessed in terms of its effects on the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p>
2.2	Christine Evans	Yes	-	-
2.3	Laura Evans	Yes	As the interactive map does not appear to work, it is difficult to ascertain whether the 'important views' and 'open space' assessments are accurately assessed as	Different map layers can be viewed in the online document by selecting the button to access the layered map. Instructions of how to use the interactive map are set out in the

			these can only be found via the interactive map. These are important issues given the amount of development proposed in the area through the Local Plan process.	draft 'Introduction to the appraisals'.
2.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the 2 different character zones is interesting; • Self-reliance is an important aspect of the character of the village, i.e. the villagers (Swanley Village Trust) taking responsibility for the village green and allotments. • Importance of the open space and agricultural land that surrounds the village to the south, west and north of the village is highlighted in the appraisal. 	Noted.
2.5	Martin Collard	No	<p>Report fails to highlight the risk of development in adjacent areas such as the proposals for Beechenlea Lane - the increase in traffic, already excessive through the village, would cause chaos</p> <p>My own house, which is one of the oldest in the village, has been hit twice by vehicles causing ongoing problems to its structure.</p>	<p>We agree that traffic affects the character of the conservation area and we will review the text of the appraisal to ensure it reflects this.</p> <p>This is not simply a conservation issue, however, and management of it is beyond the scope of the appraisal. Nevertheless, its inclusion as an issue in the appraisal will add weight to other arguments for addressing traffic problems.</p>
Question 3: Do you agreed with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	Stephen Wallis	Yes	-	-
3.2	Christine Evans	Yes	-	-
3.3	Laura Evans	-	-	-
3.4	Swanley Village	Yes	The whole building complex that makes up	In response to this comment, we have

	Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)		Old Place and Coach House building on Swanley Village Road should be included because all buildings are integral even if less visible.	reviewed the boundary as it goes around Old Place and propose to make a minor amendment to include the whole of the building attached to the listed Coach House at Old Place, now part of Old Place Stables.
3.5	Martin Collard	Yes	Several trees have disappeared which indicate a lack of enforcement of policy.	Details of how the public can help the District Council with the enforcement process are included in the management recommendations in the appraisal (section 7.0).
Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed extensions to the conservation area?				
4.1	Stephen Wallis	Yes	-	-
4.2	Christine Evans	Yes	-	-
4.3	Laura Evans	Yes	-	-
4.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	Yes	Lucas Farm to the west of Beechenlea Lane and the stables to the east are important buildings in the history of the village at its southern end. Argyle and Ascona are in the heart of the village and built sympathetically alongside the important Alice Dene.	Your support is noted.
4.5	Martin Collard	Yes	Agreed but only on the basis that more 'conserved' properties give more strength to maintaining the area as a whole.	Noted.
			One of the proposed properties has been incorrectly dated - surely more care needs to be taken before making such additions.	This was raised at the public consultation event and we apologise for the error. It is no longer proposed to include that building.

Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed Article 4 Direction to protect front gardens and boundary treatments?				
5.1	Stephen Wallis	Yes	-	-
5.2	Christine Evans	Yes	-	-
5.3	Laura Evans	Yes	-	-
5.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Householders requires the capacity to protect their property from increasing traffic large articulated lorries that drive through the village. Boundary walls are continually being knocked over. Sympathetic approach is needed to find a practical compromise. 	The requirement to apply for planning permission does not mean that change is impossible, but will enable the District Council to ensure solutions to the problem are more sympathetic to the conservation area.
			The recommendation for a Village Design Statement is a good one and we (the Swanley Village Residents Association of which I am Chair) will undertake to create one	Your support for this recommendation is noted.
5.5	Martin Collard	No	With increases in traffic and crime it is not unreasonable for householders to want to secure their boundaries	See response above 5.4.
Question 6: Would you like to tell us what you value most about the conservation area? Is there anything about the character, features of interest or potential for enhancement or any threats to the area that you would like to see highlighted?				
6.1	Stephen Wallis	Yes	The open spaces and quiet plus the many footpaths contribute to my enjoyment and fitness. Well maintained housing that is not crammed together adds to the positive experience.	Noted.

6.2	Christine Evans	-	-	-
6.3	Laura Evans	-	-	-
6.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	Yes	I would like to establish the provenance of the bungalows at the Wood Street/Ship Lane end of the village	These small cottages appear to be nineteenth- century in origin (they can be seen on the OS map published in 1898), but the extent of alteration across the whole group of cottages means that they lack the necessary historic and architectural interest to merit inclusion in the conservation area.
6.5	Martin Collard	Yes	Most people appreciate the quietness of the area. Proposed developments will threaten this as previously mentioned. General traffic increase and speed are ruining the village. The granite rumble strips are not effective in reducing speed and in Beechenlea Lane have been damaged by repairs although they are aesthetically pleasing (where complete and undamaged). A 20mph speed limit would help along with traffic calming measures such as chicanes which encourage drivers to pass in turn. Speed humps do not work.	<p>We agree that traffic affects the character of the conservation area and we will review the text of the appraisal to ensure it reflects this.</p> <p>This is not simply a conservation issue, however, and the solution to traffic management is beyond the scope of this appraisal. Nevertheless, highlighting the impact of traffic issues on the character of the conservation area will add weight to any future proposals for traffic management.</p>
Question 7: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
7.1	Stephen Wallis	Yes	No comment	-
7.2	Christine Evans	Yes	No comment	-

7.3	Laura Evans	No	As the interactive map does not appear to work, it is difficult to ascertain whether the 'important views' and 'open space' assessments are accurately assessed as these can only be found via the interactive map.	See response 2.3.
7.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	Yes	Very good documents.	Your support is noted.
			Villagers whose buildings are directly affected by the expansion should have had separate notification by letter. They only found out because the Residents Association told them.	An error was made by the company who distributed the leaflets informing residents of the consultation and resulted in a number of households not receiving the leaflets. This was rectified by writing to those individually who were missed out, with additional time given for them to make comments. Although the original omission is regrettable, the households concerned have not been disadvantaged.
7.5	Martin Collard	Yes	It is not very comprehensive and could have been improved with consultation with the residents prior to publication.	During the drafting stage an informal consultation walk-about was held with local stakeholders and their comments into account. The appraisal is still at draft stage and the feedback from residents will be taken into account in producing the final version.
Question 8: Are there any other comments you would like to make?				
8.1	Stephen Wallis	No	-	-

8.2	Christine Evans	No	-	-
8.3	Laura Evans	Yes	The example of vernacular revival shown on the right- hand side is in fact an early seventeenth-century or earlier building, and therefore genuine Kentish vernacular.	The external appearance of the house is the result of work in 1880 and therefore reflects the vernacular revival.
8.4	Swanley Village Residents' Association (Bob Wallis)	No	-	-
8.5	Martin Collard	Yes	I am concerned this has been produced to coincide with the proposal for 1,000 new houses nearby as a means of placating residents and drawing their attention away from it.	The assessment was carried out independently of any development proposals. The management recommendations in the draft appraisal set out how development in the setting of the conservation area should be assessed in terms of its effects on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

CONSERVATION AREA: **Swanley Village**

b) Written Responses from Public Consultation Event

	Name	Answer (Yes/No)	Comments	Response
Question 1: Does the appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?				
1.1	David Best	Yes	Not sent	An error was made by the company who

				distributed the leaflets informing residents of the consultation and resulted in a number of households not receiving the leaflets. This was rectified by writing to those individually who were missed out, with additional time given for them to make comments. Although the original omission is regrettable, the households concerned have not been disadvantaged.
Question 2: Does the appraisal accurately assess the condition of the conservation area and the issues affecting it?				
2.1	David Best	Yes	Not sent	See response above.
Question 3: Do you agree with the management recommendations in the appraisal?				
3.1	David Best	Yes	Not sent	See response above.
Question 4: Is the appraisal easy to use and understand?				
4.1	David Best	Yes	Not sent	See response above.
Question 5: Any other comments?				
5.1	David Best	Yes	I have had no contact from Sevenoaks at all, I was informed by the residents association. Is there no legal cover to inform those affected?	See response above.

CONSERVATION AREA: **Swanley Village**

c) Other Written Responses

	Name	Comments	Response
1.	David Best	Objection to the inclusion of Lucas Farmhouse and neighbouring buildings and land on the grounds of a lack of notification and	An error was made by the company who distributed the leaflets informing residents of the consultation and resulted in a number of

		consultation.	households not receiving the leaflets. This was rectified by writing to those individually who were missed out, with additional time given for them to make comments. Although the original omission is regrettable, the households concerned have not been disadvantaged.
			We are not in a position to comment on the earlier decision to omit parts of the village from the conservation area. The current proposals are the result of a fresh assessment by consultants who had no involvement in previous assessments.
		Potential of future development of the site. There are no advantages to a property being in a conservation area.	The owner's rights of development are subject to planning control even if the site remains out of the conservation area.
		Consultation is not enough – a local referendum should be held.	Consultation has been carried out in line with Sevenoaks District Council's <i>Statement of Community Involvement in Planning 2014</i> . This does not allow for a referendum, which would be disproportionate to the effects of the appraisal and would not therefore be a good use of limited public resources.
			As a result of this objection we have reviewed the proposal that this area should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it does merit inclusion, as proposed in the draft appraisal. The earlier decision not to include these buildings is not something that we can comment on, but we are satisfied that the tests

			<p>for inclusion are met.</p> <p>Lucas Farm is one of three farmsteads surrounding the village – Highlands Farm and Cold Harbour Farm. It is to farmsteads such as these that the settlement owes its origins as noted in the history section of the draft appraisal. Although there is some open land between Lucas Farm and the houses further north on Beechenlea Lane, the nature of Swanley Village is that of a scattered settlement, with the buildings dispersed that its buildings are scattered along its main streets and there is no village centre. Lucas Farm therefore contributes strongly to the historic interest of the village and should be protected in the same way as the rest of it.</p> <p>As set out in the draft appraisal the buildings are in keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area, with the exception of Pine Cottage. Pine Cottage does not contribute positively to the conservation area and there would be scope for enhancement to the conservation area by altering or replacing it; exclusion would leave a hole in the conservation area and there would be potential for harm to the setting of the other buildings if inappropriate development were to take place on the site.</p>
--	--	--	--

2.	Heather & Robert Wilson	Argyle should not be included in the conservation area because it has no special architectural or historic features.	As a result of this comment we have reviewed the proposal that this area should be added to the conservation area and concluded that it does not merit inclusion.
		Ascona was built against the wishes of local residents and is incorrectly identified as being sympathetic to character of the conservation area.	
		There are other areas of merit that should be included: the full length of the gardens of Dene Hill and Beechenlea House, the now inhabited stables attached to Old Place and the green field site south of Old Place.	<p>As a result of this comment, we have considered whether these parts of the village should be added to the conservation area and concluded that they should not.</p> <p>As set out in the draft appraisal the special historic and architectural interest of the southern half of the village (Character Zone 1) relates primarily to its main streets, rather than to land and buildings which stand well back from the street and are not visible from the main streets and footpaths of the village. In our view therefore it would not be appropriate to include these areas in the conservation area.</p>