

Farningham Conservation Area Appraisal update (2022-23): Responses		
Question	Comment	Response
Does the Appraisal capture what is special about the conservation area?	No: It does provide a lot of information about what is being preserved, but doesn't really provide a reason for extending bounties that currently exist and a clear impact to those within the boundaries	Draft appraisal contained explanations and justifications for proposed boundary changes. Council website provides information on the implications of conservation area designation for homeowners.
	Yes: Many areas of historic and natural beauty are captured within the conservation area.	Noted
	Yes	Noted
	Yes	Noted
	Yes: The Appraisal offers a good understanding of Farningham as a historic Darent valley settlement. The nature of the village setting and the river valley, banks, antient flood plain/water meadows.	Noted
	Yes: Variety of architectural styles, green space in centre (Market Meadow).	Noted
	Yes: The appraisal recognises the historic importance of the village, and it's connection with the other villages in the Darent Valley.	Noted
	Yes: The appraisal has captured what is special about Farningham by providing a comprehensive analysis and understanding of the area's significance and unique features.	Noted
	Yes	Noted
	IT IS HISTORICAL, IN AN AREA OF NATURAL BEAUTY	Noted
	The Appraisal outlines the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the location, history and boundaries in line with the River Darent, history, topography, geology, and population, all of which are what is special about this area. It also details the key properties that form the boundaries and those included. I feel there are some missing elements including the wildlife here, bats, deer, and snails, in particular. I believe it illustrates the heart of Farningham but hasn't captured all necessary areas currently. It does draw attention to some particular elements of the village with special interest including the cattle screen, historic river settlement, the Mill complex, the Lion Hotel and setting and conveys the age. The valley and uniqueness of the village are conveyed along with the history and how significant that history is.	Noted
	Yes: It seems to capture the important elements of the village such as the river, the woodlands and open space and the historic buildings.	Noted
	Yes: The area holds part of the Darent Valley river corridor, one of the rare chalk streams which are found mainly only in this area of Kent. Also the superb restored 18th Century Farningham Mill Estate and 18th century garden folly, and the historic bridge and cattle screen.	Noted
	Yes	Noted
What do you value most about the conservation area? For example, what is your favourite place or building? - Please write response here (optional)	The bookshop and butchers, the Lion pub and its frontage, the large, old trees of the village	The Appraisal identifies these
	I love the look and feel of the area, which we have only recently moved to, so appreciate the want to keep in tact.	The Appraisal identifies these
	The old mill house and the beautiful large tree behind the houses of 22 and 24 London Road.	The Appraisal identifies these
	The history The High Street The rural feel	The Appraisal identifies these
	High Street and old Corn mill.	The Appraisal identifies these
	As recent (last 10 years) Farningham Village residents we were attracted to the village by its central village open aspect, lack of thru traffic and icon views including: the recently restored Mill Complex, riverside setting of the Lion Hotel, many historic buildings and the village Church.	The Appraisal identifies these
	My favorite views are from the Lion Hotel into the restored Mill complex and from the open space to the rear of Farningham Mill's across the flood plain to the tower and flagpole of the village church. I imagine this is a view that has remained unchanged for centuries.	
	The preservation of the unique historic appearance of the village, including the magnificent Georgian architecture, especially Farningham Mill estate. We love the vistas across the valley, when walking in the area.	The Appraisal identifies these
	The picturesque village of Farningham is prove that conservation is working and continues to allow the cultural and historical heritage of the village.	The Appraisal identifies these
	The natural beauty surrounding the village and the historical buildings in the village are appreciated by villagers and visitors to the village on a daily basis. The combination of nature and historical buildings together are a unique and visually appealing.	
	My favourite views are from Sparepenny Lane looking down on Farningham Mill, and the fields beyond, the view from the bridge looking towards the Church. The most iconic view of the village is the view from Lion Hotel looking towards Farningham Mill Estate.	
	Green space	The Appraisal identifies these
	THE WOODLANDS AND HILLS. THE CHURCH IS LOVELY AS ARE THE OLD PUBS.	The Appraisal identifies these

	<p>I value the beautiful historic buildings, nature, wildlife and views around them in this conservation area the most. My favourite places and buildings are: The Mill, The Lion, The Mount and it's setting, including The Coach House at the rear of The Mount, the age and variety of buildings with historic interest and all telling a story of the evolution of the beautiful "chocolate box village". Visitors to me have admired and fallen in love with this great example of a historic village. My favourite walk is along Sparepenny Lane with the fabulous views over the valley looking across the Farningham Mill's Orchard, Manor House Meadow and to the wonderful St Peter and St Paul's Church. This gives me such a wonderful feeling of times gone by and how this community has merged beautifully with nature over time.</p> <p>The views of woodland from the rear of my house over the land to the rear of my cottage on London Road are beautiful and it requires preservation to avoid any negative impact on the setting of the conservation area. I see deer grazing and roaming this land at dawn, which is a rare and special experience and is important in terms of the setting in which other dwellings reside also along London Road in addition to The Mount itself. The Mount is a listed Historic Building and the land that I believe was previously attached to it would be beneficial to ensure it is included in the Farningham Conservation Area as it is the setting of these historic buildings and there is a danger of jeopardising the effect of its significance if this land is not preserved (currently not included and there is ambition to remove The Coach House and a square of land with a tree on it behind no. 24 London Road). There is a steep hill that overlooks the rear of all the properties on my side of London Road, which is significantly elevated. It is important to preserve this view and currently it is in jeopardy.</p> <p>There is a beautiful tree to the rear of my property that is one of the most impressive trees I've ever seen.</p>	<p>It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount.</p> <p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock or similar, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. The main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons this land has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p>
	<p>I like the river as it passes the Lion and the cattle screen. Also the field running along Sparepenny lane where you sometimes see deer and badgers as well as bats, stag beetles, rabbits and so on.</p>	<p>The Appraisal identifies these</p>
	<p>My favourite building is Farningham Mill, also St Peter and Paul the Parish church, the Manor House and Market Meadow. I also love the old boarded houses along the High Street and 18th C houses in Sparepenny Lane. Also Waddards Bookshop.</p>	<p>The Appraisal identifies these</p>
<p>Has the village changed since 2003 when the existing Appraisal was written? If so, please tell us about the changes. Please write response here (optional)</p>	<p>There is a burnt out shop next to the Pied Bull that is currently listed as being an 'element that contributes' whereas this is, in fact, an eyesore and would contribute again were it to become a functioning shop.</p> <p>I am new to the area, so unaware of improvements, apart from those happening currently in the Main Street. There is obviously a burnt down corner store, a butcher that is now closed and limited retail facilities. This may discourage new businesses from forming.</p> <p>Not sure, only moved in in 2021</p> <p>A dramatic increase in traffic and traffic speeds. A large increase in the number, size and scale of Traveller sites to the detriment of the surrounding character.</p> <p>We have only lived here for the past four years. No changes in this time period.</p> <p>We have only known the village for the last 10 years and the most significant positive change has been restoration of the Farningham Mill complex which now makes a very positive contribution to the visual attractiveness of the village for both visitors and local residents.</p> <p>As well as the vitality of the village and preservation of the conservation area.</p> <p>Items that have negatively impacted the conservation area are the recent loss of the last shop (Farningham Butchers) in the village, the unattended ruins of the former Farningham Oak and construction of The Mole House, on Sparepenny Lane, which is located in extremely close vicinity to the Grade 2 Listed Folly (NGR: TQ5448867016) in the grounds of Farningham Mill https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1237806?section=official-list-entry. This last most recent addition to the village would appear to have escaped a vigilant review of planning and exploited inadequacies in the conservation area boundary.</p> <p>Loss of more shops is sad to see, becoming more of a commuter village rather than a stand alone community.</p> <p>The restoration and subsequent revitalisation of the Farningham Mill Estate.</p> <p>The sad destruction by fire of the Farningham Oak building, which has been left derelict, and looks awful.</p> <p>The inexplicable permission to build The Mole House, which really doesn't fit in. The continued decrease in the number of shops in the High Street, and conversion of property to exclusively residential.</p>	<p>The fire damage is a condition issue. The historic building is still a positive contributor.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Mill site boundary has been reviewed and revised</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p>Over past 20 years there has been a positive change in Farningham, particularly with the restoration of Farningham Mill Estate and the creation of Darent Valley path.</p> <p>The Farningham Mill Estate, which was once a dilapidated and abandoned site, has been restored and developed into a thriving residential community. The restoration has brought new life to the area attracting new residents and visitors.</p> <p>Another positive change in Farningham is the continuing maintenance of the Darent path, which is a well used route along the river valley. The path provides a scenic and peaceful walking route for locals and visitors giving access the local amenities such as pubs and cafes, and shops.</p> <p>The negative side of the changes in the village are the impact of erosion of shops and the conversion of businesses to residential properties this detracts from the vitality and purpose of the village.</p> <p>Small businesses are often an essential part of the character and identity of a community. They contribute to the local economy, create jobs and provide important goods and services to residents. It is important to recognise the importance of small businesses to the vitality and purpose of the village.</p> <p>Some insensitive buildings have been constructed on the boundaries of the conservation area. These buildings have a negative impact on the area's character and integrity.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>More houses</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>LOSS OF BUSINESSES WHICH IS A SHAME. IT STILL RETAINS ITS FUNDAMENTAL BEAUTY.</p> <p>There has been a fabulous restoration project completed on the Farningham Mill Estate. This has been sympathetic and has made a huge contribution to the history and preservation of this lovely village and makes a wonderful focal point beside the eighteenth-century bridge and opposite the rare cattle screen. Sadly some shops have been lost and continue to dwindle. This is a great loss to the village, particularly the fire disaster at Farningham Oak, which sadly doesn't seem to have been rebuilt. With such a historic square next to the Pied Bull, this seems such a great shame not to have been sympathetically rebuilt in keeping with the area. Ideally, residents should have more of a say as to whether shops and public houses are converted into residential buildings and, ideally, be given the opportunity to create a community venture, if possible.</p> <p>The village attracts many walkers with the great Darent Path being well used allow full appreciation of the view of the St Peter and St Pauls medieval Church.</p> <p>Sadly, there's a new build along Sparepenny Lane (The Mole House?) with totally opposing interests to the conservation area that has been built and this is adjacent to a historic monument (the Folly at Farningham Mill). The intrusion to the enjoyment of the views is unbelievably unsympathetic and I cannot understand how this has happened and been allowed. I understand it's something to do with the planning permission having been sought on the postcode of the title of Protea Cottage instead of in it's own right and obviously without understanding of the location of the new property in relation to the Farningham Mill. It is disturbing the village has not been protected from this sort of intrusion without regard for preservation in any way.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Residents have the opportunity to comment on planning applications and the drafting of the local plan policy</p>
<p>I believe something needs to be done to include this property in the conservation area as soon as possible to avoid further threats. Also, more to be done for surrounding land, for example with the land to the rear of the Mount that runs along the rear of the houses on London Road (known as Land North West Of The Mount, The Mount Wood, Sparepenny Lane, Farningham, Dartford DA4 0JH). An unreasonably large, detached equipment/machinery store has been erected that seems to have ambition to become a dwelling rather than be used for it's declared purpose. I have concerns about the preservation of the land in front of the woodland and, the removal of the areas that have been highlighted on the plans including a beautiful tree and The Coach House will have a huge impact on all the houses along London Road that face in that direction from their gardens. There's already illegal boundary foliage that has been purposely planted there including laurels that have been grown at a height far beyond what is legal as I understand it. We were sent letters along the Road from the owner saying they plan on doing what they like. I can provide this letter, if required. I don't believe they are allowed to do that and it does demonstrate they have little intention of preserving London Road as a conservation area in terms of the views we have. I worry about this. I have tried to raise this with the owner and she has told me never to contact her again when I highlighted the illegal nature of this boundary and the deprivation of light to my garden (which has subsequently stopped my grass growing). This seems to be aiming to mask the area and prevents the enjoyment of the views of the woodland, The Coach House, wildlife, and I wonder what the purpose is of this shielding and prevention of our enjoyment of not only our own properties but also the view of the woodland, which I believe is an area marked as having "impact on the setting of the conservation area". I believe that making this land a conservation area, this will assist in preserving the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Mount property on Sparepenny Lane (a listed building) has been "divorced" from the Coach House to the rear that belonged to it and the Land North West Of The Mount. To protect and preserve the conservation, I believe this Land should be included in the conservation area and that nothing should be removed from this land, i.e. the proposal of the Coach House and separate land behind 24 London Road with a tree on it.</p>	<p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock or similar, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. The main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons this land has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p> <p>It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount.</p>
<p>There have been positives, the Mill estate looks fabulous. The dwindling number of village shops is a real shame, the loss of the butchers this year being a real blow.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	There have been changes which have enhanced the area, restoring the Mill and Colyer House and opening up the riverside paths. However the loss of nearly all the shops is greatly regretted. The Oak Barn needs attention after the fire it has been boarded up.	Noted
	The most notable change to the village has been the sympathetic restoration of the Farningham Mill Estate. Unfortunately, further shops have been lost including Farningham Oak which was destroyed by fire. Sadly there has been no progress on restoring this building which forms part of the historic square next to the Pied Bull. Some unsympathetic building projects have been allowed including 'The Mole House' in Sparepenny Lane which is not in keeping with the village.	Noted
Are there any important views that we haven't identified (in Section 4.0 of the Appraisal)?		
	Yes: View of woodland to south side of London road	Map is not an exhaustive record of every important view. This view was assessed, but not judged to meet the criteria for the map. Appraisal makes clear that views other than those show on the map can be valued and important
	No	Noted
	Yes: For a number of residents on the south side of London road the beautiful views across to the forestry trust area to the south are lovely and there is a very old and large (I think Elm) tree which is currently within the conservation area but is being proposed to be removed. I strongly oppose this change.	Amended
	Yes: During the walkabout sessions I had asked that the view from the top (West) of London Road towards the M20 motorway be included as a protected view. My rationale is not what you can see but rather what you cannot: it hides the motorway system and preserves the sense of "otherness" that is a key character trait of the village. I see that it is omitted from the published proposal and would like to reiterate the comment that I made on the day that it should be included for this reason.	Not a view of the conservation area
	Yes: The gap in development between Farningham & Eynesford, with views across the North Downs. I question whether this open space could be included within the conservation area in order to preserve views.	Historic England advises that agricultural land should not normally be included in conservation areas (the land in question is also Green Belt)
	Yes: To the South of the Village and to the West of Sparepenny Lane, following the route of the Darent Valley Path there are a number of open spaces offering significant views down the escarpment to the river valley and across the open land behind the Farningham Mill Estate and the Manor House across the floodplain/water meadow to the Village Church St Peter and St Pauls. The view from the rear of the Farningham Mill Estate across the floodplain behind the Manor House is one of our favorites. one that has been enjoyed over many centuries.	Text amended
	No	Noted
	Yes: We feel that the views across the valley, from all aspects of the village could be extended to provide further protection of these vital aspects of the village, particularly the water meadows.	Text amended
	Yes: The views from the higher western route to Farningham from Eynsford, which capture the Manor Meadows, Farningham Mill Estate and St Peter and St Pauls Church. Views from the bottom of the Darent River Valley, up the banks toward the Georgian historic homes of Sparepenny Lane is also important, and vice versa from these homes down to the Darent Valley should be protected within the Farningham Conservation Area, These views are special for the natural beauty of the landscape and historical buildings.	Noted
	YES: IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT WE DO NOT HAVE ANY CONVERSIONS OF PROPERTY OR USE OF LAND FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AS APPEARS TO BE ABOUT TO HAPPEN AT THE MOUNT'S PROPERTY ON SPAREPENNY LANE. BACKDOOR DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE BLOCKED AT ALL TIMES.	National and local planning policy is designed to balance sustainable development and conservation and historic environment. The appraisal provides an evidence base to support the implementation of this policy.
	Yes: Views around Spare Penny lane	Noted
	Yes: The view behind the Mill across the orchard and the Manor fields to the church. The view from Sparepenny Lane down to Lullingstone Castle and St Botolphs church.	Views from within private land are not included
	Yes: the view from the Darent Valley Path along Sparepenny Lane overlooking the river, church and Farningham Mill which should be protected by including this area in the Conservation Area.	Text amended
	Views from Sparepenny Lane towards the River Darent are important	Noted
Do you agree with the open space assessment (Section 5.0 of the Appraisal)?		
	Yes	Noted
	Yes: We believe the west side of the downs, being part of our property makes sense to preserve as it is visible from the other side of the valley and other part, though it should be consider only if there is a reciprocal agreement for the other side of the valley.	Noted
	Yes	Noted
	Yes: Farningham Hill Stables used to be an area for the training of horses and supported the rural character of the place. Since the (possibly illegal) change of use to a Traveller site it has become more untidy and more urban.	Noted
	Yes	Noted
	Yes: The Appraisal is a good recognition of the open spaces impacting Farningham Conservation Area. However, as discussed at length during the consultation meeting in Farningham Village Hall on 28th January more recognition of these open spaces needs to be made in the proposed revisions to the conservation area boundaries. While the land south of the A20 has been included the land and significant views to the west of Sparepenny Lane have been excluded. As previously mentioned, the significance of the valuable zones identified on page 22 are not reflected back in the proposals made on page 25.	See methodology (Section 5.0) - no private gardens are included
	Yes: but please see Q6 answer below relating to a parcel of land south of A20 and north of Sparepenny Lane/High Street Junction.	Noted

Yes: but there are some rather odd anomalies, with small pockets of land being excluded from the open space assessment.	See methodology (Section 5.0) for exclusions from the assessment
Yes	Noted
Yes	Noted
No: I believe the open space assessment clarifies nicely the importance of the preservation of the open space in relation to the Farningham Conservation Area. It feels very important not to over-shadow the beauty of Farningham Conservation Area. It feels important to include the woodland to the rear of London Road overlooking the Land North West Of The Mount also, however, to ensure there is no danger of over-shadowing the properties there and ruining the value of London Road in this way. I do hope also this woodland is protected and maintained in an appropriate way as I have seen some rather disturbing clearing activities to areas that I'm not sure should be cleared in the interest of preserving the strong contribution this area has to the Farningham Conservation Area. The views of the medieval church spire is very important, and I do hope the area is fully protecting this. At the moment, there are fields not included in the boundary of the Farningham Mill Estate and adjacent to the Farningham Mill Garden Folly that are not included and it seems an illogical boundary not to include the space between the Manor Meadow and the boundary of the existing Conservation Area boundary. It would be better reflected if the edge were to be extended and inclusive of any anomalies, for example, the donut like exclusion of The Mole House and the exclusion of the area at the rear of the Mount that are next to an area of "Strong Contribution". It makes no sense to me that an area between the conservation area and the Strong Contribution area should not be included and I believe they should all be included and a line that makes more sense be drawn even through the Strong Contribution areas to more logically identify the Conservation Area. I do not agree with the proposed removal areas including The Coach House at the rear of The Mount or the land at the rear of 24 London Road. I would like these to certainly remain in the Conservation Area and to be extended to the whole of that plot of land up to the area of Strong Contribution at the woodland to the rear of London Road. I certainly feel the boundary change and removal of an area to the north side of The Mole House shouldn't be removed, more the Mole House included to avoid the "donut" shape of the Conservation Area adjacent to the Strong Contribution area.	Land to the rear of The Mount It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount. Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'. <u>The Mill</u> Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1: <i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i> <i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i> <i>- contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets</i> <i>- has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature</i> The proposed extensions will no longer include any agricultural land north or south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.) <u>Open space proposals and methodology</u> See Section 5.0 Open space assessment and the Introduction document for an explanation of open space proposals and methodology.
Yes	Noted
No: The walled formal garden of the Mill Estate should be included and the orchard next to it. Also the Folly. There is just an empty space on the map where these are? However there needs to be provision for electric car charging points for the 24 households comprising the Mill Estate	Map amended
Yes	Noted
Are there areas of the countryside surrounding the village that you think are important to the conservation area?	
Yes: Farningham woods, the 'Poppy fields', the fields to the east of Sparepenny Lane	Noted
No	Noted
Yes: Natural beauty of the tree to the south of 24 London road, enjoyed by many in the south side of the road.	Noted
Yes: The areas shaded purple on page 22 of the Farningham Conservation Area appraisal to the West of Sparepenny Lane should be included within the revised proposal of the Conservation Area boundary.	Historic England's Advice Note 1 (Section 73) advises that agricultural land should not normally be designated in conservation areas. (The field remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)
Yes: As per the response to q4	Noted
Yes: I think the piece of woodland (marked in pink as "some contribution to open space assessment") should be included within the new boundaries of the conservation area. This is the square piece of land adjoining and south of A20/north of Sparepenny Lane/High St. junction and adjacent to listed property/properties with positive features. It can be easily encompassed by the old boundaries too and is in keeping with the Appraisal which has also gained other parcels of land.	Historic England's Advice Note 1 (Section 73) advises that agricultural land should not normally be designated in conservation areas. (The field remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)
Yes: It is very important that the land between the villages is protected, in order to ensure the distinction between them, and the lovely views of each from the other.	Noted
Yes: The fields and banks of the River Darent between Farningham and Eynsford and Farningham to Horton Kirby are important to keep a clear distinction and boundary between the villages, and of maintaining important views between them and on approach into Farningham.	Noted
YES: THE WOODLANDS TRUST PROPERTY AT THE BACK OF THE MOUNT, SPAREPENNY LANE. THE CRICKET GROUND SHOULD ALSO BE PROTECTED.	Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'. The cricket ground is already in the conservation area

	<p>Yes: most definitely. On page 22, the areas of "Strong contribution" greatly enhance the existing Conservation Area. Ideally, some of them should be included in the Conservation Area boundary to provide full protection of views on the way in to Farningham from the various approaches and to maintain the boundary from creeping and merging with Eynsford.</p> <p>The Land North West Of The Mount and woodland area are very important to the London Road area of the conservation area. The rear view outlooks and feel of the nature present there are very important and this area should definitely be included in the proposed additions.</p> <p>The view from Sparepenny Lane is very important also and The Mole House issues should be brought into line so as not to make a nonsense of the preservation of the area and views.</p>	<p>Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area. The fields around this will not be included. In accordance with Historic England's Advice Note 1 (Section 73), agricultural land should not normally be designated and so it is not proposed to include adjacent fields. (These fields however remain within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u></p> <p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p>
	<p>Yes: The open fields and banks of the river between Farningham and Eynsford and the open land and woodland which runs behind London Road.</p>	Noted
	<p>Yes: there are areas on the margins which need to be included to prevent inappropriate development such as The Mole House although now that house is there it makes sense to include it.</p>	Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'. The Mile House does not contribute to the special historical or architectural interest of the conservation area and has therefore not been considered for inclusion.
	<p>Yes: The Land North West of The Mount and adjacent woodland area has always been a stronghold for wildlife and with London Road already in the Conservation Area it would seem a sensible step to include these areas. The plan proposes to remove the small area to the rear of London Road gardens which would leave a large cedar tree at greater risk of removal in the future.</p>	<p>It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount.</p> <p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p>
Do you feel that the Appraisal identifies the issues affecting the conservation area and how they should be addressed? (Section 6.0 of the Appraisal)	<p>Yes</p>	Noted
	<p>No: I feel that maybe preserving the shops rather than converting them to residential should always be preferable and incentives provided.</p>	Noted. See SDC retail planning policies
	<p>Yes</p>	Noted
	<p>Yes</p>	Noted
	<p>No: I agree with the issues identified in Section 6.0, but think more can be done to preserve the historic character of the village and its broader setting.</p>	Village and its approaches: This is described in a number of locations from Chapter 1 to Chapter 3
	<p>Greater emphasis should be paid to the overall location of the village and its approaches by road or footpaths which often give visual access to the rear of properties.</p>	Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'. The Mile House does not contribute to the special historical or architectural interest of the conservation area and has therefore not been considered for inclusion.
	<p>The planned proposal should encompass recent additions e.g. to the Mole House to the West of Sparepenny Lane rather than drawing boundaries around them that then open the door to further linear expansion interrupting views and removing open spaces.</p>	
	<p>Yes: But also please consider how the woodland parcel above acts as a natural buffer both visually (from A20) and from a noise reduction point of view to the central High St. area, in addition to the benefits to wildlife and the natural environment.</p>	Noted
	<p>No: We are concerned that in-filling and extension that are not in character should not be permitted to detract from the historic nature of the village. Also of concern is development in back gardens, further imposing on views.</p>	The Design Guidance document has been revised
	<p>No: I feel that document has not fully understood the special historic characteristics of the village features and of suggesting priorities to protect them. The other areas which should be considered in the management of Farningham Conservation Area. Discouraging the conversion of businesses to residential and exploring opportunities for 'community right to bid' should be explored to maintain these buildings as alternative mixed use, community assets.</p>	Residents have the opportunity to comment on planning applications and the drafting of the local plan policy
	<p>Yes</p>	Noted
	<p>No: I don't feel the Appraisal identifies the issues affecting the conservation area and how they should be addressed. Section 6.0 of the Appraisal could contain far more delineations of characteristics that create the special historic elements of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Some suggestions to add to ongoing management are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bull protection of the area including the rear of properties and the views from the rear of those properties to avoid unsympathetic infill against rear boundaries. 2. Retrospective alignment of properties in line with the preservation of the areas and its views if they are an eyesore and negatively impact the Conservation Area (e.g. The Mole House, which is a good example of an "over-scaled new building). 3. Conditions upon which new buildings can be developed, if necessary, giving good guidance, e.g. those at the Mill that were new, you would never know due to the nature of their sensitive design and to a modern standard. 4. Preservation of nature and natural habitats including wildlife as well as environment. 5. Option of community investment to preserve shops – to set up some sort of scheme that allows residents to preserve if they are minded to. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: The Design Guidance document has been revised 2: Considered as part of the boundary review 3: See Design Guidance document 4: Noted 5: Residents have the opportunity to comment on planning applications and the drafting of local plan policy
	<p>No</p>	Noted
	<p>No</p>	Noted
Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Conservation Area boundary (Section 7.0 of the Appraisal)?	<p>No: The proposed removal in the garden of 'The Mount' looks like it is the part with a beautiful and very old tree. We feel this should be preserved.</p>	Amended

<p>No: We are firmly against the new boundary that looks to single out our property specifically. It is the only additional building that seems to be included in the expansion and as new owners we feel it could have a detrimental financial impact in an already uncertain time.</p> <p>Our property is low on the hill and is not visible from the public road, so should not detract from the village aesthetic. It is unclear what the benefits would be to add it for us or the village as it is already in an AONB and subject to restrictions. This would just add another layer of bureaucracy/cost to an already long expensive process for us to do any changes.</p>	<p>Cottage on the Hill is a well-preserved inter-war detached home in mature gardens, developed at or close to the same time as its neighbour Dunbrae, which is already part of the conservation area. Inclusion satisfies both Section 55 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, as a 'planted front garden ... [that] make[s] a significant contribution' and as a 'Positive Contributor' under Section 49 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - landmark quality - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - as part of a group, illustrates the development of the settlement in which it stands
<p>No: For a number of residents on the south side of London road the beautiful views across to the forestry trust area to the south are lovely and there is a very old and large (I think Elm) tree which is currently within the conservation area but is being proposed to be removed. I strongly oppose this change.</p>	<p>This boundary will no longer change</p>
<p>No: In the grounds of The Mount there is a small "notch" that the appraisal proposes to remove to align the boundary of the conservation area with the rear gardens of the houses along London Road.</p> <p>The original reason behind this "notch" is that it encompasses a very old, pretty and valuable tree. This amendment would allow for greater ease in the removal of this tree and that would be to the detriment of the character of the village. It should be retained.</p> <p>In my opinion the entirety of the land to the rear of The Mount, including the adjacent woodland and peripheral buildings, should be included in the conservation area. It is at risk of being broken up for development (it was offered as a potential parcel during the creation of the most recent Local Plan, for example) and greatly contributes to the character of the village by ensuring the openness of the Green Belt and the stature of The Mount as a grand building with suitably grand gardens.</p>	<p>It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount.</p> <p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p>
<p>Yes: But could be increased further as per the response to q4</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>No: The proposed changes to the Farningham Conservation Area Boundary are positive but more can be done to equally reflect the open landscape both North and South of the Village. The inclusion within the boundary of some historic houses and open space currently outside the Conservation Area is a positive step. As is the proposal to align more closely with existing boundaries but in a number of instances this has not been carried through into the revised boundary lines.</p> <p>The proposed change of boundary to the north of the High Street includes the open meadow to the East of the cricket ground and additional wooded land North of the Lion Hotel but not the significant views and open spaces to the West of Sparepenny Lane. Encompassing meadows beside the Darent Valley Path adjacent to Sparepenny Lane, the escarpment down to the Mill Stream, the open pasture behind Farningham Mill the River Darent and its banks, the floodplain/meadow behind the Manor House and the location of former Roman Villas.</p> <p>Since Cottage on the Hill is proposed to be included in the Conservation Area, adding the open space in front of it, down toward the division of the River Darent and the Mill Stream within Farningham Mill estate and the floodplain/meadow behind the Manor House is a more logical adherence to existing boundary lines. Current the proposed boundaries to the south of the village are confusing and do not follow clear boundaries.</p>	<p>The Mill</p> <p>Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature <p>The proposed extensions will no longer include any agricultural land north or south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p>
<p>Yes: But see Q6/Q7</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>No: We would prefer that the Conservation area be extended in line with the issues that we have raised above.</p>	<p>Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p>

	<p>No: The majority of the changes are welcome.</p> <p>However, why does the proposed new boundary of the Conservation Area not include both the important open spaces, and related estates to both the north and south of the River Darent crossing? The proposed change of boundary to the north which includes the meadows and open space next to the cricket ground is again welcome, however it should be balanced by also including the Farningham Mill Estate as a whole and the Manor Estate and Meadow as a whole. These areas are key to maintaining important views to St Peter and St Paul's Church.</p> <p>The proposals to changes of the boundary occur behind the homes on the east end of London Road and The Mount on Sparepenny Lane, taking areas out of the conservation area for no obvious reason. The proposed management approach is to include and make more logical, not to exclude. The historic 'The Mount' plot includes a rear coach house, and forested area, together with the original access to the plot form the east end of London Road. in line with the ambitions of the proposed changes to the Conservation Area boundary, this whole plot should be taken into the Conservation Area, not excluded from its historic plot boundary.</p>	<p><u>The Mill</u> Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature</p> <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u> Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p> <p>It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount.</p>
	<p>No: the areas being removed make no sense to me and I would like to understand why they're being removed. The Coach House is beautiful and certainly shouldn't be removed as it was previously part of a Historic Building Title. The boundaries are not logical, which leaves room for confusion. I would like to understand the purpose of all except the removal of the features that are detractors, which makes complete sense. Page 24 refers to the reasoning although these minor adjustments are not evident from the proposed areas. I fear these removals will deplete the importance of maintaining and preserving properties and lead to complacency rather than maintaining or addressing the issues that may have arisen to cause the removals. Removal surely defeats the purpose of having a conservation area in the first place. I feel, if the boundary to the Mill Estate is being extended, it should be fully extended to include all of their land, which it currently does not. Ideally, more areas would be added in to preserve the views to St Peter and St Paul's Church from the Darent Valley footpath and ensure the views are not further impinged in any way so that they are conserved. It seems to make sense to take a line further out to add in areas from the Cottage on the Hill over the Mill garden and to the Manor Meadow as a clear and logical boundary. Also, please do include the Land North West Of The Mount. This seems to be a gap at the moment and will have serious impact on London Road's views if not addressed. This also improves the logic of the boundary and takes the boundary of the Conservation Area to the line at the area of Strong Contribution to Farningham Conservation Area.</p>	<p><u>Boundary changes</u> The majority of areas proposed for removal have been selected as they no longer reflect modern property boundaries. However, following recommendations during the public consultation process, a number of them have been reversed, such as the removal of the two existing plots of the conservation area south of London Road which will no longer go ahead.</p> <p><u>The Mill</u> Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature</p> <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u> Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p>
	<p>Yes</p> <p>No: the areas being removed make no sense to me and I would like to understand why they're being removed. The Coach House is beautiful and certainly shouldn't be removed as it was previously part of a Historic Building Title.</p> <p>The boundaries are not logical, which leaves room for confusion. I would like to understand the purpose of all except the removal of the features that are detractors, which makes complete sense. Page 24 refers to the reasoning although these minor adjustments are not evident from the proposed areas. I fear these removals will deplete the importance of maintaining and preserving properties and lead to complacency rather than maintaining or addressing the issues that may have arisen to cause the removals. Removal surely defeats the purpose of having a conservation area in the first place. I feel, if the boundary to the Mill Estate is being extended, it should be fully extended to include all of their land, which it currently does not. Ideally, more areas would be added in to preserve the views to St Peter and St Paul's Church from the Darent Valley footpath and ensure the views are not further impinged in any way so that they are conserved. It seems to make sense to take a line further out to add in areas from the Cottage on the Hill over the Mill garden and to the Manor Meadow as a clear and logical boundary.</p> <p>Also, please do include the Land North West Of The Mount. This seems to be a gap at the moment and will have serious impact on London Road's views if not addressed. This also improves the logic of the boundary and takes the boundary of the Conservation Area to the line at the area of Strong Contribution to Farningham Conservation Area.</p>	<p><u>Noted</u></p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u> Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p> <p>The removal of the two existing plots of the conservation area south of London Road will no longer go ahead.</p> <p><u>The Mill</u> Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature</p> <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p>

<p>No: The proposed change of boundary to the north which includes the meadows and open space next to the cricket ground is positive, however it should include the whole Farningham Mill Estate and the Manor Estate and Meadow. These areas are important in maintaining views to St Peter and St Paul's Church.</p> <p>By including the Darent River Valley floor, it will also be important to include the riverbanks and meadows, including that which runs up to Sparepenny Lane from the Farningham Mill Estate. As Cottage on the Hill is proposed to be included in the Conservation Area, it would make sense for all of the open space in front of it, down toward the Weir of Farningham Mill estate to be included and across to include The Manor Meadow, giving a clear village edge.</p> <p>An illogical proposal to changes of the boundary occurs behind the houses on London Road and The Mount on Sparepenny Lane, taking areas out of the conservation area for no obvious reason. The proposed management approach is to include and make more logical, not to exclude. The historic The Mount; plot includes a rear coach house, and forested area, together with the original access to the plot form the end of London Road. in line with the ambitions of the proposed changes to the Conservation Area boundary, this whole plot should be taken into the Conservation Area, not excluded from its historic plot boundary.</p>	<p>The Mill</p> <p>Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are . . . the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature. <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u></p> <p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p> <p>The removal of the two existing plots of the conservation area south of London Road will no longer go ahead.</p>
<p>No</p> <p>No: The removal of 'The Coach House', formally in the grounds of 'The Mount', a listed building, appears incomprehensible. Likewise, the land at the rear of No.24 London Road has been marked for removal. (This plot includes a stunning ancient cedar tree.)</p> <p>Removing both of these areas will add to the unprotected area known as the Land North West of he Mount. This whole area would ideally be added to the Conservation area as it is sandwiched between the current Conservation Area and The Mount Woodland which is categorized as an area of Strong Contribution.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The removal of the two existing plots of the conservation area south of London Road will no longer go ahead.</p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u></p> <p>Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenny Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p>
<p>The Parish Councilors also discussed some of the proposed areas to be removed from the conservation area. Two of these areas house trees that are currently protected under the conservation status. If these areas are removed how can we ensure that the trees remain protected? Will you apply for TPO or is this something the Parish Council should do and if so, at which point? Once the new area has been approved or before?</p>	<p>Research indicates that this plot of land has never been part of the garden of South Hall, and has no historical reason for inclusion in the conservation area. It appears to be included to help conserve matures trees. Section 74 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 states that 'Tree Preservation Orders would be an appropriate route for protection' of trees and therefore, in the absence of other reasons for designation, this site is proposed for removal from the conservation area.</p> <p>The boundary will remain in situ for the patch of woodland opposite London Road</p>
<p>Farningham Parish Council met on Wednesday 1st February and have a question regarding an area that houses a very old tree and a second wooded area, both circled below, that will no longer be protected if the proposed boundary changes are made as a result of the appraisal. If the proposed boundary is confirmed will the conservation team (or anyone else) apply for TPOs to the trees that will no longer be protected? If the changes come into place should the Parish Council request TPOs for these trees and if it is for the PC to do should this be done soon rather than wait for the boundary to be confirmed?</p> <p>The Parish Council is not against the proposed changes but they would like to ensure the longterm proection of the trees.</p>	<p>The removal of the area south of London Road will no longer go ahead</p>
<p>I see that you did not include Jessica Albery's houses in Sparepenny Lane. I thought they were worth drawing attention to in any case. At the meeting of the Kent Historic Buildings Committee I was asked about the criteria were considered over inclusion or not. I understand it might not be possible to reveal this, but if you can it would be helpful to have an indication</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<p>What seems particularly to make sense to me is the suggested changes to the conservation area that expand its size up the river in both directions. An important element of what the community and visitors to the community experience is walking on the footpath, especially where it enters into the fields running on the West side of Sparepenney lane. It is also historically how the village would have been approached via the river going back to at least Roman times. I am strongly in support of additional expansion of the area in this direction taking in the fields I have shaded in green and marked 2&3 on the attachment. The area of land between the main river and its left has a weir dating back to the building of the Mill (I think 1700's) where the 2 river sections part and is of significant historical value.</p> <p>I live on the East side of Sparepenney lane and am concerned by the following points if you could give them careful consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The proposed changes to the area I have shaded green and marked 1) look at removing a building of historical value from the conservation are (the original coachhouse for The Mount, a house and stables that goes back to 1750). I actually think the entire of the green shaded are 1 should be included in the conservation are; part of it is already a protected ancient woodland but the northern segment of it is the historical rear drive and orchard of The Mount which is a listed house and the land im pointing out is very much part of the setting of the building. •The green shaded area I have marked 3) are two grazing field that originally were part of the parkland associated with the farm associated with Mount Pleasant (1700's) and is also part of the setting for The Mount (The Mount and Mount Pleasant were built by brothers and the land considered one for at least 100 years) and part of the setting for the Roman folly situated at the top of The Mill estate. <p>I attended the residents meeting regarding the consultation and was concerned that area 3 I have suggested to be included was not being considered because a new house has been built there. I would argue that the pre-existing things that do need to be conserved should rank more highly in importance than a planning decision made in recent history. The new house is immediately in the setting of a number of historically valuable sites, particularly the Roman Folly and should not prevent the setting</p>	<p>The Mill Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature.</p> <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p> <p><u>Land to the rear of The Mount</u> Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenney Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.</p> <p>The removal of the two existing plots of the conservation area south of London Road will no longer go ahead.</p>
	The extension behind London Road which is being proposed for removal was originally included to because of the old cedar tree. This should not be removed	Noted
	The whole of The Mount plot should be included in the conservation area	Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenney Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.
	<u>Do not remove The Coach House</u>	Amended
	The fields and river south of the current boundary should be included in the conservation area	Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area. The fields around this will not be included. In accordance with Historic England's Advice Note 1 (Section 73), agricultural land should not normally be designated and so it is not proposed to include adjacent fields. (These fields however remain within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)
	I've had a look at the old plans, and it makes no sense why this garden hasn't been included, particularly with the way it backs on to all the houses along London Road. It seems to be an oversight, particularly as the woodland is an area with significant impact on the conservation area although not included. The omission of the garden between the woodland and the houses doesn't make sense. I certainly will suggest it be included and that the proposals to remove sections of it are rejected. The coach house we look on to is beautiful and it really doesn't make sense why it would be removed from the conservation area, aside from some sort of owner convenience, which isn't in the interests of preserving the area. I do hope it is considered fully to reject this proposal and that the whole garden and those areas applied to be removed are rejected.	Historic mapping indicates that the land to the rear of The Mount was used as a landscaped paddock, of which there appears to be little survival of the historic planting structure. It seems as if the main entrance to The Mount was on Sparepenney Lane. For these reasons it has insufficient historic and architectural character and appearance to be included in the conservation area. This is in accordance with Section 15 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 and Section 191 of the NPPF that states that conservation areas should not be 'devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest'.
	I seem to recall that something was said in passing (on 28 Jan at the end of the F'ham appraisal display in FVH) that the printed maps on Farningham's Conservation Area (as proposed) contained an error in respect of the long thin island behind Farningham Mill – and that the CA should be extended to include all of that island behind the mill. Can you clarify, please, as this does not show on the website.	Amended
Do you agree with the management recommendations in the Appraisal (Section 7.0)?		
	<p>Yes</p> <p>No: It mentions reviewing the boundary to stop in crossing though buildings and the middle of properties, which makes sense, however, it then specifically points out our property as an additional extra for no specific reason. I.e. 'Also Cottage on the hill'</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Cottage on the Hill is a well-preserved inter-war detached home in mature gardens, developed at or close to the same time as its neighbour Dunbrae, which is already part of the conservation area. Inclusion satisfies both Section 55 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, as a 'planted front garden ... [that] make[s] a significant contribution' and as a 'Positive Contributor' under Section 49 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - landmark quality - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - as part of a group, illustrates the development of the settlement in which it stands
	<p>Yes</p> <p>No: In character zone 4: High Street East, the proposed new boundary in the South East corner will mean that a small patch of trees will no longer be protected by the conservation area. Please can the conservation boundary not change in this location to ensure the long-term protection of the trees? It is an irregular quadrilateral shape that looks to be at the bottom of two back gardens to houses that front onto the High Street.</p> <p>There is another patch of woodland opposite London Road that has been proposed to be removed with the new boundary. Please can this area remain in the conservation area to preseve these trees as well? It is a square shaped patch that back onto no. 24 London Road</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Research indicates that this plot of land has never been part of the garden of South Hall, and has no historical reason for inclusion in the conservation area. It appears to be included to help conserve matures trees. Section 74 of Historic England's Advice Note 1 states that 'Tree Preservation Orders would be an appropriate route for protection' of trees and therefore, in the absence of other reasons for designation, this site is proposed for removal from the conservation area.</p> <p>It is no longer proposed to amend the boundary south of London Road and behind The Mount.</p>

<p>No: We do not disagree with the broader management recommendations but feel they fall short and do not take the opportunity to fully protect and preserve the open spaces around the village. While this is achieved to the North of the village the important views and open spaces to the South of the village and to the West of Sparepenny Lane would benefit from inclusion.</p>	<p>Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature. <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p>
<p>Yes: But see Q6</p> <p>No: We would like it to go farther, and especially cover the strange small pockets of land that are seemingly excluded. We would also like all the area along Sparepenny Lane included, in order to protect the amazing views across the valley, as well as the water meadows below.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Through public consultation, it was highlighted that the whole of Mill Island is an integrated historic industrial landscape of buildings, waterways and land, which forms part of Farningham's historic settlement footprint. Therefore, the whole of the Mill complex is proposed for inclusion within the conservation area, in accordance with Sections 34 and 49 of Historic England's Advice Note 1:</p> <p><i>Section 34 states: 'Key elements in defining the special interest are ... the integrity or group value of buildings.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 49 - Criteria for identification as a 'Positive Contributor' to the special architectural interest and character of the conservation area:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contributes positively to the setting of adjacent designated heritage assets - has significant historic associations with features such as the historic road layout, burgage plots, a town park or a landscape feature. <p>The proposed extensions do not include any agricultural land south of the village, in accordance with Section 73 of Historic England's Advice Note 1, which states agricultural land should not normally be designated. (This land however remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt.)</p>
<p>No: I feel they cover some aspects well and a more adequate consideration is required to preserve the conservation of the area. I agree the boundary should be logical and plots of land should not be cut through. To achieve this, I don't believe there should be any gaps between the areas of "Strong Contribution to Conservation" and the actual Conservation Area as this leaves grey areas that are not honouring preservation of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Removal of properties rather than bringing them to the standard required to be sympathetic to the area does not seem to be a solution to problems where no consideration has been awarded to the Conservation Area. A remedy of the situation would enhance the address of insensitive developments and I believe this would be useful to include to bring buildings into line if they are not rather than decrease the area and compromise it's preservation.</p> <p>Where page 24 refers to including the entire Mill complex, the map does not illustrate this correctly and should be amended.</p>	<p>See Section 5.0 Open space assessment for an explanation of open space proposals and methodology.</p>
<p>No: I do not disagree with management recommendations I feel further steps could be made to conserve and enhance the uniqueness of the village.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>No: I feel they cover some aspects well and a more adequate consideration is required to preserve the conservation of the area. I agree the boundary should be logical and plots of land should not be cut through. To achieve this, I don't believe there should be any gaps between the areas of "Strong Contribution to Conservation" and the actual Conservation Area as this leaves grey areas that are not honouring preservation of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Removal of properties rather than bringing them to the standard required to be sympathetic to the area does not seem to be a solution to problems where no consideration has been awarded to the Conservation Area. A remedy of the situation would enhance the address of insensitive developments and I believe this would be useful to include to bring buildings into line if they are not rather than decrease the area and compromise it's preservation.</p> <p>Where page 24 refers to including the entire Mill complex, the map does not illustrate this correctly and should be amended.</p>	<p>See Section 5.0 Open space assessment for an explanation of open space proposals and methodology.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>No: I feel these should go further bearing in mind the special historic and spatial characteristics of our community</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Is the Appraisal easy to use and understand? - Is the Appraisal easy to use and understand?</p>	<p>Amended</p> <p>No: The map, although clear, is quite hard to work out and doesn't appear to take into consideration what the boundary changes will mean for the village.</p> <p>No: What the future affects will be on the community and individuals is not clear.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No: Again, in broader terms the appraisal is easy to follow but there are a number of elements that do not seem logical. One of the maps display at the consultation meeting in the Farningham Village Hall was very confusing as the names of listed properties was out of alignment with their actual location. It is likely that this map has in the past misrepresented the location of the Mill Folly, which may have lead to the exclusion of it from consideration in resent planning applications. A clear reason why more care needs to be take in online assessments of future conservation boundaries.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes: But the anomalies are difficult to fathom, and the naming of some of the buildings are incorrect, as we pointed out at the open meeting.</p> <p>Yes: The appraisal was easy to use and understand.</p>

	<p>No: I suspect most would get lost reading this document. Many do not have the time to address it either. Ideally, things like comparison of maps should not be pages apart, ideally next to one another or even on the same page so that spotting the differences can be more readily facilitated. The end goal is not totally clear and why removing certain areas is necessary. I see there are many gateways, and I don't understand why these are being removed from the conservation area. More understanding of why these are being proposed would be greatly appreciated. More information would be helpful. Illustrations are useful by way of the photos. Character Zone delineation is useful.</p>	Appraisal has been revised since
	<p>Yes</p> <p>No: I suspect most would get lost reading this document. Many do not have the time to address it either. Ideally, things like comparison of maps should not be pages apart, ideally next to one another or even on the same page so that spotting the differences can be more readily facilitated. The end goal is not totally clear and why removing certain areas is necessary. I see there are many gateways, and I don't understand why these are being removed from the conservation area. More understanding of why these are being proposed would be greatly appreciated. More information would be helpful. Illustrations are useful by way of the photos. Character Zone delineation is useful.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>See above</p>
	<p>No: I was unable to attend the meeting and some of the proposal would have benefited from further explanation</p>	Noted
	<p>Yes: It is helpful to be able to comment</p>	Noted
	<p>Yes</p>	Noted
<p>Are there any other comments you would like to make? Please write any other comments here (optional)</p>	<p>A further consultation day responding to the detailed feedback received from Farningham Village residents on Jan 28th would be very beneficial. https://engagement.sevenoaks.gov.uk/strategic-planning/farningham-conservation-area/consultation/download_file?sqid=question-2023-01-12-3303553471-filesubquestion-1673538936-05&user=ANON-C7GF-5XWQ-V</p> <p>THIS IS A LOVELY VILLAGE WHICH HAS RESISTED EXCESS DEVELOPMENT. THAT IS WHAT MAKES IT SPECIAL AND A MAJOR VISITOR ATTRACTION. THE RESIDENTS ARE PROUD OF THEIR VILLAGE AND MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO LOOK AFTER THEIR PROPERTY IN KEEPING WITH THE SURROUNDINGS. SDC SHOULD ENSURE THAT THIS IS KEPT FOR THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE AS WE ARE MERELY STEWARDS OF THIS VILLAGE.</p> <p>When attending the village meeting to seek more information on the Consultation Day, the plans were not accurate. Properties were not named in the correct places, each map had a discrepancy and they were not cross-referred accurately. This was so confusing and should be an accurate representation to be of value and aid comment. Another day of consultation would be greatly appreciated after the consultation feedback has been collated that fully illustrates accurately the information, we need to be able to make a final decision and before any final decision is made, please.</p> <p>London Road is not detailed on the building forms and details. Is this an omission? Can the Mole House be brought in line with the conservation area, particularly as it overlooks listed buildings and distorts the view from the village so from Sparepenny Lane along the Darent Valley path? Can the properties from Dartford Road to the main road be included to preserve their appearances too?</p>	<p>This response schedule sets out how all the written responses received have been considered and have informed the updated appraisal document and changes to the conservation area boundary.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Maps amended</p>
	<p>A further day for reflection on everyone's comments would be helpful</p> <p>The Consultation Day at Farningham Village Hall could have been better organized. There was little explanation regarding the maps on display so it was necessary to ask for explanations. Unfortunately the staff in attendance did not appear to be fully aware of all the aspects of the plan. Some of the building names were not correct on the map.</p> <p>I did mention to you about one reservation that we do have is that a lot of residents are considering switching to electric cars and their allocated spaces are in the rear car park, which you are considering adding to the conservation area. We are in the process of undertaking a feasibility study to consider our best options for the supply infrastructure but obviously do not want any of our options affected by a designation of the car park within the conservation area nor do we want to incur any additional costs. Could you therefore please confirm that the installation of charging points within the rear car park would fall under the heading of permitted development, within any conservation area, and that there would be no need for any planning application, heritage statement or applicable fees.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Building names on map: amended</p> <p>The Planning Portal provides advice about planning permission for electric vehicle charging points. We do not believe that the historic environment should, in and of itself, be a barrier to the installation of electric vehicle charging points, however it is not possible to assess or comment on an individual proposal in this forum. It may be useful to apply for pre-application advice, which can inform the development and design of the project.</p>
	<p>Approximately every four weeks I spend several days in Farningham looking after my Grandchildren and I am appalled that so little is done to "conserve" the lives of residents by limiting the speed at which traffic is allowed to motor through the High Street. I have read in various places that the speed limit should be 20 miles per hour, which is perfectly acceptable, but there are no signs to this effect and nothing is done to monitor the speed of vehicles or assess the danger to residents. I have witnessed cars using the High Street as a "rat run", a shortcut, travelling at sometimes in excess of 40-50 miles per hour. Is the local authority waiting for an accident to take place before acting?</p> <p>High Street Farningham is a very narrow road with (insufficient) parking on one side between the Church and the junction with the Eynsford Road and the problem is exacerbated at the weekends, especially when the weather is fine and very many visitors are in evidence.</p> <p>I would urge you to put up frequent and clear signs as a start to prevent the possibility of accident.</p>	Noted
	<p>Danger of development east of Sparepenny Lane, near the Mole House</p>	Noted