

APPENDIX i: TABLE OF REPRESENTATIONS, AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ANY CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO THEM – FOR RE-DESIGNATING FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A.

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
1	Local resident	<p>1. P17. 'Creative and Green Design' - I wish in a public consultation document you would not allow the literature produced to phrase ideas in gobbledegook - what do you/the consultants mean exactly by creative green design? Also, "21st Century vernacular"? These are loose, woolly, lazy ways of writing, which give no concrete substance to innovative, fuel-saving, carbon-zero nearing, less polluting ways of building.</p> <p>2. No mention of deterioration in the "Unauthorised Works & Deterioration" Action 8 paragraph on p.17. Swale have allowed The Garden Hotel in Boughton under Blean to deteriorate extremely badly and will not enforce the owners doing it up, as it's currently undergoing a planning application. Another example, this time in Faversham, of letting the 1400's TS Hazard building roof tiles fall into the building? Faversham Town Council had to write to remind you of your responsibility to that historic building.</p> <p>3. The rejigging of the Conservation Area boundary: You propose to remove the green space at the top of Finch Close from Conservation Area status, where it abuts the Canterbury Road (p.22), for no reason. This, if enacted, will affect the protection given to both the green space and to the mature trees currently growing on this area. The 2004 report says that, prior to the building of houses in the former chalk pit, the area's shrub and trees had naturally regenerated.</p>	Noted and the proposed corrections can be largely accommodated without fundamentally altering the shape of the document.	To make changes to the assessment document as per the schedule of corrections.

PROPOSED FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>This area affords a significant green visual relief and the trees provide a natural CO2 absorption resource which helps to offset poor air quality produced by the incessant vehicles on the A2.</p> <p>The attractive fencing, lawn and trees here help to place Preston Next Faversham to its historic heritage setting of agricultural land, (as it would originally have been - trees in orchards). Plus they are very much needed to offset the dingy and unattractive frontage of the historic buildings made so much worse by traffic fumes and dirt arising from vehicle particulates. I hate to think what resident's lungs are like when/if they have windows open or venture into back gardens.</p> <p>Page 25 point 15 is pretty damning, where it says in 2004, the created green space and new minor swerve in the road is detrimental to the historic road layout! I think that is a major thing that saves the area!</p> <p>4. Parking on the busy A2 is a huge problem for residents and road users. I hope the proposed devaluation of the green space is not so that a car-park for residents can be created?</p> <p>5. There's the eye-sore of the old antiques shop that's mostly fallen in now. It has been fenced off. Is that in the Conservation area or not? I couldn't quite tell from the map. Perhaps Swale Borough Council could acquire the building and associated land as car parking for residents. Parking permits would allow the Town or Borough Council to recoup their investment.</p>		

PROPOSED FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>6. I propose:</p> <p>i) that all the green space abutting the A2 and Finch Close is included in the new conservation area and</p> <p>ii) that the woodland strip up Salter’s Lane is included in the new redrawn conservation area too.</p>		
2	Local Resident	<p>I can see no valid reason for the removal of the conservation area status of the area to the north of Canterbury Road (pg 21/22 of the report). If these trees are unprotected, it is quite possible for the trees to be removed. We need all the green spaces possible, especially near this busy road. They are also beautiful. Please keep the protection.</p>	Noted.	To retain the said area within the conservation area.
3	Local Resident	<p>Page 5 states “The boundary of the currently designated Preston Next Faversham Conservation Area is shown on Plan 1”. However, there is no “plan 1” in the document.</p> <p>Page 6 – typo “policies” – not “polices”</p> <p>Page 7 – section 2.1 is poorly drafted ie “It was reviewed by Swale Borough Council in 2004 when it was formally re-designated in 2004. A brief character appraisal accompanied the re-designation in 2004.”</p> <p>Page 4 map – the area boundary far from clear on this map</p> <p>Page 12 The Windmill and Cherry Tree are both <i>former</i> public houses now converted into dwellings. However, this reads as though the Windmill is still a public house.</p>	Noted and the proposed corrections can be largely accommodated without fundamentally altering the shape of the document.	To make changes to the assessment document as per the schedule of corrections.

PROPOSED FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>Page 14 – Mill House closed as a Residential Care Home in 2016</p> <p>Page 15 – there is no "residential institutional use"</p> <p>Page 16 – typo - “breathe” NOT “breath”</p> <p>Page 16 section 4.4 I don’t understand this poorly drafted list. What relevance are the words “and following” under some (but not all) of the bullet points? Also – as every item in the list relates to the same Act, surely that Act need be mentioned only once, within the introductory sentence.</p> <p>Page 17 Action 7: Guidance: should read “Action 7 - Guidance:” to be consistent with the other Actions listed</p> <p>Page 21 Regarding the Proposed removal – I see no point in removing this section of green space from the conservation area. It is adjacent to the listed buildings and, if removed, would create a very odd, staggered shape. The protection over the trees located on this valuable green space will also be lost if the status is removed.</p>		
4	Local Resident	<p>P23 why not update this appraisal, it is 20 years old, and the CAPS will last another 20 years?</p> <p>Para 5 former Windmill public house the former public house building continues.....</p> <p>para 6 former Windmill public house</p> <p>para 7 former Windmill Public house</p> <p>para 8 has now brought about substantial change.</p> <p>p9 Westwood Place retains the character of Pile Cottages (to justify the change to the Cons Area boundary.</p>	Noted and the proposed corrections can be largely accommodated without fundamentally altering the shape of the document.	To make changes to the assessment document as per the schedule of corrections.

PROPOSED FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
5	Local Resident	In response to the consultation I support the extension of the conservation area, but object to the removal of the proposed area. Instead this too should be extended slightly to enclose the full length of this area of trees and green space at the top of Finch Close. This will better preserve the character of the road.		To retain the said area within the conservation area.
6	Local Resident	<p>I noticed you have said that both Ivy Cottages and Pile Cottages were built in the second half of the eighteen hundreds but in fact Ivy Cottages were built in 1811 and Pile Cottages were built around the same time and definitely by 1824. Pile Cottages were originally one up one down but had a double story built on the back sometime in the eighteen hundreds making them have two bedrooms plus a kitchen and lounge. This is why they now have a shallow Cat-slide roof at the back. There were seven Pile Cottages up until the 1950's, half being replaced by garages and half being made part of the Preston Park Estate. The narrow unmade-up road directly in-front of the 3 cottages was a Bridleway leading down to the railway line and Church going through/past a pig farm and orchards all of which was lost/blocked off for the Preston Park estate.</p> <p>The unmade up strip of road must obviously belong to someone but nobody seems to know who, which is I guess why it is in such poor condition leading from the A2. Pile Cottages addresses are 'Canterbury Road' yet when it was resurfaced a few years ago didn't come down to the cottages which would have made such a difference especially as when it rains heavily water runs fast off the A2 all the way down to Pile Cottages. Bringing with it all</p>	Noted	No Change to the assessment document.

PROPOSED FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>the dirt/etc which silts up our drains that go into our shared septic tank. Another annoying thing is Pile Cottages doesn't have any form of street/direction sign and because the cottages are tucked away yet part of the main road it often causes problems.</p> <p>The Thatched Cottage was once three cottages which then became two and then one which is when the name changed from 1,2&3 Chalk Pit Cottages.</p> <p>The Flint wall in Preston Lane at the front of the nicer of the two Ivy Cottages is what's left of the Church wall.</p>		
7.	Faversham Society	<p>The Faversham Society has been concerned for several years that the Conservation Area Appraisals need to be reviewed and are pleased that this has now been addressed. The 2004 Appraisal, which was never formally completed, contains a significant number of errors that need correcting.</p> <p>In our view, the 2004 work currently presented as an appendix should be revised and updated to clearly identify and define the historical and architectural significance of each part of the Conservation Area and Conservation Area as a whole. In addition, it needs to identify individual character elements that contribute to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Society objects to the proposed removal of the open land opposite Salters Lane (p.22) from the Conservation Area, We strongly support retaining protection of this space, which, as Faversham increases in size in the future, will become an increasingly important reminder that Preston was originally an entirely separate community.</p>	Noted & Welcomed	To retain the said area within the conservation area.

PROPOSED FAVERSHAM-PRESTON NEXT C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
--------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------