

Sevenoaks District Council

Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Statement

1. Introduction

Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) identifies the distinctive local characteristics of the residential areas in different parts of the Sevenoaks urban area and includes guidance on achieving high quality design that responds to local character. The Assessment supports Core Strategy Policy SP1 - Design of New Development and Conservation.

Once adopted, the Assessment will form part of the Sevenoaks District Local Development Framework (LDF). It will not form part of the formal development plan for the District but will be a material consideration in consideration in determining planning applications in that part of Sevenoaks to which it applies.

This document sets out Sevenoaks District Council's approach to consultation and engagement in preparing the Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment SPD. It covers: Who was consulted (which bodies and persons the Local Planning Authority invited to make representations); How the community and local stakeholders were invited to make representations; Summarises the main issues raised by the consultation; and Explains how the representations made have been taken into account.

2. Approach to consultation

Regulation 17 of the Town and Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended 2008 and 2009) and sets out the minimum requirements for consultation and public participation on SPD.

Further to these minimum requirements, the adopted Sevenoaks Statement of Community Involvement (December 2005), 'Planning for People' sets out the range of approaches to consultation and participation that will consider facilitating in preparing LDF documents. These are:

Information	Local media (newspapers, radio, TV, local/Parish newsletters).
	Electronic resources (Internet, e-mail, online consultation, diary).
	Publicity in 'community centres' (e.g. local council offices, shopping centres)
	Letter based consultation to persons/organisations on the LDF mailing list.
Consultation	Documents available for inspection at local council offices.
	Area/Town Forums and Parish/Town Council Meetings.
	Qualitative Research (Focus Groups and Questionnaire Surveys).
	Public Exhibitions.
Participation	Participation Workshops
	Working Groups

Sevenoaks District Council considers that when preparing SPDs it is appropriate to inform, consult and seek the participation of organisations and/or individuals in order to ensure that the documents more closely reflect local needs and priorities.

3. Who was consulted and How the community and local stakeholders were invited to make representations

Following preparation of a draft of the SPD, the Council resolved to undertake a formal consultation on the Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment SPD from 5th January to 16th February 2012.

There was close stakeholder involvement in preparing the SPD in order to develop a shared vision with the local community of the type of residential environments they wish to see and to develop appropriate design guidance. Local knowledge was crucial to this process, in identifying important local features and in developing design principles to guide future residential development.

Prior to the drafting of the SPD, several local stakeholder events were held:

- briefing sessions with local Ward Councillors, local amenity and resident groups, Sevenoaks Town Council, Chipstead Parish Council, Chevening Parish Council, Dunton Green Parish Council, Sevenoaks Conservation Council and Sevenoaks Society.
- a series of walkabouts were held involving local amenity and resident associations, local Ward Councillors, Town and Parish Councillors and the Planning Portfolio holder to observe and record the key features which made up the character of individual areas.

The document was then subject to formal public consultation including:

- Three public exhibitions were held on 14/01/12, 19/01/12 and 20/01/12.
- Notices and an article were placed in the local paper.
- Details of the consultation were sent to statutory consultees, individuals and organisations on the LDF mailing list. This contains 350 organisations and Individuals who responded to previous LDF consultations or who asked to be kept informed of the progress of the LDF.
- Details of the consultation were sent to all the groups involved in the walkabouts.
- The relevant extracts of the document were sent to District Councillors and Parish Councils within the assessment area.
- The documents were available on the District Council's website, in libraries and council offices.

4. Consultation Responses

A total of 51 comments were received from 18 respondents including local groups (residents associations/historical groups), District, Town and Parish Councillors members of the public and national stakeholders.

The vast majority of the comments received were positive and supportive of the aims and content of the document. Some factual changes were recommended and 2 boundary changes put forward. A summary of the comments made and the District Council's responses is attached at **Appendix B**.

This schedule sets out the how the comments received have been taken into account in revising the SPD.

Appendix A

Organisation and individuals consulted

Sevenoaks District Council are required to consult those 'specific' and 'general' consultation bodies that the Council considers are affected by the SPD¹. A list of specific consultation bodies is set out in Reg. 2 of the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended 2009). The same regulation defines 'general' consultation bodies as any voluntary bodies, bodies representing racial, ethnic, national or religious groups or disabled persons and bodies representing the interests of businesses in the area.

The Council considered it appropriate to consult the following 'specific' consultation bodies on the draft SPD

Homes and Communities Agency

The Environment Agency

English Heritage

Natural England

Neighbouring Authorities

Mobile Phone Operators

Mobile Operators Association

Electricity and Gas Companies

- N Power
- EDF
- E.On
- Scottish and Southern Electricity
- Utilita Services
- Good Energy
- Ecotricity
- Ebico Ltd
- Spark Energy
- British Gas

● Sewerage Undertaker

- Southern Water

● Water Undertakers

- East Surrey Water Co.
- South East Water
- Thames Water

Kent Police

Kent County Council

Parish Councils

- Ash-cum-Ridley Parish Council
- Brasted Parish Council
- Chevening Parish Council
- Chiddingstone Parish Council
- Cowden Parish Council
- Crockenhill Parish Council

- Dunton Green Parish Council
- Edenbridge Town Council
- Eynsford Town Council
- Farningham Parish Council
- Fawkham Parish Council
- Halstead Parish Council
- Hartley Parish Council
- Hever Parish Council
- Hextable Parish Council
- Horton Kirby & South Darent
- Kemsing Parish Council
- Knockholt Parish Council
- Leigh Parish Council
- Otford Parish Council
- Penshurst Parish Council
- Riverhead Parish Council
- Seal Parish Council
- Sevenoaks Town Council
- Sevenoaks Weald Parish Council
- Shoreham Parish Council
- Sundridge with Ide Hill Parish
- Swanley Town Council
- Westerham Parish Council
- West Kingsdown Parish Council

In addition Companies, Organisations and Individuals on the Council's LDF mailing list were also invited to comments. This mailing list contains 350 consultees, being made up of all those who responded to previous formal and informal LDF consultations or who asked to be kept informed of the progress of LDF documents.

¹ As required by Reg. 17 (3) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

DRAFT SEVENOAKS RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER AREA ASSESSMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Respondent	Representation	Response <i>italics indicate recommended amendments</i>
General Comments		
The Sevenoaks Society	<p>Our Planning Committee, in particular, has spent some considerable time reviewing this document and the Society has even gone so far as to buy a copy for easier reference and for those members of the Committee who do not have access to the internet. We consider that the Planning Department is to be congratulated on an excellent piece of work and for taking on one with such a large scope. You have created a document which will not only have great value in planning decision terms, but is also an important document of record as to the variety of the built environment in 2011 in Sevenoaks. Besides its comprehensiveness we are pleased to see that the assessments go beyond a simple recitation of materials and architectural styles to take on landscape, townscape and spatial character. Also that the areas are not treated as isolated entities but acknowledge views and relationships to adjoining areas and to the wider landscape.</p> <p>The Design Guidance offered varies from the moderately prescriptive to positive encouragement for improvement and our concerns are that the developers may cleave to the former and attempt to tick all the boxes without having the imagination to embrace the opportunities for the latter. Councillors making planning decisions will doubtless be pleased to have the SRACA for guidance. The Sevenoaks Society would encourage them to aim for high quality of design and build, to recognise that Sevenoaks is a town which has a diverse character and to look to add modern examples of good design to those from previous centuries. Let us hope when the next residential area character assessment is made that the buildings erected in the next twenty years will be seen to be amongst the most sought after and treasured in the town and that we will not have bequeathed any disastrous developments such as those enumerated in this excellent report. We would strongly suggest that with the publication of this report that it is an appropriate time to set up an architect's design panel to assist Councillors and Officers.</p> <p>Please convey our appreciation to the members of your Planning Department and Tony Fullwood Associates regarding this project.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>The District Council will keep the case for a panel under review but the constitution of such a body is independent of this SPD.</p>
Sevenoaks Conservation Council	<p>I write on behalf of the Sevenoaks Conservation Council in relation to the above SPD. I would like to compliment the District Council on the SPD which seems to me to be a very thorough and well researched document and which should prove to be a valuable tool when considering planning applications. There are a number of policies in the Core Strategy which refer to the character of the area, and this SPD ensures that the relevant information about the character of individual residential areas will be available as a</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

	<p>material consideration. As with all policies, much will depend on the way in which the SPD is implemented. It is important that it should be applied reasonably flexibly and not as a rigid set of rules. I should mention that this letter has not been approved by the Sevenoaks Conservation Council because our next meeting is not until after the expiration of the SPD consultation period. If any contrary or additional view is expressed at our next meeting on 21 March 2012, I will ensure that it is brought to your attention. Unless you hear to the contrary, would you please therefore treat this letter as containing the view of the Sevenoaks Conservation Council.</p>	
Sevenoaks Town Council	<p>After much consideration Sevenoaks Town Council wish to express their general support for the Draft Sevenoaks Residential Character Area Assessment SPD. While there are a few minor points of contention (noted below) Councillors felt that the document will be a valuable resource to aid in the planning decision making process. Particular praise was given for the high levels of community engagement prior to the drafting of the document. As a general comment Councillors would like to see the analysis of Open Spaces strengthened to aid in the assessment of their "worth" to the local community in future planning decisions.</p>	<p>Support noted. The value of open space to the character of areas is reflected throughout the SPD. The wider value of the open space is for other parts of the LDF to examine including the Allocations and Development Management DPD.</p>
Knole Paddock Residents' Association	<p>The vast majority of our members have been notified of the draft Residential Character Area Assessment SPD and have had the opportunity of seeing the documents on-line and commenting either directly or via this Residents' Association. We are pleased to say that the chapters pertaining to the roads within our area (Plymouth Drive, Plymouth Park, Chartway, Knole Way and Warren Court) have met with our residents' approval and we therefore hope that this welcome document will be adopted within the anticipated timescale.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
Acorns Residents Association	<p>It is good now to be included in the scheme - leaving the area out originally left it open to abuse.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
Packhorse Road Residents Association	<p>We note that the introduction to the document emphasises the importance of local planning authorities developing a shared vision with their local communities. We believe that acceptance of the Residents Association's comments would help achieve this.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
White Hart Estates Residents Association	<p>We commend SDC on this initiative and look forward to the adoption of the Residential Character Area Assessment SPD. Once adopted, we expect the Sevenoaks Town Council Planning Committee and Sevenoaks District Council Planning Officers to use the design guidelines to assess planning applications and to refuse applications that do not conform to the guidelines.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
Chevening Parish Council	<p>The PC is concerned at the various references to back land development within the various design guidance notes, being opposed to the practice in general.</p>	<p>Backland development is defined as development on land that lies to the rear of existing properties and is normally associated with small scale development (usually one or two plots). There is nothing against the principle of such development in national guidance or the LDF. For the SPD to oppose backland development in general would be contrary</p>

		to the planning policies and guidance which this document sets out to supplement.
Chevening Parish Council	The PC questions the need for "landmark buildings" within the Parish at all; there are plenty in the Conservation Areas already. They were recommended in the draft for I01 Nursery Place, I18 Chipstead Park, I19 Chesterfield Drive and I20 Springshaw Close. A clearer definition of such structures is needed and a firm statement that any such building should not be out of scale with the rest of the area.	<p>The SPD identifies a number of landmark buildings within the character areas – and gives the reasons for so defining the buildings (such as scale, location, use, materials). Some landmark buildings are listed buildings. Many have been identified on the walkabouts as locally important to the character of an area.</p> <p>The SPD does not want to stifle the opportunity for future landmark buildings which can lift a design from the ordinary and may be justified on the basis of a sound urban design appraisal of their context and a perceived environmental uplift to the quality of the area. There may be townscape reasons when the scale of a building can be increased such as at a junction, or to create a feature at the end of a vista (see for example Gordon Cullen – The Concise Townscape; Responsive Environments – Bentley et al). For these reasons, particularly in areas of fairly monotonous townscape, or on the principal routes, the SPD accepts the principle for new landmark buildings.</p> <p>Please see addendum sheet and end of this document</p>
Dunton Green Parish Council	<p>This study ignores the totality of Dunton Green as a rural settlement and tries to propagate the idea that the area of the village which is subject to the assessment is part of northern Sevenoaks. Dunton Green is NOT part of the town of Sevenoaks and Dunton Green Parish Council continues to object to the fact that part of the village is now referred to as 'Sevenoaks Urban' whilst the rest of the village is still identified as a rural location (although NOT included in the Village Appraisal document).</p> <p>P12, last paragraph Within the wider built up area, the historic village centres have maintained their identity with the centres of Riverhead, Dunton Green, Bessels Green and Chipstead protected by Conservation Areas.' Dunton Green Parish Council is unaware that the centre of the village is a Conservation Area. Could SDC please confirm when the village centre was made a Conservation Area? Or, correct the statement to indicate that Dunton Green village centre is unprotected and is not a Conservation Area.</p>	<p>In order to become a material planning consideration of weight in determining planning applications, this SPD is part of the District Council's Local Development Framework. The Parish Council does not appear to accept that for the purposes of the Local Development Framework, the Sevenoaks urban area is defined as Sevenoaks town, Riverhead, Dunton Green, Bessels Green and Chipstead. This definition is already part of the adopted Core Strategy. It is not possible for the SPD to contradict the Core Strategy which it is intended to supplement.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the SPD refers to the distinctive character areas of Dunton Green. The SPD incorrectly identifies that Dunton Green centre has CA status.</p> <p>Recommended Change: Section 6 Origins and Development of Sevenoaks, Riverhead, Dunton Green, Bessels Green and Chipstead. Amend wording to read:</p>

		<i>Within the wider built up area, the village centres have maintained their identity with each of the centres of Riverhead, Dunton Green, Bessels Green and Chipstead having an historic core.</i>
Environment Agency	We have no real concerns with the contents of the document, but would like to recommend that where new driveways proposed whether for existing properties or new developments, these are permeable. This will reduce surface water runoff that could otherwise result in pluvial (surface water) flooding.	<p>The SPD supports the Core Strategy which covers the issue of permeability in greater detail including Policy SP 2 (Sustainable Development Sustainable Construction and Low-Carbon Energy Generation).</p> <p>An increased tendency for the creation of hard standing usually for off-street car parking can increase flooding and associated water pollution. With climate change and increased amounts of hard surfacing in urban areas, the Government has changed permitted development rights to allow residents to pave over front gardens of more than 5 square metres without planning permission only if the surface is made of porous materials such as permeable paving or gravel, or unless provision is made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable surface within the grounds of the dwelling.</p> <p>The District Council would wish to see the use of permeable materials if hard surfacing is required. Natural materials such as gravel can also assist in softening the appearance of the garden area. Greater permeability should also increase soil moisture levels which would benefit street and garden trees</p> <p>Recommended Change: Within the design guidance sections of the SPD add an additional sentence about surface treatment: Where off street parking is proposed within front curtilages, boundaries with neighbouring properties should be retained and enhanced and the maximum length of front boundary retained to help enclose the road space, define the boundary between public and private space and help reinforce the character of an area. Wherever possible permeable surfaces should be used which are in keeping with the character of the property and its curtilage.</p>
Natural England	The document sets out a valuable and comprehensive record of residential character, and provides a robust context for judging development and other changes. However, the document mainly focuses on the public realm. Whilst there are references to trees in back	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The SPD is concerned principally with the physical character</p>

	<p>gardens and their value to streetscape, the value of back gardens in wider landscape terms and as components in a complex network of habitats, seems to be missing. In some cases, the assessment of residential character concludes that there may be potential for backland development. The words “balance in favour of the landscape dominating the built form should be retained” that occur in the Design Guidance in relevant cases, are welcomed. However some assessment of backland opportunities in terms of their value to the wider landscape/townscape (in addition to local streetscape and residential character) and their value as part of the network of urban habitats is important.</p>	<p>of the area but supports the Core Strategy which covers the issue of biodiversity and a network of habitats in greater detail including Policy SP 11 (Biodiversity). This seeks opportunities for the enhancement of biodiversity through the creation, protection, enhancement, extension and management of sites and through the maintenance and, where possible, enhancement of a green infrastructure network to improve connectivity between habitats.</p> <p>The Allocations and Development Management DPD will set out proposals for the Green Infrastructure Network which will include, areas of value for biodiversity, opportunities and locations for biodiversity enhancement (including creation of new habitats) taking account of defined Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, open space sites identified for retention under the policy, new areas of open space taking account of the findings of the Open Spaces Study, opportunities for linking open spaces and areas of biodiversity value to improve connectivity for people and wildlife and targets for implementation and proposals for effective long term management of sites forming part of the network.</p>
Age Concern	<p>I have looked and read the assessment report, thank you for the opportunity in being able to comment. One area that I am concerned about is the loss of bungalows in the area. Many bungalows in Sevenoaks District are being developed into two or even three storey homes, which impacts on neighbours and the community. Bungalows were originally developed, many years ago, almost as lifetime homes, which suite older people or those with disabilities, if all the bungalows disappear, this is a resource lost to the district and for future generations of older or disabled people. I would therefore support any proposals to restrict planning and development in connection with bungalows.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is not to support the retention of any particular house type based on the needs of older or disabled people. This issue is covered by other plans within the LDF including the Core Strategy: Policy SP 5: Housing Size and Type.</p>
Historical Reference		
Gillian Patterson; Derek Medhurst	<p>While examining the LDF document, I noticed a couple of inaccuracies that I hope you will be able to correct: 1) In sections C12, D05, K14 and K15, the document refers to Lord Greatness. As far as I have been able to find out, Lord Hillingdon owned the land in question. 'Greatness' is the name of a residential area in northern Sevenoaks, derived from 'sandy heathland' as it was called in the 9th century. There does not seem to have been a Lord Greatness in the history of Sevenoaks.</p> <p>I'll be looking to find out just who 'Lord Greatness' was who is reputed to have donated the land in the 1920s. In nearly 60 years of living hereabouts I've never heard of him and have never seen the name in any local history book!</p>	<p>Lord Greatness is referred to in several Town Council documents but always with the same quotation about giving land in the 1920s, so probably all quoting from the same source. However there is no citation so the source could be incorrect.</p> <p>Recommended Change: Section 6 Origins and Development of Sevenoaks, Riverhead, Dunton Green, Bessels Green and Chipstead and Historical Context section of Character Areas C12, D05, I21, K14 and K15: Delete 'by Lord Greatness'</p>

Boundary		
Jenny Barnes	Area missing - Quarry Cottages, London Road by Halfway House pub. 1900/Vict/Edw railway cottages.	An additional character area is recommended to cover this area which was originally excluded from the SPD due to the adjacent commercial area. Recommended Change Add additional Character Area A15 Quarry Cottages, London Road
A Victorian/ Edwardian		
Sevenoaks Town Council	A06 Bayham Road Area: STC believe the houses towards the end of Knole Road are early 1950s, and not 1960s as stated.	Factual amendment is proposed to the text in F08 Knole Road where it is considered this reference appears: Recommended Change: Amend F08 Knole Road to: The Knole Road cul-de-sac development was built in the late 1950's as an extension of the existing road on orchards to the rear of Seal Hollow House (now Quaker House).
B Inter-War Linear Development		
White Hart Estates Residents Association	<p>B05 Weald Road- We agree that B05 is correctly classified as Inter-War Linear Development.</p> <p>Locally Distinctive Contextual Features - We think that the important strip of Protected Woodland forming part of the back gardens of Weald Road and Brattle Wood properties at the southern half of Weald Road should be mentioned. Please see our detailed suggestions in the Appendix A</p> <p>Local Positive and Negative Features - Again, we think that the important strip of Protected Woodland forming part of the back gardens of Weald Road and Brattle Wood properties at the southern half of Weald Road should be mentioned .Please see our detailed suggestions in the Appendix A</p> <p>Design Guidance - Again, we think that the important strip of Protected Woodland forming part of the back gardens of Weald Road and Brattle Wood properties at the southern half of Weald Road should be mentioned. Please see our detailed suggestions in the Appendix A Please note that the words in <i>italics</i> are our suggested additions to the relevant section.</p> <p>P124 – Under Open Space/Vegetation: Front boundary garden hedges and trees. <i>Important strip of Protected Woodland forming part of the back gardens of Weald Road and Brattle Wood properties at the southern half of Weald Road.</i></p> <p>P125 – Locally Distinctive Positive Features, new paragraph: <i>Important strip of Protected Woodland forming part of the back gardens of Weald Road and Brattle Wood properties at the southern half of Weald Road.</i></p>	<p>Site visits, aerial photography and TPO records show the strip of trees is located outside the character area and, because of the disposition of buildings and the sloping gardens, is not prominent when viewed from the public realm of the Weald Road area. For this reason, the tree belt is not mentioned with section B05.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the strip of protected trees is located within the G01 White Hart Area and is already depicted on the Townscape Map for this area. Trees to rear gardens which act as a backdrop to the houses are also mentioned in the Locally Distinctive Contextual Features and Locally Distinctive Positive Features Sections for this area. The relevant Design Guidance already contains reference to retention of mature trees and hedges which contribute to the character of the area.</p>

	P126 – Under Design Guidance, new last paragraph: <i>There should be no interference with the Protected Woodland at the rear of the properties on Weald Road.</i>	
D Garden City Influence Planned Development		
Councillor Hunter	D02 - Solefields Road Area: Page 203: Reference is made to balconies but no picture is included	The original picture has become omitted from the document during production and will be reinstated. Recommended Change: Reinstate photograph
Dunton Green Parish Council	D03 Lusted Road - Historical context. 'A development of semi detached housing constructed on previously open land around 1960.' These properties were, in fact, built after WW2 in 1946/1947. The houses are NOT a 1960s development. This needs to be corrected.	Factual amendments are proposed to the text. Recommended Change: Amend Historical Context to: A development of semi detached housing constructed on previously open land in the late 1940s Amend Age of Buildings: Late 1940s
Dunton Green Parish Council	D04 Crescent Cottages. - Block of text next to second photograph (starts 'Three of the terraces area arranged...'). There is a comment that in the last sentence that '...parking on the open space detracts from the character.' Dunton Green Parish Council has installed a number of no parking signs around the perimeter of the open space here and there no longer appears to be any parking on the open space. However, as this was an observation made at the time of the assessment SDC may feel that it is still valid to leave it in.	This was an observation made at the time of the assessment and it is proposed to retain the text.
Derek Medhurst	D05 Orchard Close - Page 215 of the document claims it's about Orchard Close, Greatness Lane and Orchard Drive. There is no Orchard Drive here.	Factual amendment is proposed to the text. Recommended Change: Delete references to Orchard Drive and replace with Orchard Close
Sevenoaks Town Council	D07 Hillingdon Rise Area - STC believe the low number terraces on Hillingdon Rise (towards Little Wood) are older than stated in the document (1950's if not pre-war)	Factual amendment: Recommended change: Amend Historical Context to: The terraced housing in Little Wood was built in the early 1950s.
Councillor Dickens	D08 Bradbourne Vale Road. - Would not the parking 'situation' be a negative feature?	The parking situation is more a matter of traffic management. The impact of traffic is already mentioned as a negative feature.
E Formal Semi-Detached Layout Character Areas		
MJ Miles	E05 Church Fields: p 250 Churchfields also includes some flats (= numbers 11-22) but only 2 storey. p 252 Re Churchfields you mention under Design Guidance the open space at the west end of Woodfield Rd. This is nowhere near Churchfields but in Bradbourne Park Rd (so this should be on p 729?) But there is a green amenity space opposite 11-22 Churchfields which should be protected.	Factual amendment to add reference to flats and delete reference to Woodside Road. Recommended Change: Amend Type of buildings to: Semi-detached, terraced houses and flats Amend design Guidance to The amenity open space opposite 11-22 Churchfields should be protected

F Formal Detached		
Councillor Hunter	F06 Downsview Road. - P. 278 Downsview and Croft Way development started pre-war. P. 280 The semi's were police houses	Factual amendments are proposed to the text Recommended Change: Amend Historical Context to: Downsview Road and Croft Way were started pre war on open land adjoining Brittain's Lane as part of a westward expansion of the Sevenoaks urban area primarily in the 1950s and early 1960s. Amend text box page 280 to: At the western end of Downsview Road, two pairs of semi detached former police houses are built in a simpler style with plain red brick elevations, flat porch covers supported on brick pillars and shallow tiled gabled roof.
MJ Miles	F07 Montreal Park Area. - p 287 An additional negative feature could be the recent appearance of dormers on some properties which tend to give the appearance of a third storey and affects the unity of this area.	There is some evidence of a limited number of over dominant dormers on some properties. Recommended Change: Add additional Negative Feature: Some over-dominant dormer extensions Amend Design Guidance to: The characteristic designs and roofline should be respected
MJ Miles	F10 St Mary's Drive Area - p 297 I wonder why number 11 St Mary's Drive (The Stone House) has not been included in the shading in your map? I understand that this is an older house - certainly pre 1960. pp 298 and 299. The "recreation ground" you mention is presumably the bowling green and cricket ground which is to the west of the end of St Mary's Drive. The south side of St Mary's drive looks over the Riverhead Parkland which has no recreational facilities, just open parkland with trees, stream, ponds etc. It does not appear to be named as such on your map (p297).	11 St Mary's Drive is located outside the built up area of Sevenoaks within the Green Belt and is therefore not included within the SPD. The text in relation to the recreation ground and parkland should be clarified. Recommended Change: Page 298 Area Characteristics text box amend to: There is a vista into the Conservation Area to the north and short views southwards over the parkland. Locally Distinctive Positive Features: Amend to: There are vistas and short views from St Mary's Drive of St Mary's Church steeple, the Conservation Area and the parkland.
G Formal Avenue Character Areas		
White Hart Estates Residents Association	Suggest amendments shown in italics: P327 - Individually designed mostly 2 storey, and <i>fairly substantial</i> detached houses are set well back along wide avenues with wide grass verges and pavements and are visible above <i>low</i> walled, hedged and treed front boundaries. Add to end of 2nd paragraph: contribution to the character of this area <i>and its semi rural nature.</i>	The term 'fairly substantial' is a relative term and therefore adds little to the description of the area for planning purposes particularly when the houses are not of uniform size. The boundary walls are characteristically low within the area and the term is a helpful addition to the description.

		<p>The term 'semi-rural' is not recognised as an accurate description of the formal avenues character areas for planning purposes. The areas retain a suburban character which comprises detached houses set well back along wide verdant avenues where buildings do not contain the space. The verdant character to the roads is already described within the SPD.</p> <p>Recommended Change: P327 – Amend to: Individually designed mostly 2 storey, detached houses are set well back along wide avenues with wide grass verges and pavements and are visible above low walled, hedged and treed front boundaries.</p>
Councillor Hunter	G01 White Hart Area Photos and narrative do not always match up.	<p>The original layout of text and photographs has been amended during production and will be reinstated.</p> <p>Recommended Change: Ensure clear relationship between photographs and text boxes</p>
White Hart Estates Residents Association	<p>G01 White Hart Area; We agree that G01 is correctly classified as having the characteristics of a formal avenue area.</p> <p>The Green Belt of Sevenoaks Common and Conservation Area of Knole Park immediately surrounding the White Hart Area to the South, East and West should be mentioned. We think that more emphasis could be put on the protected nature of the surrounding woodland and Common in the Locally Distinctive Features and Local Positive and Negative Features – see detailed suggestions in the Appendix A.</p> <p>Parkland Close is within the area and should be listed on page 329; Letter Box Lane and Beechmont Road are on the boundary and should also be included in the list on page 329</p> <p>Local Positive and Negative Features - We think that detached garages forward of the building line and, in particular, those close to the front boundary, are unattractive negative features.</p> <p>We think that the sub-division of plots to replace a single house with two houses of similar design is a negative feature</p> <p>We also think that existing roof heights and roof architecture should be respected.</p> <p>Please see our detailed suggestions in the Appendix A</p>	<p>The setting of the White Hart area is already referred to in area G01 White Hart Area: 'The area is largely surrounded by countryside and the surrounding roads such as Letter Box Lane have a rural character.'</p> <p>There is also reference to the views from the area into the surrounding countryside. Nevertheless, the SPD covers the built up area of the town and, although the introduction of the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is mentioned in the section on the historic development of the town, the document does not refer specifically to these designations which affect land beyond the built up area.</p> <p>The additional roads referred to should be included in the list on page 329.</p> <p>There is evidence in this area that garages forward of the building line, particularly those close to the front boundary can result in a detracting feature from the overall character of the area and that additional wording and photograph to this effect should be added.</p> <p>In relation to the points about detached garages forward of the building line and the sub-division of plots, there is already reference in the Negative Features to some new</p>

<p>Map p329 – The meaning and significance of the green areas on the map should be made clear. For example, are they intended to show areas of woodland or a concentration or strip of trees? It should be made clear whether any of these areas represent Protected Woodland.</p> <p>p. 330 Remove “and three storey” from Building heights</p> <p>Add text in italics: Remnant woodland survives within the estate; <i>some areas of it are protected.</i></p> <p>Hedges and trees to front and rear gardens, <i>with hedges on side boundaries</i>, trees which act as a backdrop to the houses, <i>and are an important feature of the local landscape character.</i></p> <p>p. 331 1st para - ...set well back on a <i>(delete the word relatively)</i> regular building line footways and verges and a <i>(delete the word relatively)</i> regular building line</p> <p>2nd para - ...and a <i>couple of</i> semi detached houses are set back from the west side of Shenden Way</p> <p>332 – The photo of the entrance to Cade Lane on top right does not seem to fit in with the theme – delete?</p> <p>334 – Brattle Wood (bottom right) is a significant copse of historic <i>protected</i> woodland</p> <p>335 – 1st para - ...and provide a magnificent setting of historic <i>Conservation</i> landscape</p> <p>336 - 17th Century posting inn</p> <p>337 – Positive features</p> <p>Individually designed mostly 2 storey detached houses <i>of low density</i> are set back from the road along a regular <i>(delete the word relatively)</i> building line with gaps between buildings <i>giving an open, semi rural feel</i> as well as some wooded areas, <i>some of which are Protected</i></p> <p>The edge of the area <i>on the south, east and west</i> is characterized by <i>the Green Belt area of trees and woodland of Sevenoaks Common</i> and the historic Landscape of Knole Park</p> <p><i>Low brick or stone wall boundaries topped by hedging, or hedged boundaries or hedged boundaries front and side</i></p>	<p>development which has not respected the characteristic set back from the road or allowed spacing between buildings. Additional photographs illustrating cramped development and prominent garage supplied by the Residents Association should be added together with appropriate text.</p> <p>It is not accepted that even with some new development the character of the area is being urbanised. An urban character is created when buildings contain the space such as a Victorian terraced street. The White Hart area retains a suburban character which comprises detached houses set well back along wide verdant avenues where buildings do not contain the space.</p> <p>The map shows the general location and shape of tree groups. The text explains in more detail the role and value of various groups of trees.</p> <p>It would be inaccurate to remove three storeys from the building height when there is some development of this height within the area. The reference in the text already illustrates that there is only some three storey development. ‘Two storeys with some bungalows and three storey’.</p> <p>The corollary of some trees being protected (including those in Brattle Wood) is that others are not. As the SPD seeks to protect all those trees identified as important to the character, it is unnecessary to sub-divide the protected status which is independent of the SPD.</p> <p>The additional description of hedges on side boundaries is accurate and further illustrates the character of the area. Reference should be made in the Positive Features section.</p> <p>The singling out of one feature which is important to the character of the area in the Locally Distinctive Contextual Features diminishes the others and in planning terms may be counterproductive in relation to those other features.</p> <p>Maps and site inspections indicate that there is not a regular building line within the area. It would be inaccurate to describe the building line as anything other than ‘relatively</p>
--	--

<p>337 - Negative features</p> <p>Add new first point – <i>Some new development is out of scale with the area and can give the impression of undesirable urbanization by virtue of size, height, mass and siting</i></p> <p>Some new development has not respected the characteristic set back from the road or allowed <i>adequate</i> spacing between buildings</p> <p>338 – Design Guidance Add the following three new points:</p> <p><i>The characterful Kentish pitched and angled roofs of properties in the area should be retained and flat topped, shallower, pitched roofs avoided. Existing ridge heights of properties should generally be respected and maintained to maintain the balance of the dwelling and loft extensions should not detract from the characteristic roof profile of a street</i></p> <p><i>Roof lights, particularly on front elevations, should be the preferred alternative to the use of dormers or roof extensions, particularly in areas where there are no dormers already</i></p> <p><i>The sub-division of plots to replace a single house with two houses of similar design should not be permitted. In rare cases where a plot is of commensurate scale in relation to its neighbours and the replacement houses are single detached properties and can be well-spaced between themselves and with regard to neighbouring houses, the design should be individual to each house.</i></p> <p>Amend the following two points:</p> <p>Garages should be of a scale, form, materials and location that fit unobtrusively with the house, surrounding garden and the character of the street. <i>Detached garages forward of the building line should not be permitted unless there are mitigating circumstances arising from the topography of the plot</i></p> <p>Any backland development should be served by narrow and hedge lined access drives</p> <p>Mature trees and hedges or wall and hedge boundaries – <i>both front and side</i> – which contribute to the character of the area should be retained. <i>Close board fencing should be avoided.</i></p>	<p>regular’.</p> <p>There are two semi-detached properties on Shendon Way and the text could be amended to state this.</p> <p>The photograph of the entrance to Cade Lane is accurately described in the text.</p> <p>The term ‘historic Conservation landscape’ has no clear definition in planning terms. The area of Knole Park is outside the remit of the SPD but is already protected by Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designations.</p> <p>The official listed building description of the White Hart Public House describes the building as a 18th Century posting inn.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the density of a proposal per se would be the determining factor in judging the acceptability of a proposal. Consequently, the SPD focuses on the characteristics of the area rather than a calculation of relative density which are not specified in the document (other than in error on p 184). The latter error is to be deleted.</p> <p>In relation to positive features further details to boundaries help clarify their role in the character of the area and should be added to the text.</p> <p>In relation to negative features adequate spacing between buildings is an issue in this area and the text should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed additional design guidance, the height or style of roof is not mentioned in the contextual analysis or features of the area. Indeed, the walkabout and site visits indicate a variety of roof styles within the area. The SPD notes that the building heights in the White Hart area are varied. The issue of roof heights within the area is also compounded by the subtle and dramatic changes in topography across the area. This result is a varied roof profile within and between streets. For this reason, it would be</p>
---	---

Detractors – additional photographs and comments proposed by the Residents Association:



Houses of a similar or identical design built on sub-divided plots with no space between themselves and neighbouring houses are out of character with the area.

unreasonable and unjustifiable for design guidance in this area to limit all properties to existing ridge heights or to state an in principle preference against front dormer windows.

Similarly there is nothing in national guidance or the LDF against the principle of the sub-division of plots to replace a single house with two houses such development. For the SPD to oppose such development in principle would be contrary to the planning policies and guidance which this document sets out to supplement. In relation to development affecting roofs or the subdivision of plots, the Design Guidance within the SPD already states:

- The scale, height and mass of new development should fit unobtrusively within its setting and should not appear cramped on the site or out of context with the character of the street

Detached garages forward of the building line are not encouraged by the Design Guidance of the SPD which already states:

- Development should be set back from the road and respect the relatively regular building line
- Garages should be of a scale, form, materials and location that fit unobtrusively with the house, surrounding garden and the character of the street

In relation to backland or any other type of development, the addition of the term 'any' is superfluous.

In relation to the retention of mature trees and hedges or wall and hedge boundaries which contribute to the character of the area, the addition of 'both front and side' is superfluous as the role of trees within all locations is stated as important within this character area. The proposed suffix would also miss the protection of trees in rear gardens which are also noted as important.

Recommended Change: Amend to: **Comprising The Rise; Garth Road; Brattle Wood; White Hart Wood; Shenden Way; Turners Gardens; White Hart Close; Cade Lane; Tonbridge Road; Parkland Close; Letter Box Lane and Beechmont Road**

		<p><i>Detached garages in front of the building line, particularly if they are close to the front boundary, can appear dominant in the street scene and, if more are allowed, will urbanise the character of the area.</i></p>	<p>Detractors Add additional photograph depicting a prominent garage and accompanying text box: <i>Where visible, the introduction of detached garage buildings to the front of the house towards the front of the building curtilage can appear dominant in the street scene and change the verdant character to the roads where houses are set well back behind landscaped front gardens and walled, hedged and treed front boundaries.</i></p> <p>Add additional photograph depicting development on a sub divided plot and accompanying text box: <i>Closely abutting two storey houses on sub-divided plots in a prominent location without adequate space between them or landscaped boundaries can appear out of character with the area.</i></p> <p>p. 331 2nd para Amend to: and two semi detached houses are set back from the west side of Shenden Way</p> <p>p 337 – Positive features. Amend to: Low brick or stone wall boundaries topped by hedging, or hedged boundaries or hedged boundaries front and side</p> <p>p. 337 - Negative features Amend to: Some new development has not respected the characteristic set back from the road or allowed adequate spacing between buildings</p> <p>p 184 Delete from text box at a medium density</p>
H Informal Lane			
Councillor Hunter	H05 Kippington Road Area p. 375, South Park should be Brittain's Lane		Factual amendment is proposed to the text: Recommended Change: Amend Wood Drive, off South Park to Wood Drive off Brittain's Lane
Packhorse Road Residents Association	H08 Packhorse Road The area is stated as covering Packhorse Road and Westerham Road but it appears that it also includes The Old Carriageway, some houses on The Old Garden and a part of Homedean Road and so we would suggest that it is appropriate to define the area accordingly.		The area includes The Old Carriageway, some houses on The Old Garden and part of Homedean Road and the text should be amended accordingly. It is appropriate to include the section of Westerham Road

<p>In addition as the area is included in the Informal Lane section we question that it is appropriate to include Westerham Road, which is mainly part of the A25 and as such not in any way of the same character as Packhorse Road. If Westerham Road is not to be excluded it should be made clear that the appearance of the two roads is very different and it should be clarified as to which comments relate to Packhorse Road and which relate to Westerham Road.</p> <p>Under the various sections we would comment as follows:</p> <p>Historical Context We would suggest that the word “infilled” on line 3 is substituted with the word “developed” as we believe that this is the meaning that the document is seeking to convey. It may also be worth adding “The houses are built in the former grounds of Chipstead Place and the junction where the road intersects with the A25 was the main entrance to Chipstead Place. Some houses back on to the former Chipstead Place tennis courts which now house Chipstead Tennis Club”</p> <p>Locally Distinctive Contextual Features Under Building Heights we suggest the reference to bungalows is deleted as there are no bungalows on Packhorse Road. If there are bungalows in some of the other roads we would suggest that the wording is revised to indicate their location.</p> <p>Area Characteristics We would recommend the additional wording at the end of the last sentence on page 396 “The appearance has been achieved by the properties being developed in line with the original covenants which required one house per plot built behind a defined building line.”</p> <p>On page 398 the existing comment about the Sunrise nursing home makes no sense. We would recommend that it is deleted and the following wording substituted “The height, design, stepped building, roof line and the much larger footprint of the nursing home close to the corner of Westerham Road does not fit with the general character of the area and therefore should not be taken as a precedent for future development in this area.” (You will recall that SDC refused this planning application)</p> <p>Detractors Please add an additional item “Garages or similar structures close to the front boundaries or in front gardens.”</p> <p>Locally Distinctive Positive Features Please delete the word “generally” from the first line of the second point. On point 4 please add the words “and where appropriate should be protected by TPOs.” Please also add the following points Packhorse Road is not adopted and is individually owned by each resident and maintained by the residents, collectively. Packhorse Road is bounded by 2 conservation areas to the north and the south and by the hard line boundary of a Green Belt area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to the</p>	<p>within the same character area as the rest of H08 Packhorse Road as it exhibits most of the characteristics of this character type including large individually designed well screened detached houses set well back from the road with generally a minimal impact on the street scene. Hedges and trees abut this part of the road and development is generally well hidden by vegetation and narrow entrances. The northern part of Westerham Road has no footway and an informal edge complements its rural character. As with other informal lanes, Westerham Road skirts the edge of Sevenoaks beyond which limited development is visible. The character of the part of the road included within the character area is unified not by the buildings themselves, but the verdant landscape framework and the discrete appearance of buildings. The illustrated text boxes already distinguish between individual roads and make clear their distinctive features.</p> <p>In relation to the historical context, the text correctly describes the process of infilling since the 1960s. The proposed additional historic context would add to the description of the area and should be added to the text.</p> <p>The reference within Building heights to ‘Two storeys with some bungalows’ is factually correct. The section does not emphasise bungalows as a principal building type. Indeed, the Locally Distinctive Positive Features section describes ‘large individually designed 2 storey detached houses are generally set back from the road behind hedged and treed front gardens’.</p> <p>Covenants are not a material planning consideration and are not therefore referred to within the individual character areas of the SPD. Nevertheless, they are part of the historical development of parts of Sevenoaks and reference to the Packhorse Road covenants should be made in section 6 of the SPD.</p> <p>In relation to the Sunrise nursing home, the larger footprint is broken up by the design, stepped building and roof line and materials and will be screened by landscaping to allow the building to more successfully respond to the character of this</p>
--	--

<p>west</p> <p>Negative Features For the second point please delete “on A25”</p> <p>Design Guidance In the first sentence of the first point please delete “infilled” and substitute “developed”. Please also delete the second sentence and substitute it with “Backland development should be discouraged as it will adversely impact on the feeling of spaciousness between the properties; it will increase the density of the properties in this area and therefore it will be contrary to the attractiveness and character of the area.” In the third point please add the words “and should therefore be resisted” at the end of the sentence. Delete the fifth point under “In proposing new development within the Packhorse Road Character Area” regarding backland development.</p>	<p>part of the road. Some revised text would help to clarify this point.</p> <p>In terms of an additional detractor, there is little evidence of garages or similar structures close to the front boundaries or in front gardens and for this reason, this is not recorded as a detractor to the character of the area.</p> <p>In relation to Locally Distinctive Positive Features the word generally can accurately be deleted from the second bullet point.</p> <p>The creation of TPOs is a matter for individual appraisal and justification outside of the SPD process.</p> <p>The setting of the Chipstead Conservation Area is already referred to in this section but reference to the built up area covered by the Bessels Green Conservation Area should be added.</p> <p>The SPD covers the built up area of the town and although the introduction of the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is mentioned, the document does not refer specifically to these designations which affect land beyond the built up area. .</p> <p>If the traffic noise is perceived to be a negative feature beyond the A25, then it is appropriate to delete the specific reference to the A25.</p> <p>In relation to design guidance, backland development is defined as development on land that lies to the rear of existing properties and is normally associated with small scale development (usually one or two plots). There is nothing in national guidance or the LDF against the principle of such development. For the SPD to oppose backland development in principle would be contrary to the planning policies and guidance which this document sets out to supplement. Such development need not result in the loss of the feeling of spaciousness between the properties and would be judged on its impact on the distinctive character of the area as set out in the SPD rather than a calculation of density. The addition of ‘and should therefore be resisted’ as</p>
--	--

suggested would not add to the design guidance.

Recommended Change:

Amend to **Comprising Packhorse Road, Westerham Road, The Old Carriageway, The Old Garden and Homedean Road (part)**

Amend Historical Context to: **Historically, Packhorse Road was where the packhorses plying the London to Hastings route were kept. Packhorse Road and this section of Westerham Road were laid out in the 1920s but the main development took place in the 1930s and has gradually been infilled to the present day. The houses were built in the former grounds of Chipstead Place whose main entrance was at the junction of Packhorse Road and the A25. Some houses back on to the former Chipstead Place tennis courts which now house Chipstead Tennis Club.**

Amend Section 6 Origins and Development of Sevenoaks, Riverhead, Dunton Green, Bessels Green and Chipstead to: **However in other areas, such as Kippington, Packhorse and Oakhill Roads, individual plots were sold for development often with covenants specifying the minimum value of the house and set back from the road.**

Amend text box to nursing home photograph to: **Although the footprint of the nursing home is larger than surrounding development, the property is located at the junction of two important roads where increased scale can be justified. The larger footprint is also broken up by the design, stepped building and roof lines and materials and will be screened by landscaping which allows the building to more successfully respond to the character of this part of the road.**

Amend text box page 397 to: **Individually designed detached houses on Westerham Road are set well back from the road and are accessed from narrow drives ensuring that the properties are unobtrusive behind a landscaped frontage. This part of the character area abuts the Bessels Green Conservation Area.**

		Amend Negative Features second point to: Traffic noise
Councillor Hunter	H14 Oak Avenue Area p. 417, the grammar is wrong in the historical context box	Amended text would clarify the historical context: Recommended Change: Amend text as follows: The area to the north of Grassy Lane and Oak Avenue were initially laid out above the railway line in the 1930s and have gradually been redeveloped and infilled up to the present day.
I Open Plan		
Councillor Hunter	I09 Beaconfields p.. 468, houses were built late 1960s, my house was built in 1968, not 1970s.	Factual amendment is proposed to the text: Recommended Change: Amend: Age of buildings to: Late 1960s - early 1970s
K Compact Terraced Character Areas		
Councillor Hunter	K03 Julians Close p. 556, the grammar is wrong, "They are" not "have flat frontage"	Amended text would clarify the meaning: Recommended Change: Amend to: The generally flat fronted facades are given relief by brick pillars supporting flat concrete porch canopies and white framed wide windows.
Dunton Green Parish Council	L03 The Sidings. Negative Features 'No significant detractors.' This is not entirely true. The Sidings and Station Approach is plagued by commuter parking during the week. The Sidings is mostly affected by parking of vehicles on and around the junction with Station Approach which, given resident complaints, would be viewed as a negative factor. If The Sidings was visited at the weekend this issue would not have been apparent as this is very much a weekday issue for residents.	Whilst commuter parking is considered a negative factor by residents, in visual terms, the parking issue is not considered significant to the area.
N Mixed Character		
Dunton Green Parish Council	N06 London Road/ Vicarage Lane. Views. The amenity open space referred to is the Rose Garden.	Factual amendment is proposed to the text: Recommended Change: Amend text box to: The Rose Garden amenity open space (foreground)
Dunton Green Parish Council	N07 London Road/ Kingswood Road Area. "Views. 'Panoramic views of open countryside extend northwards from Station Road.' There are NO panoramic views in any direction from Station Road. The photograph taken is from Rye Lane and the description is only applicable to Rye Lane. Station Road ceases at the railway bridge and becomes Rye Lane as you move eastwards (towards the entrance of the old WKCS site) beyond the railway bridge. Detractor. 'The commercial buildings along Station Road have little landscaping to screen the buildings and extensive hard standing.' This commercial building is NOT in Station Road, it is in Rye Lane.	Factual amendment is proposed to the text: Recommended Change: Amend Views to: Panoramic views of open countryside extend northwards from Rye Lane. Amend Detractor to: The commercial buildings along Rye Lane
Gillian Patterson	N09 Mill Lane/ Seal Road I live in section N09, in one of the 1932 semi-detached houses on the north side of Seal Road. I would be grateful if you could add the following details to this section of the document: Positive feature: panoramic view of North Downs, visible from car park on	The width of the pavement is not a matter for the SPD though the impact of traffic generally on the character of the area is mentioned.

	<p>corner of Seal Road/Grove Road, and a feature of nos 120/122/124 Seal Road. Probably from North Downs View as well. To be preserved. Negative feature: very narrow pavement on north side of Seal Road (extending westwards to Bat and Ball junction).I also have a query regarding the mill in section N09 - is it listed, and if not, are there measures in place to keep its external appearance intact?</p>	<p>The view is captured on the Townscape Map for A08 - Seal Road/ Greatness Road/ Grove Road but should be replicated on the B09 Townscape Map and added as a Locally Distinctive Positive Feature with its retention added as part of the Design Guidance.</p> <p>The Mill has been de-listed but the SPD seeks to retain the character of the original building.</p> <p>Recommended Change: Add to the Townscape Map View arrow to North Downs from Seal Road/Grove Road. Add an additional Locally Distinctive Positive Feature: View of the North Downs from Seal Road/Grove Road junction. Add additional Design Guidance: The view of the North Downs should be protected</p>
<p>Chevening Parish Council</p>	<p>Area N10 Bullfinch Close Area Should be sub-divided into North and South, to reflect this different character of development at each end of the road.</p>	<p>As with some other parts of the town, subdivision into smaller areas has allowed a closer definition of character. There is an opportunity to subdivide Area N10 into four separate character areas</p> <p>Recommended Change Revise Character Area N10 into: N10 - Chipstead Lane (Mixed Character Area) D09 – Bullfinch Close west (Garden City Influence Planned Development) K19 Bullfinch Close west (Compact Terraced and Apartments) M12 Bullfinch Dene (Clustered Cul de Sac Developments)</p>

Addendum Sheet

A minor amendment to the document has been requested by Chevening Parish Council. The request is to include a caveat about the size of potential new landmark buildings, to reflect the scale and character of the surrounding area. This relates to the following areas in Chipstead: I01 Nursery Place, I18 Chipstead Park, I19 Chesterfield Drive and I20 Springshaw Close.

The SPD identifies a number of landmark buildings within the character areas, and gives the reasons for defining the buildings (such as scale, location, use, materials). Some landmark buildings are listed buildings. Many have been identified on the walkabouts as locally important to the character of an area.

The SPD does not want to stifle the opportunity for future landmark buildings which can lift a design from the ordinary and may be justified on the basis of a sound urban design appraisal of their context and a perceived environmental uplift to the quality of the area. There may be townscape reasons when the scale of a building can be increased such as at a junction, or to create a feature at the end of a vista. For these reasons, particularly in areas of fairly monotonous townscape, or on the principal routes, the SPD accepts the principle for new landmark buildings.

However, for the four identified areas in Chipstead, which are all located in close proximity to conservation areas and listed buildings, we have proposed the following amendment (in bold) to satisfy the above concerns:

Recommended change to I01 Nursery Place, I18 Chipstead Park, I19 Chesterfield Drive and I20 Springshaw Close Design Guidance

The grain of the area with substantially built up frontages leaves little scope for new development and the area is likely to remain largely unchanged over time. There may be opportunities to enhance the area either through retrofitting some buildings not built to current energy efficiency standards (for example with new cladding, solar panels and added insulation) or through the creation of individual buildings of interest or additional landscape features. There may be merit in using such improvements to uplift indistinctive, standardised architecture and add a new distinctiveness to an area. Landmark buildings can lift a design from the ordinary and may be justified on the basis of a sound urban design appraisal of their context and a perceived environmental uplift to the quality of the area.
Any landmark building would need to be consistent with the scale and character of the surrounding residential area.

(this change appears on P.435 / 492 / 495 and 499 of the document)