

**Appendix 4**

**Schedule of Representations and Recommended Responses  
London Road Character Area**

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
Mr Ian Walsh		Bower Mount Residents Association	Observations	<p>Following consultation with our members concerning this assessment, we have the following comments for your consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are concerned at the lack of teeth for the document, in the face of developers' reluctance to accept conditions that will put up costs, leading to expensive appeals. A large number of the recommendations concerning, for example, scale, period features, maintenance of views and trees, will impose costs and it is important for the planning approvals process to be robust in defending the key features of the areas identified in the report.</li> <li>• The changes to planning regulations that make roofline and window amendments simply development control matters, will also prevent implementation of the recommendation that the 'form, materials and character of historic buildings' should be respected even in small scale detailing.</li> <li>• The boundaries of the area have been drawn to exclude the Kent County Council owned land in Oakwood Park. Whilst we can speculate on the possible reasons for this, the assessment of character should be blind to ownership. Oakwood Park is the dominant environmental feature of this part of Maidstone, with its mature trees, stone boundary walls and open vistas. In particular we are concerned that the boundary between Bower Mount Road and Oakwood Park has been too finely drawn to exclude the belt of trees running alongside the boundary and worth protecting. The map/text should be amended.</li> <li>• The emphasis on the requirement for development to reinforce the particular character of the area and the quality of the surface of roads and footpaths is to be welcomed. It is hoped that Kent Highways will find the funds to maintain the degraded surfaces</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Development Control staff have participated in the production of the SPD and will be responsible for implementing the document, which, once adopted as part of the Council's Local Development Framework, will be a material consideration when dealing with planning applications. The Bower Mount Residents Association will also be able to draw the Council's attention to relevant sections of the document as part of its scrutiny of planning applications.</p> <p>In relation to small scale planning applications, the SPD cross references the need to refer to the Borough Council's Residential Extensions SPD which the respondent would not have had the benefit of seeing at the time of making this response.</p> <p>The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.</p>	No changes required to the document

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>soon.</p> <p>We would also suggest that, on completion and approval of the report, the guidance therein is issued to residents by publication of a leaflet, including examples of good and poor practice and photomontages of what may be done. Residents are very aware of the benefits of improving their local environment, not least because of the effect on the value of their properties, and I am sure such information would be well received and ensure that the benefits of the money spent on the consultants' reports was maximized.</p>		
Ms Lorraine Smith		Natural England South East Region	Support	<p>Natural England welcomes the aim to protect and enhance landscape features within both the Loose Road Area and the London Road Area, in particular ensuring that tree belts, individual trees and open spaces are protected from loss through future development.</p> <p>Natural England believes green infrastructure should be at the heart of all development and recommends that such multifunctional greenspaces should be integral to all housing developments proposed within the Borough. We would draw the Council's attention to the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) . These standards recommend that people living in towns and cities should have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An accessible natural greenspace less than 300 metres from home;</li> <li>• Statutory, Local Nature Reserves at a minimum of one hectare per thousand of population;</li> <li>• At least one accessible, 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home; one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home and one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home.</li> </ul> <p>A recent study has looked at accessible natural greenspace</p>	The Council has already adopted green space standards in the Open Space DPD.	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				across the South East. You may find it useful to make reference the following publication "An Analysis of Accessible Natural Greenspace in the South East" which is available from this link. <a href="http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infid-7d4mgd">http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infid-7d4mgd</a>		
Mr David Mill			Object	<p>We note that Oakwood Court is not covered by this proposal while Pembury Gardens in a similar position is. When driving down Bower Mount Road Oakwood Court appears to be an extension of this important road.</p> <p>We should be included due to large expanse of ragstone walling which is adjacent the Methodist church and continues to 130 Tonbridge Road, also the backdrop of trees which enhance the view of the Methodist church and St Michaels.</p>	The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Observations	<p>Sustainability Appraisal and Sustainability Environmental Appraisal</p> <p>The Trust would suggest that Maidstone borough council consider formulating a number of positive features within the area and expectations relating to the increase of biodiversity.</p> <p>Sustainability Objectives</p> <p>Objective 2 Flood Alleviation</p> <p>The Trust would suggest that Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) be supplied within new development From an environmental standpoint this would increase permeability within the area and could alleviate flood risk.</p> <p>Objective 12 Climate Change</p> <p>Permeability within the built environment will assist species to move as a result of climate change. This would strengthen the Borough's resilience to the effects of climate change</p> <p>Objective 13 to conserve and enhance biodiversity</p>	The SPD is concerned with matters of design and other documents in the Local Development Framework will deal with wider development issues such as the incorporation of SUDs and biodiversity. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Maidstone Borough Biodiversity Action Plan which are both in preparation for publication next year are more appropriate vehicles for the suggestions provided, including areas of opportunity which will be examined in relation to the latter document.	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>Enhancements and permeability could be included within the SPD attracting wildlife into the urban environment bringing positive benefits for biodiversity and the population alike</p> <p>Objective 14</p> <p>Research has proved that access to wildlife within the urban environment increases population health and quality of life. For increased biodiversity to become a reality the SPD should include expectations of development as specified in question 8 and the Technical Biodiversity Appendix.</p>		
Mrs Susan Atkins			Support	We congratulate the Borough Council on commissioning this work, which seems to have been carried out very professionally and painstakingly. We hope it will be taken seriously as Supplementary Planning guidance to flesh out the LDF.	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr Jack Atkins			Support	Support the production of the Character Assessment and its use as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr Jack Atkins			Object	<p>Object to omission of land north of Leafy Lane and between London Road and the railway line as far north as the Queens Avenue junction. The omitted area is an integral part of this stretch of the London Road and is in urgent need of planning guidance in view of the impact of its users on the character of a busy and important route into the town. The adverse impact of the omitted area is mentioned on page 28 so why not formally include it as part of the Assessment Area.</p> <p>Oakwood Park is a very important open space in this part of the town and is also in urgent need of planning guidance in view of the impact of its various users on the character of the area. It should either be included within the Assessment Area and a</p>	<p>The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.</p>	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				response made to the impact of its use or it should be the subject of a separate assessment. In addition to its impact on its surroundings its own character is being progressively eroded by continuing development which should now be curtailed.		
Ms Lesley Cooke			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr Julian Dipper		Kent County Council (County Planning Authority)	Observations	I suggest that this section should explain why SPDs have been produced for only 'London Road, Bower Mount Road and Buckland Hill area' and 'Loose Road Area'. Is the intention to cover the whole of the urban area (and larger villages) with similar studies and if so, are these pilot studies for that longer term objective?	The SPDs are self-contained documents produced for the areas selected by Members who will decide on any future programme of SPDs based on the feedback report.	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr Julian Dipper		Kent County Council (County Planning Authority)	Observations	The four objectives are supported. However, these are a somewhat limited. Rather than just as an aid to providing design policies/guidance and development control decisions, the report could be more useful to the LDF as a whole if the conclusions on each of the character areas were to indicate the scope for change within them i.e. whether the character attributes of a character area are positive overall (implying emphasis on conservation), neutral, or negative (implying the need for enhancement or change of character which new development could bring). Such conclusions might be used to complement or reinforce the findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Employment Land Review in indicating the scope for development/redevelopment in significant parts of settlements. The evidence base for the LDF, about the choices made on the scale and distribution of development in particular parts of the main urban area or	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				smaller individual settlements, might thus be strengthened.		
Mrs Susan Atkins			Object	<p>Many of the character features identified both positive and negative, are of course the result of decisions made by property owners outside planning control. So surely one of the objectives of the SPG should also be to raise the awareness of the public, inspire and persuade them to make decisions which enhance the character (and the value of their property),also hopefully to shame them into avoiding, reversing or rectifying negative features. Otherwise the Borough Council can only preserve features or achieve enhancement when development requiring planning permission occurs, or where they are protected by Conservation Area designation or listing.</p> <p>This approach is surely within the spirit of the Government Guidance summarised in the next section which exhorts planning authorities to engage with local communities.</p>	The aims of the SPDs should be widened to include raising awareness (to cover changes which do not require planning consent) and to ensure successful outcomes on the ground.	<p>Page 3:</p> <p>Amend the second aim and add a further aim to both SPDs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To raise the awareness and provide design guidance on the appropriateness of, and potential for, types of development within an area</li> <li>To deliver improved designs on the ground which enhance the character of the area</li> </ul>
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr Jack Atkins			Support	Support, particularly the aim for it to assist in the appraisal of planning applications and future proposed allocations (substitute planning policies for allocations).	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Lesley Cooke			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support	In general I consider this to be a helpful document providing useful background to the assessment of future development proposals within the study area.	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support	The Trust recognises that much of this area is urban and built up, but the area also includes allotments often rich in reptile and invertebrate life and a number of parks, school grounds; church	The SPD is concerned with matters of design and other documents in the Local Development Framework will deal with wider development	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				a railway line and the river Medway which could be enhanced for biodiversity. The Trust would suggest identifying areas that could be enhanced be stated within this section.	issues such as the incorporation of SUDs and biodiversity. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Maidstone Borough Biodiversity Action Plan which are both in preparation for publication next year are more appropriate vehicles for the suggestions provided, including areas of opportunity which will be examined in relation to the latter document.	
Mr Julian Dipper		Kent County Council (County Planning Authority)	Observations	KCC notes that the SPD is to supplement Policy QL1 of the Kent and Medway Structure Plan. Whilst this is perfectly in order it should be noted that the Structure Plan now has a limited life as it will be superseded by the Regional Spatial Strategy ;'The South East Plan' within a few months.	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mrs Susan Atkins			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Lesley Cooke			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mrs Susan Atkins			Support	The general approach and level of detail are such as to engage the public in good design decision making. A more technical or overly analytical approach might be off-putting.	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs David and			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
Penny Harris						
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Lesley Cooke			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support	<p>The Trust recommends that consideration of biodiversity, permeability or enhancement is included within the methodology. The site survey mentions the open spaces present and the Trust would recommend that consideration be given to their potential for biodiversity enhancement.</p> <p>The key characteristics, habitats have been mapped and the Trust welcomes the retention of the network of tree lines and hedges. Although important to wildlife they are not the only factor which can be enhanced for biodiversity within the urban environment. There is much potential within the open spaces for the incorporation of corridors and stepping stones and permeability could be requested within all new development and where possible within the built environment present.</p>	<p>The SPD is concerned with matters of design and other documents in the Local Development Framework will deal with wider development issues such as the incorporation of SUDs and biodiversity. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Maidstone Borough Biodiversity Action Plan which are both in preparation for publication next year are more appropriate vehicles for the suggestions provided, including areas of opportunity which will be examined in relation to the latter document.</p>	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mrs Susan Atkins			Object	<p>The consultation exercise has left a good deal to be desired. I became aware of it from a LDF email, from 'Downsmail' and from political parties' newsletters. Well and good, but when I set out to look at a paper copy of the Assessment, (97 pages on screen is too much) the new Borough Council reception desk knew nothing of the documents, nor did the person sent down from the Planning Department to talk to me. In fact she admitted she had never heard of it. The Planning Officer I was referred to had had evidently had to obtain a very rapid briefing from someone in Policy. No paper copy seemed to be available, and I was urged to access it online. When I later rang up the</p>	<p>Noted. Development Control staff have participated in the production of the SPD and a training event is proposed with them to launch the adopted document.</p> <p>Street enhancements will be implemented through negotiations with developers and detailed discussions with utility companies would occur where relevant.</p>	No changes required to the Assessment.



Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>contact number given, I only ever got a voicemail. Eventually I was offered a free copy, but it took several days to arrive, and then the package only contained the Sustainability Report! I found a copy of all the papers in Allington Library and after another phone call was presented with a copy at the exhibition, but a less persistent resident might have given up.</p> <p>The point of repeating all this is that if even the Borough Council's own staff are not aware of the exercise, what are the prospects for informing and engaging the general public, and secondly, what are the chances of the SPG being taken seriously in the control of development? Will DC officers receive good briefing on and required to refer to the SPG when considering planning applications?</p> <p>Street enhancement will require the co-operation of utility companies and the highway authorities - I trust they have are aware of the exercise and are on board? The document could clarify this.</p>		
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Lesley Cooke			Observations	Information is getting through to public, but something concise and clear to explain project and encourage general public involvement would have promoted participation.	Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
Mrs Susan Atkins			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Object	We feel the Oakwood Park area has historically been important influencing the Bower Mount Road. For example, we believe the mature trees along the fronts of houses on Bower Mount Road West, backs of the gardens and elsewhere around Oakwood Park were all part of the old estate.	The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Lesley Cooke			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mrs Susan Atkins			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Object	We think this document is very useful. It would have been great to have had it some ten or twenty years ago. Also we feel one is needed to cover the area of Oakwood Park as it is under severe development pressure. And it has a direct bearing on the character of Bower Mount Road, from the point of view of the height of the land - overlooking Bower Mount Road and the trees.	The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Ms Lesley Cooke			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
Helen Davison						
Mr James Forster			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr Julian Dipper		Kent County Council (County Planning Authority)	Object	<p>8.2 KCC property Group wishes to make the following points.</p> <p>The Baptist Church site is in the London Road North Character Area. (There is an adjacent area that includes Brunswick House School).</p> <p>The assessment of character of the London Road North area does not specifically mention the Baptist Church site, although views to the N. Downs are mentioned, from the adjacent leafy Lane/A20 junction and across the top of the retail warehouse units opposite. The bank of trees on the Leafy Lane side of the KCC site are shown on the SPD reference plan.</p> <p>We should support the proposal on Pp 26 that development will be expected to respond to the scale, height, form, mass alignment, materials and character of historic buildings. The reason is that the ABC site has capacity to accept 3-4 storey development and is currently an unsightly feature making no contribution to the character that has been evaluated in the document as being worth retaining.</p> <p>Generally however we regard the references to the detailed design of existing historic buildings as too limiting to designers for new buildings, stifling modern design and initiatives. We support the intention to reinforce the ragstone walling on London Road and appreciate that there is a predominance of yellow stock brick in the area of course, but nothing should be done to prescribe the type of designs that are regarded as capable of responding to the context.</p>	<p>The remarks appear somewhat contradictory. Nothing in the document prescribes designs – rather the key visual cues which provide the distinctive local character and context for new development are set out and appropriate responses to that context are for the designer.</p>	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mrs Susan Atkins			Object	Omissions:	The document deliberately does not distinguish between the importance of the character of some	Pages 43 and 50:

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>I am mainly concerned here with Queens Road and London Road. Along with Queens Avenue, Bower Mount Road, Buckland Hill and Somerfield Road these character areas are all more important than the other minor character areas in terms of defining the wider area's special character and providing local distinctiveness, not just for local residents, but for the wider public and to the character of the town as a whole. They are much more vulnerable to loss or erosion of character than modern cul de sacs and estates.</p> <p>Whilst the consultants have picked up on most of the existing features which are important to the character of the areas surveyed, as a long term resident I am aware of some omissions. I realise that the Assessment can only be a snapshot in time, and of course the surveyors will not necessarily be aware of some past changes and current trends affecting the area's character, which worry residents.</p> <p>Most residents will be worried about traffic and parking issues which I agree are to some extent matters which can only be addressed in the wider planning context. However there are problems specific to this area, particularly those caused by over-development of Oakwood Park, drawing in excessive amounts of school and other traffic and university parking. This could be noted.</p> <p>Even more important to the areas' future character is the threat of losing the remaining large Victorian and early 20th century villas set in large gardens, with their ragstone and brick walls - often 6 feet high, mature front gardens and trees. Several have already been completely lost and replaced with standardised flats and houses.. Notable examples include two beautiful ragstone villas at the London Road end of Queens Road (one was called 'Akiva'), now replaced with Greyfriars Close; Etom House on Queens Road near Warden Close; now replaced with a block of flats; Brunswick House in Buckland Road; and the property adjacent to 'Pippins' on London Road. Efforts to retain</p>	<p>areas in comparison with others. Rather, each area has a distinct character to which new development will be expected to respond and, where possible, enhance. Other than this respondent, local residents have not responded that the named areas were more important than others.</p> <p>Traffic matters are noted as negative features in 8.1 Tonbridge Road/ London Road South; 8.2 London Road North and 8.8 Buckland Hill Character Areas. Additional text in relation to traffic in the Bower Mount Road Character Areas is proposed.</p> <p>Large Victorian and early 20th century villas set in large gardens, with ragstone and brick walls mature front gardens and trees are mentioned in the contextual and positive features and appropriate policy criteria are included in the SPD. In relation to ragstone walls, the text could clarify that the retention of traditional boundary treatment of walls and mature landscape refers to loss or reduction of these features.</p> <p>In relation to extensions, the SPD cross references the need to refer to the Borough Council's Residential Extensions SPD which the respondent would not have had the benefit of seeing at the time of making this response. The Borough Council is now preparing a Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document which, in addition to the Character Area Assessment SPDs will be available on the website and also seeks to raise awareness of good design.</p> <p>There is a distinct break in the character of London Road between the Rocky Hill</p>	<p>For areas 8.4 Bower Mount Road South Character Area and</p> <p>8.5 Bower Mount Road North Character Area, add the following additional bullet point to the Negative Features text box:</p> <p>Traffic associated with school or cutting between London Road and Tonbridge Road</p> <p>Pages 44 and 50:</p> <p>Add an additional paragraph on Traffic:</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>The issue of traffic, whilst affecting the character of the area, is beyond the scope of this SPD. Wider proposals will be brought forward by the relevant authorities which should aim at improving the residential amenity within the area.</p> <p>Amend each section of the SPDs:</p> <p>Retain traditional boundary treatment of walls and mature</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>the front walls and trees have been appreciated, but in some cases the walls have ended up lower than previously, exposing ugly car park areas and rubbish bins instead of gardens, and some important trees have been lost. The development at 'Cedardale' in Queens Road is current example.</p> <p>While the retention of many larger properties as old age care homes has helped to retain the spacious leafy feel in the street scene, extensions into their rear gardens has in some cases resulted in a threat to the character of neighbouring properties. Examples include buildings at the rear of Bower Mount Road properties which now threaten the viability of Somerfield Road's spacious character, and at the care home near the junction of Queens Road and Langdale Rise.</p> <p>Suggested Conservation Area:</p> <p>Bearing in mind my point made under Section 2, that loss of important character features and unsympathetic alterations by property owners can occur any time, without any planning or other control, there are surely some features which are identified as so important as landmarks, not just to the survey areas but to the town as a whole that need more formal protection. In particular, I feel that the remaining unlisted large villas on London Road should be protected. If they do not qualify for listing, or even if they do, the existing Conservation Area at Terrace Road should be extended at least to Somerfield Hospital and Fanum House,(listed building on the corner of London Road and Queens Road now part of Brachers) -with possible extensions also considered, for instance along Bower Mount Road north.</p> <p>Perhaps the only way to preserve our ragstone walls is to list them all? The ragstone barn and wall in Oakwood Road at the former school farm, important landmarks just outside the survey area, are now neglected and partially demolished either by KCC or the developers - an example of what can happen.</p>	<p>Conservation Area and the area being proposed as a conservation area (as defined by different character areas). Most of the buildings fronting London Road in the area proposed are either listed buildings or are modern development and not in keeping with the character of the historic buildings. Other areas lack sufficient cohesive architectural or historic character to justify Conservation Area status. For these reasons, there is no justification for an extension of the conservation area.</p> <p>Trees - in the roadside verge on Queens Road between Court Drive and Warden Close are an important feature which should be added to the Townscape Analysis Map.</p> <p>The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.</p>	<p>landscape</p> <p>Development should not erode this unique feature along this strategic approach to the town through the loss, or reduction, of walls, hedges/ trees or the use of unsympathetic boundary treatment such as close boarded fences or brick walls.</p> <p>Page 74:</p> <p>Add trees - in the roadside verge on the north side of Queens Road between Court Drive and Warden Close to the Queens Road Townscape Analysis Map.</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>Other Detailed Omissions:</p> <p>Trees - in the roadside verge on Queens Road between Court Drive and Warden Close should be marked as feature and subject to a TPO, if not already. They are extremely important to the leafy character of the road. Also there has been a loss of trees in front gardens of large houses lower down Queens Road - re-instatement would be good.</p> <p>Queens Ave - the boundary of the character area is illogical. The special character of this road applies to both sides equally. Far too few feature trees are shown in Queens Ave. The threat of further plot subdivision and loss of character buildings applies to both sides of the road.</p> <p>Somerfield Road is part of an important pedestrian route and its spacious leafy character has been subject to much pressure over the years. There are several large older character properties in addition to the old Vicarage and other landmark features identified. 'Rockstow' is as important as the Vicarage, and perhaps should be listed, if it not already. Possibly this road should be included in the Conservation Area suggested above.</p>		
Mr Ian Walsh		Bower Mount Residents Association	Object	<p>In Bower Mount Road South Character Area in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The characteristic 'Retain or create defensible space', present in the North Character Area, has been left out. We believe this to be an error rather than a deliberate omission. For example Cornwallis Park could be significantly affected by this oversight.</li> <li>The absence of any mention of the allotments behind Cornwallis Road/Bower Mount Road/Bower Street. This is an important feature in the Area; well used, well respected and providing a delightful green enclave that is under pressure from developers for infilling.</li> </ul>	<p>The Bower Mount Road South Character Area contains some open plan frontages and it would be appropriate to add an additional criterion to cover this point.</p> <p>The allotments behind Cornwallis Road/Bower Mount Road/Bower Street are not visually prominent from the public domain and are consequently not highlighted as a key feature which should be retained.</p> <p>The Leylandii is not a native tree characteristic of this area and is not specifically included as a feature worthy of protection.</p>	<p>Page 43:</p> <p>Add additional criterion:</p> <p>When assessing development proposals within the Bower Mount Road South Character Area, the Borough Council will expect development to:</p> <p>Retain or create defensible space</p> <p>Clear definition of space</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the trees at the south end on the corner with Oakwood Road and those opposite the Cornwallis Road junction are singled out as important, as well as, surprisingly, the Leylandii adjacent to Scrubbs Lane, the remaining belt of Douglas fir trees along the west side of Bower Mount Road are not mentioned and should be added to the map. Some of these are the subject of protection orders.</li> <li>• The highlighting of 18A Cornwallis Road as a detractor in the report seems harsh, even though the property it is actually rather bland.</li> </ul> <p>In Bower Mount Road North Character Area in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mention of 'Seeking streetscape enhancement'. This would appear to be an omission as the poor streetscape in Bower Close is commented on.</li> <li>• Many residents are more than happy with the open layout of Whitchurch Close, although the report author criticises it for reducing 'defensible space'. The public areas seem to be well overlooked by properties and the presence of strangers on foot is readily visible.</li> <li>• The attractiveness of the ragstone boundary wall on the west side at the north end is noted, as it has been at risk.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst the Association welcomes the descriptions and analysis, we think that some recommendations are unrealistic. For example the space available for planting specimen trees, e.g. Page 44 b) is very limited. It could be better rephrased as 'replace existing mature trees with similar approved tree species when they reach the end of their current lives'. Maidstone Borough Council may like to consider tree grants for this purpose.</p>	<p>The remaining belt of Douglas fir trees along the west side of Bower Mount Road are important to the character of the area and have been added to the Townscape Map.</p> <p>It is important that 18A Cornwallis Road is not used as a precedent for future designs and therefore a specific mention is justified.</p> <p>There are no specific examples of public realm improvements identified which would merit seeking streetscape enhancement other than through the criteria already set out in the SPD.</p> <p>The Borough Council is keen to see replacement of specimen trees wherever possible.</p>	<p>enables residents to exercise control over their environment and to know who should or should not be there. There are examples where open frontages are created to the road leaving no definition of the space, reducing security and privacy.</p> <p>Wherever possible, private space should be defined by a boundary – characteristically a ragstone wall topped by hedge or trees in this area.</p> <p>Page 41:</p> <p>Add Douglas fir trees along the west side of Bower Mount Road to the Townscape Map.</p>
Ms Kirsty Lidington	David Hicken Associates		Object	KCC - Property Group currently own the Allington Baptist Church site at the corner of London Road and Leafy Lane and	Nothing in the document prescribes designs – rather the key visual cues which provide the	Page 23:

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>therefore have an interest in the SPD in terms of the way in which it may influence future development potential for their site. As framework consultants for KCC Property Group, we therefore make the following comments on the draft SPD on behalf of our client.</p> <p>The Allington Baptist Church site is not mentioned specifically within the SPD which we address below when considering the SPD proposals, yet the site is the one readily available development opportunity in the area, containing only temporary buildings in poor condition. Its corner position also means that it is potentially important in reinforcing the areas character. The site is however shown on the Townscape Map at Page 25 as containing a tree screen along the northern boundary with Leafy Lane. This bank of trees is subject of a number of TPO's and its importance in screening and landscape effect is noted and supported.</p> <p>The area around the Queens Road/Leafy Lane/London Road crossroads is of particular interest as it provides the context of built form for the Allington Baptist Church Site. At page 23 the SPD recognises the Kingsgate development on the corner of Queens Road and London Road, opposite the Allington Baptist Church site as a landmark building and it is acknowledged that at four storeys its scale and height are appropriate to its prominent position. 1-4 storey development is recognised as being a contextual feature and this is supported as it provides confirmation of the scale and height context to which future development can compare.</p> <p>At Page 26 it is proposed at sub paragraph a) that new development in the London Road North Character Assessment Area be required to respond to the scale, height, form, mass, alignment, materials and character of historic buildings. The Allington Baptist Church site currently presents modern development that does nothing to respond to these broad contextual aspects and makes no contribution to the historic</p>	<p>distinctive local character and context for new development are set out and appropriate responses to that context are for the designer.</p> <p>The loss of enclosure on Queens Road junction, and reference to some modern buildings on London Road lacking height are already listed as negative features within the character area. However, specific reference should be made to the important site of Allington Church and the opportunity for enhancement.</p>	<p>Add a paragraph after the Kingsgate reference:</p> <p>The Allington Baptist Church site currently presents a low rise modern development which is out of scale with surrounding development and does not respond to contextual features such as the prominent building materials or boundary treatment.</p> <p>Add detractor symbol to the site on the Townscape Analysis Map.</p> <p>Page 28:</p> <p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>a) Replacing or screening features which detract</p> <p>Road junctions form nodal points for the area where development is often given greater scale to signify the importance of the intersection. Opposite Kingsgate, at this important junction, there is a void of space formed by a large sunken car park set well below the road level. Although some trees are growing on the slope down to the car park, it will be a long time before they</p>



Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>character evaluated in the SPD as being worth retaining. The site presents the opportunity to provide a more appropriate and harmonious development and the proposed requirement is therefore welcomed.</p> <p>Having said this however, there are numerous references made to individual listed and historic buildings along the northern part of London Road and in particular to their detailed design. Whilst the protection and enhancement of the character and integrity of the historic environment in this location is supported and should be respected it is considered that to adhere rigidly to these existing historic aspects of design would be limiting for designers when creating new buildings and would stifle modern design initiatives. Referring in such detail to the various architectural merits of the historic buildings, promotes pastiche development which does not allow for progression and goes against basic urban design principles. It is felt that the role of the SPD should not be to prescribe the type of designs that are regarded as capable of responding to context.</p> <p>At sub paragraph b) on page 27 it is recognised that ragstone walls are a prevalent feature along London Road and later on at page 29 sub paragraph c) it is proposed to reinforce the landscape character of this area with ragstone boundary walls. This is supported.</p> <p>At page 28, subparagraph a) it is proposed that the Borough Council will seek improvements to the character of the North London Road area by replacing or screening features that detract. In particular the void of space that is formed by the sunken car park of the retail outlets opposite Kingsgate is identified as an area in need of development to enclose the space at the junction. Whilst this corner is desirable for development of a landmark building to signify the importance of the intersection, it is unlikely to become available. It is considered that the Allington Baptist Church site on the corner of Leafy Lane should also be included in this section as it is</p>		<p>enclose the junction at this point. Enhancement would be brought about if the space were to be developed (provided sufficient alternative parking was available and the new development was well designed and respected the character of the area). Similarly, the site of Allington Church is a low rise modern development which is out of scale with surrounding development and enhancement could be brought about by the redevelopment of the site provided the new development was well designed and respected the character of the area. The location at this junction makes these sites appropriate for new landmark buildings.</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				equally suitable for development of a landmark building and I available. The site is currently under-developed with small scale development that does not contribute to the grander forms of development at this intersection which the Borough Council considers are appropriate. Furthermore, development of the Allington Baptist Church Site has the ability to bring the footbridge over London Road into better scale with the townscape generally and with the substantial trees already identified near the site. We would therefore request that the Allington Baptist Church site be specifically identified at this section as constituting a site that detracts from the streetscene but which is appropriate and capable of accommodating a landmark style development.		
Mr Jack Atkins			Support	<p>Page 15: Strongly support the requirement that proposals should be accompanied by a design statement that explains how those proposals respond to the assessment.</p> <p>Page 75: Strongly support the identification of Ragstone walls as a positive feature in Queens Road (and in other parts of the Assessment Area) and the need for this unique feature not to be eroded. This protection should also include the prevention proposals to lower the wall as has occurred at the property between Littleton and The Knoll Queens Road.</p>	<p>Pages 15 and 75: Noted.</p> <p>In relation to ragstone walls, the text could clarify that the retention of traditional boundary treatment of walls and mature landscape refers to loss or reduction of such features.</p>	<p>Amend each section of the SPDs:</p> <p>Retain traditional boundary treatment of walls and mature landscape</p> <p>Development should not erode this unique feature along this strategic approach to the town through the loss, or reduction, of walls, hedges/ trees or the use of unsympathetic boundary treatment such as close boarded fences or brick walls</p>
Mr Jack Atkins			Object	<p>Page 23: In addition to the poor quality street furniture, the frequent attachment of advertising banners to the railings which border the highway at this point also adds to the clutter which disfigures this prominent location on a major route into the town. The Assessment should refer to this and set out the Council's intention to take enforcement action against illegal advertising.</p>	<p>Page 23: The temporary use of advertising does not significantly affect the overall character of the London Road North area.</p> <p>Page 35: The allotments between Bower Mount Road and Bower Street are not visually prominent from the public domain and are consequently not highlighted as a key feature which should be</p>	<p>Page 35:</p> <p>Within Positive Features text box:</p> <p>Amend text to Open space of the Scrubbs Lane allotments.</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>Page 35: The Assessment identifies the open space of the allotments to the rear of Bower Mount Road and Bower Street as a positive feature but contains no commitment to protect this feature. This omission should be rectified.</p> <p>Page 50: The Nursing Home curtilage is listed as a negative feature but is not identified on the map as a detractor.</p> <p>Page 53: The requirement that development should not erode these features through the loss of trees or the generation of traffic should add that the glass houses or the wall mentioned in the previous paragraph will also be protected.</p> <p>Page 74: The map does not include the trees in the grass verge on the north west side of Queens Road between Court Drive and Warden Close. These are important to the character of Queens Road and should be shown and protected by a Tree preservation Order if they are not already.</p> <p>Page 76: The box of negative features should include the large tarmaced car parks in the frontages of the property referred to in the previous paragraph and 327 Queens Road, the latter including a large unsightly refuse bin prominently located on the frontage boundary. The policy response should make it clear that such car parking will be resisted as harmful to the character of the area and also that proposals for the change of use of family homes to institutional uses such as residential care establishments will be resisted because they are likely to result in pressures for large areas of car parking to the detriment of the character of the area.</p> <p>The paragraph on traffic should give some indication of what these wider proposals are, who is preparing them, when they will be published and when we will be consulted on them.</p>	<p>retained. However, the Scrubbs Lane allotments are such a feature, offering long views from this compact residential area to open countryside to the north east. This area of open space should be protected and text should be amended to clarify.</p> <p>Page 50: The Nursing Home curtilage should be shown on the Townscape Analysis Map as a detractor.</p> <p>Page 53: The value of the glass houses is mentioned as part of the low key buildings set well back from the road which contribute to the character of this area and further clarification about the character of any new development should be added to the text.</p> <p>Page 74: trees in the grass verge on the north west side of Queens Road between Court Drive and Warden Close should be added to the Townscape Analysis Map.</p> <p>Page 76: Agree addition of the negative feature to the text box.</p> <p>It should be clear from the text that such car parking is a detractor and should not set a precedent for future development. The SPD cannot prevent the change of use of family homes to institutional uses such as residential care establishments as a matter of principle. However, any conversions should comply with the criteria in the SPD which include protecting traditional boundary treatment of walls and mature landscape and landscape features.</p>	<p>Page 36:</p> <p>Add additional criterion in 8.3 Bower Street Character Area:</p> <p>When assessing development proposals within the Bower Street Character Area, the Borough Council will expect development to:</p> <p>Protect Landscape Features</p> <p>The appraisal identifies a number of individual trees and open spaces, including the Scrubbs Lane allotments which are visible from the public domain (shown on the Townscape Analysis Map) which perform an important function within the Character Area and which should be protected.</p> <p>Page 47:</p> <p>Add The Nursing Home curtilage as a detractor on the Bower Mount Road North Townscape Analysis Map.</p> <p>Page 53:</p> <p>Amend text in 8.6 Somerfield Road Character Area:</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
						<p>When assessing development proposals within the Somerfield Road Character area, the Borough Council will expect development to:</p> <p>b) Respect the informal rural character of Somerfield Road</p> <p>The character is created through the informal layout of the road, with no pavements for lengths of the road, low key buildings set well back, often behind trees, and retained historic buildings such as glass houses and a coach house topped with a weather vane next to an old brick wall which forms the rear boundary of a Victorian house in Bower Mount Road.</p> <p>Development should not erode these unique features through the loss of trees, or the generation of substantial additional traffic that would cause the erosion of the boundary features. New development should comprise unobtrusive buildings set well back from the road.</p> <p>Page 47: Add trees on the north west</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
						<p>side of Queens Road between Court Drive and Warden Close to the Bower Mount Road North Townscape Analysis Map.</p> <p>Page 76:</p> <p>Add: Large tarmaced car parks in the frontages of properties to the Negative Features Text box</p>
Mr & Mrs David and Penny Harris			Object	<p>A distinction should be made between historic (the mass of Edwardian and Victorian) properties in Bower Mount Road and developments of buildings within the last 2 decades. Section (b) refers to clues in new designs (paragraph 2) being used as reference for future development. We are concerned that some of the newer developments, e.g. Beaverbrook Mews and Oakwood Court, are OUT of character with the majority of Edwardian and Victorian housing in terms of height and density and architectural style. We are concerned that these should not be used as a model for future developments.</p> <p>The Douglas Firs should be picked out on the street plan as character trees. They run along the west side of Bower Mount Road South from the corner of Oakwood Road to Scrubs Lane and are situated in many, but not all, of the front gardens of these properties (see picture on page 37 which shows these Douglas Firs). There are also many character trees bordering the Bower Mount Road South area where it joins Oakwood Park KCC land.</p> <p>On page 39 in the first paragraph, Beaverbrook Mews is described as fitting in well in terms of bulk and height. However this is not our assessment of this recent development. From the back of the houses on the east side of Bower Mount Road the height is imposing. From the rear of houses on</p>	<p>The SPD expects development to respond sensitively to the positive features listed in the SPDs, including the character of historic buildings and states that following clues from past developments in new designs will help retain local distinctiveness and guard against development with no local references. The SPD distinguishes between positive and negative features. Far from setting a precedent for future development, isolated properties which are out of keeping with the general character of the area are noted as areas of opportunity which, over time, may provide an opportunity for more sensitive redevelopment. However, it is proposed to clarify the text further to remove any ambiguity.</p> <p>The Douglas Firs and other mature garden trees which include holly and silver birch should be added to the Bower Mount Road South Townscape Analysis Map along the west side of Bower Mount Road South</p> <p>The SPD is concerned with the character of an area from the public domain. From the sloping Cornwallis Road, the bulk, height and other</p>	<p>Amend text throughout the SPDs. Replace:</p> <p>'Following such clues in new designs will help retain and enhance local distinctiveness... '</p> <p>with</p> <p>"Following such clues when designing new development will help retain and enhance local distinctiveness..."</p> <p>Page 41: Add Feature trees to the Bower Mount Road South Townscape Analysis Map along the west side of Bower Mount Road South.</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				Pembury Gardens, they are completely out of scale where the bedrooms are on the same level as the ground floor of the Beaverbrook development. Also the density of houses and miniscule garden space is far from in keeping with the surrounding area.	features of Beaverbrook are considered broadly acceptable in relation to the general character of the street.	
Ms Lesley Cooke			Object	Page 28 Re: buildings lacking height. I disagree that development should be 3 storeys and pitched roofs, etc. E.g. Kingsgate is too high and too close to the road, creating an overwhelming, monolithic structure. Also, the newer development (where there was a single bungalow in a dip, surrounded by lawn and trees) is now overdeveloped with particularly unprepossessing flats of similar height. Apart from the unappealing look of these developments, the infrastructure in terms of roads is not designed to cope with increase in rush-hour traffic the increase in residents brings.	<p>Most of the grander historic buildings located along London Road are 3 storeys high - some with tall steeply pitched roofs with gable ends facing the road giving greater scale.</p> <p>Within a document which aims to identify the distinctive features that define the local character, and seeks high quality designs which place emphasis on the local context, it is important to record such features.</p> <p>The scale of buildings is appropriate for this strategic route into town, reflecting the importance of the road and the imminence of the town centre.</p> <p>In townscape terms a landmark building is appropriate at the junction which forms an important intersection of routes. Kingsgate has responded to visual clues from existing development in terms of height, steep gable ends and materials. The bulk of the building is not monolithic. The location of the flats may be outside the pilot area.</p> <p>The SPD is concerned with matters of design and other documents in the Local Development Framework will deal with the impacts of development on local infrastructure.</p>	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr & Mrs Eric and Marion Churchyard			Observations	8.7 - Tree symbol should be moved to garden of no. 2 Kingsdown Close, i.e. two properties N and in W top L.H. corner.	Agreed.	Page 56: Amend Kingsdown Close Townscape Analysis Map to move the tree symbol to the garden of no. 2

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				Contextual features - Age of buildings should read "1938 to present day".		Kingsdown Close.  Page 55: Amend Contextual Features - Age of Buildings to 1930s to present day.
Mr & Mrs Nigel and Helen Davison			Support		Noted	No changes required to the Assessment.
Mr James Forster			Support	<p>As a resident of Bower Mount Road I believe the principal features of the road have been identified, although it appears that the document attached no great significance to the mature trees in the front gardens of houses. The Townscape Analysis Map identifies feature trees at the Oakwood Court junction but other individual trees provide additional definition to the character of the area.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the document is concerned with development within the study area this does have the drawback of excluding guidance on the assessment of proposals immediately outside this area. Specifically any further development at Oakwood Park (which lies on the boundary of area 8.4) could potentially have a much more significant impact on the character of Bower Mount Road than development within the study area itself.</p> <p>In a number of character areas (e.g. areas 8.8 and 8.14) reference is made to the adverse effects of traffic. There is no such reference in relation to Bower Mount Road although there are already significant traffic movements from outside the study area either accessing the schools at Oakwood Park or rat running between London Road and Tonbridge Road. I believe traffic represents the greatest risk to the character of Bower Mount Road, and that it would therefore be helpful to include the effect of traffic as a consideration in the assessment of future planning proposals.</p> <p>The character of other parts of the study area has been adversely</p>	<p>The mature trees in the front gardens facing Bower Mount Road should be added to the Townscape Analysis Map along the west side of Bower Mount Road South.</p> <p>The Pilot area was selected by Members as the appropriate area for the SPD. There may be an opportunity for the adjoining area to be included in a future SPD should Members decide to extend the pilot to other parts of Maidstone.</p> <p>Traffic associated with school or cutting between London Road and Tonbridge Road is a local issue which could be mentioned in the negative features text box.</p> <p>The SPD cannot prevent conversion of single properties into flats as a matter of principle. However, any conversions should comply with the criteria in the SPD which include protecting traditional boundary treatment of walls and mature landscape and landscape features.</p>	<p>Page 41:</p> <p>Add Feature trees to the Bower Mount Road South Townscape Analysis Map along the west side of Bower Mount Road South</p> <p>Pages 43 and 50:</p> <p>For areas 8.4 Bower Mount Road South Character Area and</p> <p>8.5 Bower Mount Road North Character Area, add the following additional bullet point to the Negative Features text box:</p> <p>Traffic associated with school or cutting between London Road and Tonbridge Road</p> <p>Pages 43 and 50:</p> <p>Add an additional paragraph on Traffic:</p>

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				affected by splitting relatively large houses into separate flats. Hopefully any proposals for this form of development in Bower Mount Road could be resisted.		Traffic  The issue of traffic, whilst affecting the character of the area, is beyond the scope of this SPD. Wider proposals will be brought forward by the relevant authorities which should aim at improving the residential amenity within the area.
Miss Debbie Salmon		Kent Wildlife Trust	Support	<p>Consideration should be given to biodiversity maintenance, enhancement and permeability. The Trust acknowledges that this is an urban area and welcomes the retention of the hedges, trees and tree lines, but there are more opportunities for wildlife that retaining the hedge system enhancement of open spaces by providing natural corridors or stepping stones wild flower rich verges and enhancement of green space and gardens within new development, which will attract wildlife into the urban setting providing contact with nature for the population.</p> <p>DESIGN PRINCIPLES</p> <p>Within the design principles the Trust would recommend that permeability and enhancement be mentioned as a design principle of new development.</p> <p>BIODIVERSITY AND PERMEABILITY FEATURES AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY</p> <p>This should include :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to increase biodiversity as laid out in The Kent Design Guide Biodiversity Technical Appendix to be found at <a href="http://www.kent.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/559D0301-726C-440E-A77E-0F989AD8368C/0/Biodiversity.pdf">http://www.kent.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/559D0301-726C-440E-A77E-0F989AD8368C/0/Biodiversity.pdf</a>.</li> </ul>	The SPD is concerned with matters of design and other documents in the Local Development Framework will deal with wider development issues such as the incorporation of SUDs and biodiversity. The Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Maidstone Borough Biodiversity Action Plan which are both in preparation for publication next year are more appropriate vehicles for the suggestions provided, including areas of opportunity which will be examined in relation to the latter document.	No changes required to the Assessment.



Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>Designs to increase biodiversity within open spaces such as playing fields, parks, school grounds, churchyards, allotments, roadside verges and country lanes</p> <p>Positive biodiversity features and habitats could be identified within the document.</p> <p>If the built environment is to be intensified it is highly likely that green spaces, gardens, waste ground and verges will be lost to wildlife. The Trust would wish to refer Maidstone Borough Council to Let Our Gardens Live whose aims the Trust fully endorse  <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/campaigns/breathingplaces/Documents/garden-manifesto.pdf">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/campaigns/breathingplaces/Documents/garden-manifesto.pdf</a></p> <p>AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY IDENTIFIED FROM THE LONDON ROAD CHARACTER AREA ASSESSMENT</p> <p>8.1 Tonbridge Road and London Road South</p> <p>St Michaels Churchyard</p> <p>All Angels Churchyard</p> <p>Spiritualist Church grounds</p> <p>Methodist Church grounds</p> <p>Rocky Hill Terrace Community Gardens</p> <p>Cordwallis Park</p> <p>Grassed bank west London Road</p> <p>8.3 Bower Street</p>		

Contact Full Name	Agent Name	Organisation	Nature Of Response:	Representation/Comment	Officers Response	Officers' Recommendation
				<p>White Rock Place•</p> <p>Allotments,• Especially those disused</p> <p>8.5 Bower Mount Road South</p> <p>Road• verges along Whitchurch Close</p> <p>8.6 Somerfeild Road</p> <p>Somerfeild• Lane</p> <p>Ivy clad hospital wall•</p> <p>East Somerfeild Road•</p> <p>8.7 Buckland Hill</p> <p>The Railway Line•</p> <p>The Playing Fields•</p> <p>8.8 Brunswick House School</p> <p>Playing Fields•</p> <p>Large• areas of open space.</p> <p>This list is not exhaustive</p>		