

**APPENDIX i: TABLE OF REPRESENTATIONS, AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ANY CHANGES TO THE REVIEW DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO THEM – FOR MILSTEAD CONSERVATION AREA**

<b>Rep. No(s).</b>	<b>Representation By</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
1	Milstead Parish Council (MPC)	MPC has been involved in the discussions around and production of the conservation area (CA) review document and very much welcomes this update. The proposed conservation area boundary changes are fully supported and the document is considered to be accurate and fit for purpose. MPC hopes to see it adopted.	Noted and welcomed.	No change to review document needed.
2 – 4 & 6 – 9 & 12-13	Local residents	Support the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary (including the proposed extensions)	Noted and welcomed.	No change to review document needed.
5	Local resident	<p>Provision of information re Roman archaeology.</p> <p>Suggested correction re reference to commentator on village.</p> <p>Feedback re traffic levels in village and request for Council to put pressure on the Highway Authority to introduce 20mph speed limits through all Swale villages where it is necessary to walk on the highway (where there are no footways)</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to reference the fact that traffic levels in the village do vary according to the time of day and season (i.e. are not always very low). Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) are needed to alter speed</p>	<p>Document to be updated to incorporate these revisions.</p> <p>Document to be updated to incorporate these revisions.</p> <p>Document to be updated to incorporate this revision. Proposed 20mph speed limit in villages/areas of villages with no separate footways to be raised with the Joint Transportation Board.</p>

**MILSTEAD CONSERVATION AREA – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

<b>Rep. No(s).</b>	<b>Representation By</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
5 (cont.)	Local resident		limits and KCC as the Highway Authority is unlikely to prioritise such works unless there is an evidenced need for them, and such a move is supported by the relevant parish council(s). Such TRO's seem broadly appropriate however, particularly if it helps to preserve the tranquillity of village conservation areas and their rural character. This is a matter which in the first instance should be raised with the Joint Transportation Board.	(see above)
10	Local resident	<p>7 pages of feedback, including suggested corrections to typos and factual errors (e.g. incorrect place names and dates, etc).</p> <p>Commentary on the contribution that later (C20) buildings makes to the setting of the CA and that creating and maintaining a chocolate box image is not appropriate.</p> <p>Suggestion to include shaw to SW side of Little Danes within proposed boundary extension C.</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Some re-writing of the relevant sections is proposed to more fairly reflect the contribution that C20 buildings make to the setting of the CA.</p> <p>Whilst the shaw in question dates from post-war, it has the effect (in parallel with pre-Tithe</p>	<p>Document to be updated to incorporate corrections.</p> <p>Document to be updated to incorporate these revisions, which it is agreed on balance are justifiable.</p> <p>Proposed boundary extension C to the CA to be altered to incorporate the shaw in question.</p>

**MILSTEAD CONSERVATION AREA – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
10 (cont.)	Local resident	<p>Provision of additional information concerning significant trees and corrections to labelling around important views.</p>	<p>map shows) of providing a strong enclosed character to the CA with visually enclosed small parcels of land combining with buildings, gardens and the churchyard to create an intimate landscape character. The inclusion of the shaw in question would only require a modest change to proposed extension C but would ensure that the trees forming this important natural feature are recognised for their visual and ecological benefits and given some protection through the CA designation.</p> <p>The input provided re trees and views is helpful and highly relevant and it is therefore planned to incorporate the feedback provided in this respect.</p>	<p>(see above)</p> <p>Document to be updated to incorporate these revisions.</p>
11	Historic England	<p>No substantive comments to make on either the contents of the review or the extensions to the conservation areas proposed. Attention is drawn to the relevant Historic England guidance document: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and M'gmt.</p>	<p>The referenced document has been appropriately referred to and also referenced in the CA review document.</p>	<p>No change to review document needed.</p>