

**APPENDIX i: TABLE OF REPRESENTATIONS, AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ANY CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO THEM – FOR PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A.**

<b>Rep. No(s).</b>	<b>Representation By</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
1	Local resident	<p>The Hartlip Conservation Area Character Appraisal document is detailed and well considered. As an owner of one of the properties currently outside of the existing conservation area but within the proposed extension to the west of the Street, on the whole I welcome the proposed extension, recognising the greater good that will result from the extension despite the additional processes and controls that will result to any proposed building and land changes (eg tree removal).</p> <p>However, what strikes me is the omission from the proposed extension of the area to the east of the Street, ie the land from around Lily of the Valley and Hollow Lane up to Munn's Lane in the north and bounded by Lower Hartlip Road to the east. The post-war infill residential properties in that section are mixed, of variable quality and in some cases similar to those infill properties to the west of the Street in the proposed extension. But as the appraisal document points out, a key reason for the proposed extension to the west is to protect the strong relationship between the village and the surrounding landscape, and that to my mind should apply equally to the land to the east of the Street. Some of the views north from Hollow Lane and east sweeping down from the Street to Lower Hartlip Road are important components to the overall character of the village. Accordingly, I would urge the Council to consider extending the conservation area to include the land from the parkland area (behind the Parsonage) up to Munns Lane.</p>	<p>Noted &amp; welcomed.</p> <p>The buildings, the trees and the landscape in this area do not possess the quality and character of those in the other areas recommended for inclusion within the conservation area. It falls short of the standard required for statutory designation. It is relevant that statutory controls still afford some protection to development that falls within the setting of the CA.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
2	Local Resident	<p>I am pleased to see the heritage buildings in Hartlip so well documented in this review and support all three proposed extensions of the conservation area which enhance the setting of those buildings and reflect the ancient routes and long rural views in and out of this settlement.</p> <p>In particular, I think the western extension over the orchards is inspired - the view downhill from that side of the church across that classic Kentish view is one I remember from growing up there years ago and that remains the same today, well worth protecting for Swale residents for the future. And the route through Mount Lane has always had a strong atmosphere - the explanation of this route's ancient links in the review goes a long way to explaining this and why the conservation area should be extended to include this too.</p> <p>I hope, therefore, that Swale will accept and adopt this review and all the extensions.</p>	Noted & welcomed.	No change to the assessment document needed.
3	Local Resident	<p>Nomenclature and location changes detailed and requested.</p> <p>The house is known as Keites Styles, not Keats Stiles as is shown incorrectly on the ordnance survey maps.</p> <p>The ordnance survey map on the right of page 41 is from 1838 not 1895, and that on the right of page 42 is from 1895 not 1938.</p>	<p>Noted and the proposed corrections to be made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The objective of the CA is not to prevent development in the</p>	<p>To make changes to the assessment document.</p> <p>To make changes to the assessment document.</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
3	Local Resident (Contd.)	<p>I understand the reason for the proposed boundary adjustment 3 as these define the northern end of the village. However, this will not prevent the field surrounding and joining it with the other houses on Mill Lane, from being developed in the future. It has already been changed from farming land to horse paddock with a large stable block.</p> <p>The garden contains many trees, planted by the previous owners. These are largely not native species, and must be actively managed, so it is difficult to understand what benefit there is to the character of the village from putting the garden into the conservation area.</p> <p>I note that many houses towards the south of The Street and continuing to Place Lane will also be added to the conservation area in adjustment 2, but no reason for this is given. It also leaves just 6 houses on the east side of The Street to the south of Hollow Lane outside the conservation area, although these 6 houses are very similar in construction date to those included. No explanation for this omission is given. It seems logical to either include all the houses on both sides of The Street in the boundary changes or omit the new ones included and confine the boundary adjustment to Cuckoo Orchard and the allotments/Village Hall.</p>	<p>future. The field in question was assessed but was not considered to possess the special architectural or historic character required for CA designation.</p> <p>It would be impractical to include the building but not the garden within the conservation area.</p> <p>The houses on the west of The Street are included because they are 'captured' by the proposed boundary inclusion of Cuckoo Orchard. Consideration was given to excluding the houses, but the result would be a conservation area with a hole which seems contrary to nature of an area/spatially based designation. The houses on the east side of The Street are not of special architectural or historic interest and are not encompassed by land which is. As such there is no inconsistency in the proposed designation.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
3	Local Resident (Contd.)			
4	Local Resident	<p>I am writing to extend my appreciation for the diligent efforts put into the Hartlip Conservation Area Review. While the review is comprehensive, I would like to bring to your attention some important concerns that I believe should be addressed to ensure the well-being and sustainable development of our community.</p> <p>The village of Hartlip undoubtedly holds a unique charm, and the conservation area review acknowledges this with its detailed examination of various aspects. However, there are pressing traffic-related issues that are integral to the village's quality of life and deserve consideration alongside the conservation efforts.</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Currently there are no highway proposals within the vicinity of the proposed conservation area. If or when proposals come forward, they will be considered within the context of the conservation area designation.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>
5	Local Resident	<p>I have lived in Hartlip all my life and my ancestors since at least the early 1800's if not longer. Over the last eighty years or so I have seen considerable change. I have witnessed the Dane Close development, the building of the original post war Graine Fields homes and subsequent redevelopment and building along The Street especially between Hollow Lane and Mount Lane where, as a child, there was only eight or so properties.</p> <p>I wholly recognise the special character referred to in the Consultation Document despite there having been significant erosion of this over the years. As a general observation I would express concern over the increased use of Laurel and Red Robin hedging rather than the traditional mixed native hedging that once dominated and benefited wildlife. I have also seen the emergence of close board fencing and solid high gates such as those installed at Tevrin.</p>	<p>All noted and agreed. The Conservation Area can control some inappropriate gates, fences, and walls through the need for planning permission. It cannot normally control the typed of hedging apart from through design guidance and advice.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
5	Local Resident (Contd.)	<p>It seems that this is a mindset of exclusion and territorial ring fencing rather than inclusion that serves only to detract from the openness that had once been an important contributor to the special character and threatens to turn the Street into a hostile tunnel. I don't know to what extent the conservation designation can guard against this.</p> <p>I hear various calls for street lighting which, apart from being impractical to physically install along The Street given the narrowness of or absence of pathways, in my view further detracts from the traditional environment. There is already an increasing implementation of contemporary "look at me" lighting that serves no practical purpose other than to illuminate and display an asset.</p> <p>I am mindful that Hartlip has no right to be excluded from playing its part in the provision of much needed housing and whilst I understand the role of the conservation designation there is a risk that it serves to enhance exclusivity and therefore monetary gain rather than develop community. Hartlip has already suffered from this over the years. The conservation designation appears to have been used to preclude planning and development even where there would be little impact on the street scene that conservation designation was originally designed to protect. Whether it is appropriate to utilise conservation designation for this purpose rather than relying on the merits of planning is questionable. Examples of this within the existing designations are the inclusion of the gardens of Orchard Lea, Rose Cottage and the rear gardens of Clairmont, Zaharia and Barrows.</p>	<p>Street lighting would actively detract from the rural character of Hartlip Conservation Area and should be positively discouraged.</p> <p>CA designation is not intended to prevent development. It is intended to provide a framework to manage future change in a way that responds to the special character of the place.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
5	Local Resident (Contd.)	<p>In these cases there is no apparent reason for inclusion other than to prevent off street development.</p> <p>A minor issue is the changing of house names. The Street has never had numbers and people have always known properties by names. For example, The Cottage was previously known as Roseneath. Parsonage Cottage has become The Cottage. Elsewhere what is now called Warren Cottage was for hundreds of years called Cradles. To what extent can house names fall under conservation protection?</p> <p>Finally, whilst conservation designation imposes constraints on the property owners for the good of the overall locality what obligations does the designation status impose on Swale Borough Council? Does it get specific or additional funding for complimentary improvement or maintenance of the street scene such as signage, verge and pathway management? I raise this for example because of the weed bound pathways to Dane Close, non-matching street name signage and bramble thicket that has taken over the approach to Dane Close.</p>	<p>House names fall outside of conservation or planning control.</p> <p>Following on from designation, the key tool for fulfilling the council's duties under the <u>1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act</u> is to review the conservation area and its boundaries and formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the area. The Council can add to the types of alterations that need planning permission by making an <u>Article 4 Directions</u>, and this can be used to protect features particular to the area from being lost without the need of permission.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
5	Local Resident (Contd.)	<p><b>Street Furniture &amp; Signage</b></p> <p>I have already mentioned the inconsistent street signage with regard to Dane Close, in addition the damaged sign at Lockes corner has remained for years without being replaced.</p> <p>The 20mph on road advisory notices are ugly but perhaps necessary if there is to be any attempt at enforcement.</p> <p>The new village signs are not in keeping with either the village or conservation areas. Surely there are more discreet and attractive options. I have certainly seen less obtrusive black metal framed alternatives incorporating both the name and speed advice negating the need for the separate “lollipop” sign. The current signage at either end of The Street is something of an abomination.</p> <p><b>Enforcement</b></p> <p>On paper the designated conservation status should offer protection against inappropriate alteration and development. It should equip the local authority with all the necessary tools to enforce regulations. In practice however my experience is that enforcement is at best haphazard. In certain cases, it could be said that the role to preserve and enhance otherwise negative aspects of a conservation area has been so corrupted as to bring the conservation status into disrepute.</p> <p>I use Rose Cottage as an example and in particular the replacement of unremarkable white wooden timber framed windows with contemporary anthracite-coloured</p>	<p>The management strategy recommends a review of signage.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>It does become difficult to manage and control a lot of minor development which</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p> <p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>frames. On no account can these be said to enhance the conservation area and yet they were allowed despite objection. I had the most extraordinary reply from the Head of Swale Planning when I called in to question the judgement. Rose Cottage has manicured Red Robin Hedges, nicely stained pale fencing and up and down lighters. In short it has been turned from a property that blended into the street scene into a stand out super smart estate type premises that is entirely out of place with the special character that the existing conservation designation should have prevented from happening.</p> <p>Whilst I welcome the motion of improving and extending the conservation designation the whole exercise is pointless unless there is an appetite for rigorous enforcement for all properties. Rose Cottage is a damning example of failure.</p>	<p>though minor in nature, can it is accepted, nevertheless effect the character &amp; appearance of CA's, and hence the consideration of, and recommendation in the Hartlip CA Review document to implement a related Article 4 Direction.</p>	
6	Local Resident	<p>As a resident of 25 years, I am writing to extend my appreciation for the diligent efforts put into the Hartlip Conservation Area Review. While the review is comprehensive, I would like to bring to your attention some important concerns that I believe should be addressed to ensure the well-being and sustainable development of our community.</p> <p>The village of Hartlip undoubtedly holds a unique charm, and the conservation area review acknowledges this with its detailed examination of various aspects. However, there are pressing traffic-related issues that are integral to the village's quality of life and deserve consideration alongside the conservation efforts.</p> <p>1) The utilization of The Street as a thoroughfare to the motorway system results in an overwhelming volume of traffic that is unsuitable for the size of our village's narrow</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed. A number of points raised have been addressed within the proposed management plan, however some fall outside of the remit of a Conservation Area appraisal.</p>	<p>No change to the assessment document needed.</p>



**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)**

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
6	Local Resident (Contd.)	<p>lanes and roads. This influx not only generates noise but also leads to air pollution, affecting the health and tranquillity of residents.</p> <p>2) Despite the established 20 mph speed limit, many drivers blatantly ignore this restriction. Given the road's narrow dimensions, this reckless behaviour poses a significant hazard to both pedestrians and vehicles alike.</p> <p>3) The presence of the village school brings about additional traffic from surrounding areas. This often leads to obstructed pavements due to parked cars, forcing pedestrians, including schoolchildren, to use the road for passage—a perilous situation that requires immediate attention. The drivers also use the pavement as a runway, and drive along this until they reach their chosen parking spot, often behind pedestrians.</p> <p>4) The current parking habits sometimes render the road impassable for emergency vehicles, potentially endangering lives in critical situations. The village urgently needs a car park facility for the school and Church.</p> <p>5) Parents picking up their children from school frequently arrive well in advance to secure a pavement parking space. The idling of engines during winter for warmth and air conditioning use during summer contribute to air pollution, which has both immediate and long-term consequences.</p> <p>As we contemplate the changes within the conservation area, it is vital that the impact of these traffic-related concerns is thoroughly evaluated. Any modifications should account for the safety, environmental sustainability, and overall well-being of Hartlip's residents.</p> <p>I kindly request that these points be taken into consideration during the assessment of proposed</p>		

**PROPOSED HARTLIP. C.A. – 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>
6	Local Resident (Contd.)	changes to the conservation area. Our village's unique heritage can be effectively preserved only when the challenges of our modern community are addressed in tandem.		