

## ANNEX A

### TONBRIDGE CHARACTER AREA APPRAISAL SPD – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Respondent	Representation	Response
Roger and Mary Lawes Baltic Road	<b>Area B3 - St Mary's Road</b> The description as 19 <sup>th</sup> Century Cottages is misleading as their house was built in 1905	The Character Type is typical of 19 <sup>th</sup> Century Cottages, even though in some areas like St Mary's Road the character and age of buildings is more mixed and this is acknowledged in the text. The Locally Distinctive Contextual Features recognise the age of buildings as ranging from 1850's to early 20 <sup>th</sup> Century. <b>NO CHANGE</b>
John Smalman-Smith Hadlow Road	<b>Map A5.1 – Hadlow Road (West)</b> – there are some inaccuracies on the Ordnance Survey base map	The Ordnance Survey bas map is the most up-to-date available.
	<b>Map A5.1 – Hadlow Road (West)</b> The trees/green frontage extends to No 31-53 Hadlow Road	<b>REVISE MAP ACCORDINGLY</b>  (see amended Sections and Map for <b>Area A5.1 Hadlow Road (West)</b> )
	<b>Area A5.1 – Hadlow Road (West)</b> Under “Negative Features” add reference to “traffic queues” to traffic noise”. Traffic noise has been much improved by recent resurfacing. It is the density of traffic that is a more negative feature.	Queuing traffic is only a feature of Hadlow Road for relatively limited periods of the day a characteristic which also applies to many other parts of the town during peak periods. <b>NO CHANGE</b>
	A truly impressive, thorough document.	Noted

Respondent	Representation	Response
Janice Browne Tonbridge Civic Society	The document reads well and presents a very clear and comprehensive picture of all those parts of the town not already safeguarded by detailed Conservation Area and Action Plan policies. Neighbourhood specific amplification of already adopted policies should lead to considerable benefit for both applicants and Council planning staff in some cases saving a great deal of expensive, abortive, work.	Noted
	<b>A4.1 Shipbourne Road (South) Area:</b> Negative Features – there is also pavement parking on Shipbourne Road.	<b>ADD REFERENCE TO “pavement parking on Shipbourne Road”</b>
	<b>A5.2 Cornwallis Avenue</b> - Questions whether there are semi-detached houses on the south side of Cornwallis Avenue	There is only one semi-detached house. <b>REVISE TO READ:</b>  “The south side comprises open countryside, smaller scale chalet bungalows and mainly detached houses”
	<b>G2 Audley Rise</b> – is post war public housing and should therefore be under category F	This was a low cost market housing scheme promoted by the Borough Council. It is correctly included under Category G.
	<b>G6 Longmead Way Area</b> - Drybank Court and Drybank Road do not relate to the Longmead Way Area. They are part of the Dryhill area but out side of the Conservation Area	<b>Dry Bank Road</b> comprises detached houses set back and down behind parking areas/garages with open or partially enclosed frontages dating from the 1970s and later. At the far end there is a Victorian semi-detached building with steeply pitched double slate gabled roof. It is proposed that this area be reclassified as lower density detached

Respondent	Representation	Response
		<p>(see new Character Area Character Area <b>H9 Dry Bank Road</b>).</p> <p><b>Dry Bank Court</b> comprises rectangular three storey buff brick apartment blocks facing onto communal parking area and garages. They all date from the late 1970s/80s with one more recent apartment block that reflects the surrounding development. It is considered that the buildings in Dry Bank Court and Welland Road and the wider Long Mead Way area are too similar in age and appearance to comprise a separate character area.</p>
	<p><b>G11 Chilton Way</b> – incorrectly refers to a “short terrace of flat fronted buff brick houses”. It is, in fact, a block of two storey flats.</p>	<p><b>REVISE TO READ:- “The straight road culminates in a flat fronted, buff brick two storey block of flats with prominent white porches”</b></p>
	<p><b>G11 Chilton Way</b> - this area includes part of Dernier Road and is not at all in character with the Chilton Way area.</p>	<p>The map is wrong. Dernier Road is included in Area A4.1. See revised map for <b>Area G11 Chiltern Way</b></p>
	<p><b>G12 Shelton Close</b> – there is a footpath between the belt of trees and the cemetery wall</p>	<p><b>REVISE TO READ: “The belt of trees bordering the footpath alongside the cemetery is visible between the houses.....” AND AMEND THE MAP ACCORDINGLY</b></p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>G15 Farm Lane</b> - There was originally a mown grass bank along the London Road boundary with the town houses' gardens defined in a regular line above. There are applications to modify this line which have been partially implemented. A new line and boundary treatment needs to be agreed to avoid a prominent negative effect at the entrance to Tonbridge and opposite the Hilden Manor</p>	<p><b>ADD THE FOLLOWING TO THE TEXT NEXT TO SECOND PHOTOGRAPH:</b>  <i>There is some encroachment of private garden space into the road verge which creates an untidy appearance</i></p> <p><b>UNDER NEGATIVE FEATURES REPLACE</b> “No significant detractors” <b>WITH</b> “Erosion of the road verge by Farm Lane by private garden encroachment” under Area A3.</p>
	<p><b>H4 The Ridgeway</b> – part of this area is not “lower density”. The plots in Wells Close are very compact. It should be a separate area under Category I.</p>	<p>Wells Close should be retained as a lower density area even though it is more compact than the rest of the Ridgeway in terms of plot size. The houses are aligned along the road in the traditional format and are not clustered which fits much better with the categorisation of section H (Lower Density Detached Housing) than Section I (Clustered Cul-de-Sac Development).</p>
	<p><b>H2 Ridgeway Crescent</b> – the detrimental effect of side extensions should be referred to in the Negative Features Box</p>	<p><b>ADD TO THE LIST OF NEGATIVE FEATURES:</b>  <b>“side extensions which reduce the feeling of spaciousness”</b></p>
	<p><b>H7 College Avenue</b> – This is not a “lower density” area. Some of the plots are very small. It should be under Category I</p>	<p>Area H6 correctly belongs in lower density category as the houses follow the traditional street format and are certainly not clustered. It is admittedly not as low density as the other areas but they are still detached houses in individual</p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
		plots. It does not conform to the characterisation as a Clustered Cul-de-Sac (Category I). There is a spectrum of densities in any character area type, but any changes in character which result are picked up in the text and photographs
	<b>I4 The Haydens</b> – The “Victorian Villa” was built at the same time as the rest of the development on the sites of the “The Elms” that was demolished.	<b>REVISE TO REFER TO</b> “Victorian-style Villa”
	<b>I4 The Haydens</b> – The area erroneously includes part of Portman Park that should be included with Area L1	The map is wrong. See revised map for <b>Area I4 The Haydens</b>
	<b>K2 High Hilden</b> – why is the group of cottages and farm building conversions north of Oast Lane not included? They are numbered as part of London Road.	The properties lie outside the urban confines and in the Green Belt. The Character Area Appraisals deal only with land within the defined confines.
	There are other pockets of development within the urban boundary in Higham Ward off the A26 which should be included, namely: by Cuckoo Lane, Redlands and Three Elm Lane.	The properties lie outside the urban confines and in the Green Belt. The Character Area Appraisals deal only with land within the defined confines.
	<b>K3 Hadlow Stair</b> – There is no official connection between Stair Road and Hadlow Stair.	<b>REVISE TO READ: “Stair Road leads off Old Hadlow Road to a group of Listed Buildings. Hadlow Stair runs from Hadlow Road along the edge of the built up area.”</b>

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>K3 Hadlow Stair</b> - The properties fronting Valley Forge Close should be in Area H8 – Old Hadlow Road</p>	<p>These properties are low density, very verdant and set back from the main road frontage having a quiet enclosed character and are more in character with Old Hadlow Road than the main road.</p>
	<p><b>L2 Lime Tree Close Area</b> – Should be called the “Kendal Drive Area”. Limetree Close is a smaller later addition</p>	<p><b>REVISE TITLE TO “Kendal Drive Area”</b></p>
	<p><b>L2 Limetree Close Area</b> – No 14 and Fairways belong to Bordyke. They are not part of the Limetree Close Area</p>	<p>Whilst they are accessed from Bordyke they lie outside the Conservation Area. They are too small to comprise a Character Area in their own right. Hence the Limetree Close Area is referred to as a mixed character area.</p>
	<p><b>N Commercial Areas</b> - When the Industrial Estate was laid out it attracted comments as a pleasantly landscaped area. Over the years the planting and verges been despoiled but the possibilities are still there. Could the wording of the Negative Features Box set their restoration and improvement as a firm objective/requirement.</p>	<p>The absence of landscaping and screening and the use of unattractive fencing as boundary treatments are already identified as negative features worthy of enhancement. <b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
	<p><b>Chapter 9 - Design Guidance</b> Where a planning application is needed the approved policies, backed up by the SPD should ensure the right outcome, but the Guidance will be particularly important in the case of minor, permitted development. Whilst legally permitted some of these changes may be seen to be unsympathetic. Could the first sentence of the second paragraph be strengthened as follows (new words in bold):</p>	<p><b>REVISE TO READ:</b></p> <p>“Whilst some minor development is permitted, by Parliament, without the need for a planning application (usually known as permitted development), home owners and developers who are considering such alterations should refer to the distinctive characteristics of their area as described in this SPD when considering even minor</p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><i>“Some minor development is permitted, by Parliament, without the need for a planning application (usually known as permitted development), <b>but</b> home owners and developers who are considering such alterations are <b>asked</b> to refer to the distinctive characteristics of their area as described in this SPD when considering even minor development”</i></p>	<p>development to ensure an acceptable result.”</p>
	<p>Parked vehicles are a negative feature in many Character Areas. They may be prominent on-street where no off-street parking is available. Off-street they may stand on ill-adapted front gardens that are bereft of characteristic boundaries and planting. Ugly and detrimentally impermeable surfacing adds to the problem. Applications to convert garages into living space which tend to be permitted so long as the requisite number of spaces can be accommodated on site add to this negative feature. In some case these changes are permitted development.</p> <p>Whist this situation is covered to an extent in (3) perhaps a further sentence could be added as follows:</p> <p><i>“So far as possible, some space should be allowed for planting or other features to soften the effect of parked vehicles upon the street scene”</i></p>	<p><b>ADD THE FOLLOWING WORDS TO SECTION (3) IN CHAPTER 9:</b></p> <p>“So far as possible, some space should be allowed for planting or other features to soften the effect of parked vehicles upon the street scene”</p>
	<p>In section (8) and in several of the Character Area appraisals there is, what might be taken as an encouraging reference to the redevelopment of unattractive garage courts. Perhaps wording could be added to the effect that, where this is done, appropriate provision should be made for the displaced vehicles.</p>	<p><b>REVISE THE WORDING IN SECTION 8(a) OF CHAPTER 9 TO READ:</b></p> <p>“For example, isolated properties may be redeveloped or in some cases garage courts may be replaced (subject to there being satisfactory alternative parking provision)”.</p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
Tim Hinton Hadlow Road	<p><b>A5.1 Hadlow Road West</b> – there is no specific description of the Hadlow Road (West Area). The photographs do not include any properties at the southern end of the area which are different in character to those further north.</p>	<p>A description of Hadlow Road West should be added. Additional photographs and captions should also be included to more accurately reflect the changing character of the road. See amended section for <b>Area A5.1 Hadlow Road West</b></p>
	<p><b>A5.1 Hadlow Road (West)</b> - Does the description of Monk’s Cottage as ”diminutive” take into account current works to the property?</p>	<p>The property is being considerably extended. <b>REMOVE THE WORD</b> ”diminutive” form the description of Monks Cottage.</p>
	<p><b>A5.1 Hadlow Road (West) – Contextual Features</b> - The age of buildings should be “19<sup>th</sup> century – 1970s” and not “1900-1970s”.</p>	<p><b>REVISE AGE OF BUILDINGS TO READ: “19<sup>th</sup> Century to 1970s”</b></p>
	<p><b>A5.1 Hadlow Road (West) – Contextual Features</b> – A predominant boundary treatment for the 19<sup>th</sup> century housing is an open frontage with only a change of paving marking the transition from public to private space. Likewise, frontage parking is a prominent feature along this section of road and not just for the Victorian housing</p>	<p><b>ADD “some open frontages” TO THE LIST OF PROMINENT BOUNDARY TREATMENTS.</b></p> <p>See amended section for <b>A5.1 Hadlow Road West</b></p>
	<p><b>Map A5.1 Hadlow Road (West)</b> - The “tight-knit Victorian Cottages” in Garden Road should be included in Area L3 –Garden Road because that is where they are correctly described.</p>	<p><b>REVISE BOUNDARIES OF AREAS A5.1 and L3 SO THAT THE VICTORIAN COTTAGES ARE INCLUDED IN AREA L3.</b></p> <p>See amended section and map for <b>Area L3 Garden Road</b></p>



Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>A5.1 Hadlow Road (West) Positive Features</b> – the predominance of frontage parking should be regarded as a positive feature which in terms of amenity for residents it certainly is. Where integrated with soft and hard landscaping frontage parking can contribute to an enhancement of the appearance of a locality.</p>	<p>The SPD is concerned with the character of an area. Whilst frontage parking may be an amenity for occupants of properties, the impact on the character of the properties and the street scene is the aspect reflected in the SPD. In this respect, frontage parking may detract from the traditional features of the property and result in the loss of traditional boundary features. Within tight knit developments such as part of Hadlow Road (West) there is often no room for planting or boundary treatment to help screen the parked cars.</p>
	<p><b>A5.1 Hadlow Road (West) Negative Features</b> – “loss of front gardens and boundaries” does not only apply to Victorian properties. As mentioned above, frontage parking should be regarded as a positive feature. The negative feature should read: Lack of landscaping and boundary definition to frontage parking areas to properties”</p>	<p>Within tight knit developments such as part of Hadlow Road (West) there is often no room for planting or boundary treatment to help screen the parked cars. The SPD already encourages the reinstatement of front boundaries - Design Guidance (9).</p> <p><b>REVISE THE NEGATIVE FEATURE TO READ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Loss of front gardens and boundaries”</li> </ul>
	<p><b>L Mixed Character Areas – Contextual Features</b> – Tile hanging on upper storeys and slate roofs should be added to the list of Prominent Building Materials</p>	<p><b>ADD THE FOLLOWING TO THE LIST OF PROMINENT BUILDING MATERIALS UNDER CATEGORY L</b></p> <p>“tile hanging on upper storeys and slate roofs”</p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>L Mixed Character Areas – Positive Features</b> – there is a mix of architectural style and detail, albeit generally traditional in form, but using a limited and complementary palette of materials giving these areas a subtly diverse visual character.</p>	<p>It is not always the case that properties use a limited and complementary palette of materials. Nevertheless, the introductory text to the Mixed Character Areas Section should be revised as follows:</p> <p><i>In some areas, piecemeal development and redevelopment can result in a frontage that is very mixed in terms of the layout, style and age of buildings. In Tonbridge, whilst the character is more mixed along the principal routes, the housing areas to the rear have generally retained a distinctive character related to the period in which they were designed, by whom and for whom they were constructed and the physical factors of their location. There are exceptions where the individual houses vary so much in age, materials and appearance that no particular character predominates. However, whilst there is a mix of architectural style and detail, the housing is generally traditional in form with pitched roofs. For the purposes of this appraisal, these areas have been designated as being of mixed character.</i></p>
	<p><b>L Mixed Character Areas – Negative Features</b> - Not sure that “Opportunity for the creation of individual buildings of interest and high standard of intrinsic design quality” is a “Negative Feature”, if anything it should be seen as a “Positive Feature”</p>	<p>The text should be consistent with the approach taken to Open Plan Housing Developments and <b>SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant detractors, but these developments lack a unified character in terms of materials or design.</li> </ul>

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>L3 Garden Road</b> - Generally the description of the area is reasonable, but the reference to the strong enclosure of the entrance to Garden Road by the buildings and fence is misleading because the panel fence is quite low and could be replaced even lower under permitted development which would dramatically change the sense of space in this location.</p>	<p>Agree to delete the reference to strong enclosure and the panel fencing. <b>THE TEXT SHOULD BE REVISED TO READ:</b></p> <p><i>The entrance to Garden Road from Hadlow Road is enclosed by the side elevations of houses fronting Hadlow Road and Garden Terrace on the western side.</i></p> <p>(See revised Section and Map for <b>Area L3 Garden Road</b>)</p>
	<p><b>L3 Garden Road</b> - Victorian terrace in Garden Road should be included in Area L3 and not Area A5.1 because that is where they are correctly described.</p>	<p><b>REVISE BOUNDARIES OF AREAS A5.1 and L3 SO THAT THE VICTORIAN COTTAGES ARE INCLUDED IN AREA L3.</b></p> <p>(See amended section and map for <b>Area L3 Garden Road</b>)</p>
	<p><b>L3 Garden Road - Positive Features</b> The reference to northern section of Garden Road having an enclosed Victorian character is incorrect. Different parts of the terrace overlook a variety of elements which do not all enclose the street scene.</p>	<p>The east side of the road is mostly enclosed by a fence but no buildings. The reference to “enclosed” should therefore be removed. <b>REVISE TO READ:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Northern section of Garden Road has a Victorian cottage character”</li> </ul>

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>L3 Garden Road - Negative Features</b> The dereliction and shanty town appearance of the area adjacent to No 21 Garden Road is not mentioned or identified as an area worthy of enhancement.</p>	<p>The area adjacent to no. 21 Garden Road is empty and unkempt and detracting from the character of the area. The area should therefore be included as a negative feature worthy of enhancement and highlighted on the map.</p> <p>(See amended section and map for <b>Area L3 Garden Road</b>)</p>
	<p><b>Chapter 9 – Design Guidance</b> - Whilst the document provides reasonable guidance on the features/issues TMBC will require to be addressed in the design of new developments, the general tenor does come across as promoting traditional design solutions. It appears to promote architectural pastiche rather than intrinsic design quality.</p>	<p>The aim of the document is to encourage development which respects the locally distinctive positive features of a character area. The outcome of such designs will not necessarily be a pastiche of existing properties but should ensure that visual clues are followed so that development generally fits well with the context. Design Guidance (2) says that “The principles set out above should drive the design process in the vast majority of cases. However, they should not necessarily be regarded as a deterrent to the creation of imaginative high quality contemporary designs using appropriate contemporary materials in the right setting”. Furthermore, Section 8(a) says that “in designing new development a high standard of intrinsic design quality is required”. <b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
	<p><b>Public consultation</b> was not well advertised to residents whom it may affect. Also surprised that the draft document was not being referred to by development control officers.</p>	<p>Advance warning of the consultation was given in the Council’s newspaper “Here and Now” which is delivered to every household in Tonbridge. There was a Press Release and a Statutory Notice in the paper. The Exhibition was</p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
		<p>also advertised by posters in the town. It was also a “Stop Press” item on the Council’s Website.</p> <p>The draft document was only approved for the purposes of public consultation and not as a material consideration for development control. It will not be used for this purpose until finally adopted.</p>
<p>Cllr P Bolt</p>	<p><b>B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b> – The Barden Road Moorings should be a Character Area in their own right due to their historical connection with early 20<sup>th</sup> century boat building and repair and to the unique facility of providing docking for river barges and other boats otherwise absent on this scale on the Medway west of the Big Bridge.</p> <p>Seen from the Sports Ground the scene of river craft with its background of green hedge and trees is a popular subject for artists. From Barden Road the high green hedge and trees flanking the footpath integral with the moorings area provide valuable relief from the high concentration of residential development in this area.</p> <p>Whilst the Moorings are mentioned, amongst others, as a Locally Distinctive Positive Feature, they are of exceptional value and the outstanding feature of the locality. As such it should be identified as an Area of Special Character in its own right. They are of Town status importance.</p>	<p>Agree that more emphasis should be placed on the importance of the Barden Road Moorings within this Character Area. Additional photographs and text have been added to emphasise the importance of this area of special character.</p> <p>(See amended section and map for <b>Area B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b>)</p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
Sally McKay Barden Road	<b>B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b> - The historical Boat Yard in Barden Road should be given special status. It should be kept as part of our heritage and kept free from development. This area is unique in its connection with the river.	Agree that more emphasis should be placed on the importance of the Barden Road Moorings within this Character Area. Additional photographs and text have been added to emphasise the importance of this area of special character.  (See amended section and map for <b>Area B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b> )
W & M Goubin Barden Road	<b>B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area – Contextual Features</b> - There is no mention of the apartment blocks in Avebury Avenue and Barden Road constructed in the 1990s	The predominant character of Area B1 is as Victorian Cottages is correctly described. There is only one modern apartment block on the edge of the area (the others in Avebury Avenue are not within this character area). It is not necessary to mention every building. <b>NO CHANGE</b>
	<b>B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area – Positive Features</b> Add the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scenic views across the Sports Ground of the Castle and as far as Hildenborough</li> <li>• Ease of access to the riverside and countryside</li> </ul>	These long views are not evident from the Character Area and may therefore be from the upper storeys of properties. It is the views from the public domain which are important to the character area and these have been captured within the document. However, glimpses of, and accessibility to, the riverside have been added to the revised Positive Features for this area.  (See amended section and map for <b>Area B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b> )

Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b> – there should be no development of the river bank in Barden Road which was the traditional boat building and river leisure activities centre in Tonbridge. Any development would deprive residents of local views and increase danger of flooding.</p>	<p>The Character Area Appraisals are not about where development should be located. However, it is agreed that more emphasis should be placed on the importance of the Barden Road Moorings within this Character Area. Additional photographs and text have been added to emphasise the importance of this area of special character.</p> <p>(See amended section and map for <b>B1 Douglas Road/Barden Road Area</b>)</p>
	<p><b>Chapter 7 – Origins and Development</b> - No mention of Barden Road which was built in the late 1900s, a principal feature being the bay windows considered then to be a real asset.</p> <p><b>Chapter 9 – Design Guidelines</b> – there is no direct reference to the River Medway or its environs.</p>	<p><b>NEAR THE TOP OF PAGE 10 AFTER THE WORDS “St Stephens Church” ADD</b></p> <p>“...and leading off Barden Road, where larger bay fronted properties faced onto the river and open countryside”.</p> <p>The Design Guidelines provide generic guidance for Tonbridge. Reference to the River Medway is made within the individual Character Areas where it contributes to the character. <b>NO CHANGE</b></p>
Cllr Gordon Court	<p><b>A4.2 Shipbourne Road (Central) Area</b> - Forest Grove was one of the first areas of social housing built in Tonbridge and therefore dates from much earlier than the 1930’s referred to in the annotation to the photograph.</p>	<p><b>AMEND CAPTION TO THE SECOND PHOTOGRAPH TO REFER TO</b></p> <p><i>“...a row of 1920s former TUDC cottage-style semi-detached and terraced houses...”</i></p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
Ian Bailey Willow Lea	<b>Map A5.1 Hadlow Road</b> - Nos 1-10 Garden Road represent a close knit Victorian terrace which should be included in Area L3 – Garden Road.	<b>REVISE BOUNDARIES OF AREAS A5.1 and L3 SO THAT THE VICTORIAN COTTAGES ARE INCLUDED IN AREA L3.</b>  (See amended section and map for <b>Area L3 Garden Road</b> )
	<b>G8 Willow Lea – Description</b> The majority of the Willow Lea area (originally called the Weald Park Estate when developed in 1960/61) was built by Gough Cooper which explains the distinctive style of the houses and layout. This should be mentioned in the assessment because the company set guidelines for what occupiers could do with their property. It is partly due to the adherence to these rules that explains the distinctive character of the area. In addition, there is no mention of the distinctive chalet style houses, for example, on the north side of Willow Lea.	<b>REVISE TO MAKE REFERENCE TO</b> 1960's Gough Cooper development and chalet style properties.  (See amended section for <b>Area G8 Willow Lea Area</b> ).
	<b>G8 Willow Lea – Positive Features</b> – Willow Lea Road represents the northern boundary of Tonbridge with open countryside beyond. The Appraisal does not make this clear. The countryside is easily accessed from the area. This, and the large garden sizes are positive features worthy of recognition.	The impact of the proximity of the countryside on the character of the area is already mentioned in the text and Positive Features. The contribution of front gardens to the spacious character should be mentioned. The specimen trees in gardens which contribute to the verdant character are already mentioned in the text.  (See amended section for <b>Area G8 Willow Lea Area</b> ).



Respondent	Representation	Response
	<p><b>G8 Willow Lea – Negative Features</b> – Despite most properties having drives and garages, parking on the road detracts from the appearance of the area.</p> <p><b>G8 Willow Lea</b> - the emphasis on the amenity value of the open space at Quincewood Gardens to the Willow Lea area is overstated. The park to the east of Shipbourne Road is the preferred location for recreation.</p> <p>The southern part of this Character Area blurs with the Bishops Oak Rise/Trench Wood areas and defining a boundary between these two very distinctive areas will be key to the success of this part of the SPD.</p>	<p>It is not considered that parking on the road is a major issue in this area. <b>NO CHANGE</b></p> <p>It is proposed to move the Quincewood Gardens and Cedar Crescent area from G8 to the adjoining F4 Bishops Oak Ride Area (Post War Public Housing Schemes) as, although they have seen considerable personalisation, they were originally part of the Bishops Oak Ride public housing development.</p> <p>(See amended section and maps for <b>G8 Willow Lea Area and F4 Bishops Oak Ride Area.</b></p>
<p>Inland Waterways Association</p>	<p><b>N1 Vale Road Woodgate Ways Areas – Negative Features</b> The industrial units east of Cannon Lane and north of the river (ie along the tow path) turn their backs to the river leaving it unsightly and neglected. A condition on any future development should be to open up the vista as has very successfully been done west of Cannon Lane.</p>	<p><b>ADD THE FOLLOWING BULLET POINT TO THE NEGATIVE FEATURES:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Units east of Cannon Lane and north of the Medway turn their backs on the river leaving it unsightly and not overlooked.”</li> </ul> <p>In relation to improving the character and design quality of the Commercial character area, Design Guidance (b) already states:</p> <p><i>In addition, development in the commercial character area should positively address the river which runs through it in recognition that water is a key asset and, in effect, an important public space within Tonbridge</i></p>

Respondent	Representation	Response
<p>Tim &amp; Gill Wilson London Road</p>	<p>The document focuses too narrowly on design, landscaping and road engineering. These are only some of the elements that form the character of an area as a place in which to live and work. None of the Appraisals seek to describe access to and quality of public transport, cycle paths, jobs, health facilities, education, shops, leisure and community facilities or the provision for physical exercise. The principles of social inclusiveness, sustainable development and development control is much more than the details of building design.</p>	<p>Whilst it is true that aspects other than physical appearance can affect the character of an area. This particular SPD intentionally confines itself to matters relating to the character of the built environment. The SPD does not purport to be the Development Plan for the area. It is the amplification of but one policy in one of the four DPDs that together comprise the Development Plan for the Borough. Development proposals will be considered against all of the relevant policies including their impact on the character the area which this SPD will inform.</p>
<p>Howard Tillotson The Drive</p>	<p><b>C1 Springwell Road Area and E1 Deakin Leas Area</b> The Drive and Weald View Road suffer from a lack of a cohesive description, being split between the two sections. This gives scant description of each street as a whole. The Drive is nearly all Edwardian or earlier with a few acute pitched roof houses. There is some infill and hardly any full front garden removal. The property, formerly known as Marlfield House, that originally gave the Drive its name is the large Victorian Mansion now split in two. Its gardener's bothy, now known as Marlfield Cottage, is further down the hill with access from Pembury Road. There is a considerable area between The Drive and Deakin Leas of unspoilt garden land. None of this is mentioned in the description of the Springwell Road Area. Whilst there is some reference to the importance of long views from the area there is no recognition of this large natural green area that divides The Drive from Deakin Leas, the importance of which was recognised by the Inspector in the recent appeal decision. As currently drafted the SPD would not have had any influence, positive or otherwise, on the appeal decision.</p>	<p>Section C1 has been amended to include more detailed reference to The Drive and the open garden area between The Drive and Deakin Leas.</p> <p>(See amended section for <b>C1 Springwell Road Area</b>).</p>