

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 21 July 2021

**Present: Councillor Godfrey Bland (Chairman)
Councillors Backhouse (Vice-Chairman), Atwood, Dr Hall, Funnell, Poile and Pound**

Officers in Attendance: Marie Bolton (Principal Planning Officer), Canan Clatworthy (Principal Planning Officer) and Caroline Britt (Democratic Services Officer)

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor McDermott

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

PLA28/21 The Chairman opened the meeting, introduced Committee members and officers in attendance, and outlined procedural matters of the meeting.

APOLOGIES

PLA29/21 Apologies were received from Councillors Hamilton, Hills, Pope and Warne.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

PLA30/21 With reference to Planning Application 21/00427, Bethany School, Jarvis Lane, Goudhurst, Kent, Councillor Dr Linda Hall made the following statement:

“There is an application on the Agenda (Item 8(F)) which involves development at Bethany School. I own property and live within close proximity to Bethany school. I am also involved in higher tertiary education and am an Inspector for the HEFCE, but my roles in these capacities does not affect or influence development matters or decision making either in general or specifically in relation to Bethany School. I have not been involved in any decisions relating to the proposed development at Bethany School. I am coming to the meeting with an open mind and propose to fully take part in and vote on the application.”

DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING (IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROTOCOL FOR MEMBERS TAKING PART IN THE PLANNING PROCESS, PART 5, SECTION 5.11, PARAGRAPH 6.6)

PLA31/21 No declarations of lobbying were made.

NOTIFICATION OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

PLA32/21 Details of Members and Members of the public who have registered to speak would be given under the respective planning applications.

SITE INSPECTIONS

PLA33/21 Due to the current restrictions Members had not undertaken any site visits.

TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 23 JUNE 2021

PLA34/21 In respect of Planning Application 21/00848/FULL, Breakstones, Speldhurst Road, Langton Green, Tunbridge Wells, under section Committee Debate

and Officer responses, Members agreed the first bullet point to be amended as follows:

- It was accepted by some but not all Members that the proposed fence was required for privacy reasons. The current fence was dilapidated and the new proposal had been discussed with the neighbours.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 23 June 2021 be recorded as a correct record.

REPORTS OF HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES (ATTACHED)

PLA35/21

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/00427/FULL - BETHANY SCHOOL, JARVIS LANE, GOUDHURST, KENT

PLA36/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/00427/FULL, Bethany School, Jarvis Lane, Goudhurst, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Canan Clatworthy, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – Two letters of objection had been received from residents raising issues concerning the level of hedgerows, ecology loss, the potential commercial use of the facility, lighting and noise. All these issues were dealt with in the report under the AONB and ecology sections and with the attachment of suitable conditions. In addition, following the publication of the revised NPPF (published on 20 July 2021), no additional considerations needed to be taken into account save for the changes to paragraph numbers. Para 95a of the revised NPPF (94a of the revoked NPPF) continues to give great weight to the need to create, expand and alter schools.

Registered Speakers – There were three speakers registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Danielle Lawrence – DHA Planning on behalf of the applicant
Parish Councillor Antony Harris – Chair of Goudhurst Parish Council
Mr Ed Bates – Local Resident

Matters of Clarification by Officers and Committee Members' Questions to Officers – Members raised a number of questions and officers confirmed the following:

- A CCTV survey of the existing surface water would be likely including the car park (as a new area of hard standing) and would be undertaken as part of the Conditions.
- Condition 19 was strong enough to prevent the use of the new facilities for any other purpose other than by the school.
- Removal of the hedgerow was required to provide better visibility at the entrance/exit to the car park.
- Additional landscaping enhancements in other areas of the development would be provided.
- Condition 12 had been added to ensure that details of any lighting provision would have to be submitted to the Council.

- A Noise Survey to include the Amphitheatre and proposed building was suggested to ensure that any noise impact was minimised or mitigated upon the amenities of local residents.
- Use of the new facilities for charitable purposes e.g. local schools was considered important to the local community and should be allowed. This would be similar to what was currently being done with the swimming pool. It was unclear as to whether the Condition 19 allowed for this, or whether it could be left to the discretion of the school. It was further determined that ancillary use could be left to the discretion to Bethany School.
- A transport report was included and determined that there would be no additional traffic to what was currently experienced at the school.
- With regards to flooding, the wording of the relevant Condition ensured that mapping would be required to show where the existing ditches and drainage were and how any issues would be addressed through discharge of conditions.

Committee Debate and Officer Responses – Members of the Committee took account of the presentations made and raised a number of questions and issues within their discussions. These included:

- There was general support for the application, with the caveat there was a Condition to survey the impact of performance noise from the proposed Amphitheatre and the indoor theatre.
- The proposal included the reuse of the old swimming pool which should be applauded.
- There remained concern about the wording of Condition 19. That it should be amended to ensure the use of facilities for charitable purposes, including local schools.
- The current wording was deemed as quite succinct in that it made clear the new facilities could not be used for commercial or business purposes. This prevented the school from turning the facilities into a commercial enterprise. However, the school had a moral duty to extend the use of its premises to other similar organisations e.g. local schools, similar to what was already being done with the swimming pool.
- The current wording of Condition 19 left the decision to the school.
- The addition of a noise Condition to be included, based along the following lines ‘an additional survey on the impact of performance noise from the Amphitheatre and indoor theatre measured by the impact from local properties’.
- Officers confirmed such a condition could be agreed with the Chair.

Decision/voting – On the basis that members were satisfied that all relevant planning considerations had been covered within the report, a motion was proposed by Councillor Pound, seconded by Councillor Dr Hall and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation but subject to confirmation that the application included a sufficient requirement to ascertain the noise impact of both the Amphitheatre and the indoor theatre.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/00427/FULL, Bethany School, Jarvis Lane, Goudhurst, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report, plus confirmation that the report included sufficient requirements relating to noise for the purposes of the application.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01735/FULL - TWO BRIDGES, ALTERNATIVE PUPIL PROVISION, YMCA, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT

PLA37/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA21/01735/FULL, Two Bridges, Alternative Pupil Provision, YMCA, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Canan Clatworthy, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – Following the publication of the revised NPPF (published 20 July 2021), no additional considerations needed to be taken into account save for the changes to paragraph numbers. Para 95a of the revised NPPF (94a of the revoked NPPF) continues to give great weight to the need to create, expand and alter schools.

Registered Speakers – There were no speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Decision/voting – On the basis that members were satisfied that all relevant planning considerations had been covered within the report, a motion was proposed by Councillor Pound, seconded by Councillor Backhouse and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/01735/FULL, Two Bridges, Alternative Pupil Provision, YMCA, Royal Tunbridge Wells be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01701/FULL - THE FORUM, THE COMMON, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT

PLA38/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA21/01701/FULL, The Forum, The Common, Royal Tunbridge Wells and this was summarised at the meeting by Canan Clatworthy, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – Following the publication of the revised NPPF (published 20 July 2021), no additional considerations needed to be taken into account save for the changes to paragraph numbers.

Registered Speakers – There were no speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Matters of Clarification by Officers and Committee Members' Questions to Officers – Members raised a number of questions and officers confirmed the following:

- The material being used for the construction of the building was thermal wood and was considered appropriate for the area.
- The colour of the proposed building had been deemed acceptable.
- It was suggested the proposed layout would not be intrusive.
- There was concern that the proposal did not fit with the character of

the Forum.

- The application was for a permanent structure (to replace the existing temporary structure).
- The application did not include provision for any alcohol, just for hot drinks.
- An informative could be included for a conversation with the Conservators to include sufficient provision for litter bins in the immediate and surrounding area.

Committee Debate and Officer Responses – Members of the Committee took account of the presentations made and raised a number of questions and issues within their discussions. These included:

- The existing provision was very popular and was widely used by local residents.
- There remained concern about the look of the structure, which was out of keeping with the local area.
- The Conservation Officer required that the proposed structure did not blend in with the existing structure.
- Supporting local businesses was paramount and the temporary structure had been extremely popular during the pandemic.

Decision/voting – On the basis that members were satisfied that all relevant planning considerations had been covered within the report, a motion was proposed by Councillor Backhouse, seconded by Councillor Atwood and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation with an additional informative for the provision of sufficient litter bins.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/01701/FULL, The Forum, The Common, Royal Tunbridge Wells be given delegated powers to grant subject to no new planning matters being raised and the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report with an additional informative regarding the mitigation of litter in the immediate and surrounding area.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01755/FULL - FORMER DAY IN THE WELLS BUILDING, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT

PLA39/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA21/01755/FULL, Former Day in the Wells Building, Royal Tunbridge Wells and this was summarised at the meeting by Canan Clatworthy, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – Following publication of the revised NPPF (published 20 July 2021), no additional considerations needed to be taken into account save for the changes to paragraph numbers.

Registered Speakers – There were no speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Matters of Clarification by Officers and Committee Members' Questions to Officers – Members raised a number of questions and officers confirmed the following:

- Dandara's temporary permission did not expire until 2023.
- It was confirmed that the opening hours were 0700 to 0700 i.e. 24 hours. This allowed for maximum flexibility for the users, access to the building and accords with the approach for the Corn Exchange.
- It was confirmed the extant planning permission for the cinema was still valid.

Decision/voting – On the basis that members were satisfied that all relevant planning considerations had been covered within the report, a motion was proposed by Councillor Backhouse, seconded by Councillor Dr Hall and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/01755/FULL, Former Day in the Wells Building, Royal Tunbridge Wells be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01990/ADV - THE AMELIA, MOUNT PLEASANT, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT

PLA40/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA21/01990/ADV, The Amelia, Mount Pleasant, Royal Tunbridge Wells and this was summarised at the meeting by Marie Bolton, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – Following publication of the revised NPPF (published 20 July 2021), no additional considerations needed to be taken into account save for the changes to paragraph numbers.

Registered Speakers – There were no speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Matters of Clarification by Officers and Committee Members' Questions to Officers – Members raised a number of questions and officers confirmed the following:

- Discussions had taken place with the Conservation Officer about form of the adverts, that followed pre-application advice.

Committee Debate and Officer Responses:

- It was disappointing that given the amount of time and money that had gone into the building that a modern version of advertising was considered unsuitable.

Decision/voting – On the basis that members were satisfied that all relevant planning considerations had been covered within the report, a motion was proposed by Councillor Poile, seconded by Councillor Funnell and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/01990/ADV, The Amelia, Mount Pleasant, Royal Tunbridge Wells be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01515/LBC - THE AMELIA, MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT

PLA41/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA21/01515/LBC, The Amelia, Mount Pleasant, Royal Tunbridge Wells and this was summarised at the meeting by Marie Bolton, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – Following publication of the revised NPPF (published 20 July 2021), no additional considerations needed to be taken into account save for the changes to paragraph numbers.

Registered Speakers – There were no speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Matters of Clarification by Officers and Committee Members' Questions to Officers – Members raised a number of questions and officers confirmed the following:

- Lightning Tape was used for earthing lightning strikes to the building.

Committee Debate and Officer Responses:

- It was commented that attaching security lights to the building was permissible, which seemed contrary to advice given on the previous application regarding the use of electronic advertising.

Decision/voting – On the basis that members were satisfied that all relevant planning considerations had been covered within the report, a motion was proposed by Councillor Atwood, seconded by Councillor Poile and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/01515/LBC, The Amelia, Mount Pleasant, Royal Tunbridge Wells be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPEAL DECISIONS FOR NOTING 15/06/2021 TO 08/07/2021

PLA42/21 **RESOLVED** – That the list of appeal decisions provided for information, be noted.

URGENT BUSINESS

PLA43/21 There was no urgent business for consideration.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

PLA44/21 The next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 11 August 2021 at 5:00pm.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 12.28 pm.