

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 22 September 2021

Present:

Councillors Backhouse (Vice-Chairman), Atwood, Hamilton, Poile, Pound, Warne, Hills, Fitzsimmons and Patterson

Officers in Attendance: Stephen Baughen (Head of Planning Services), Peter Hockney (Development Manager), Jennifer Begeman (Principal Planning Officer), Tracey Wagstaff (Senior Lawyer) and Mark O'Callaghan (Scrutiny and Engagement Officer)

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors McDermott, Atkins and Bailey

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

PLA59/21 The Chairman opened the meeting, introduced Committee members and officers in attendance, and outlined procedural matters of the meeting.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

PLA60/21 Apologies were received from Councillors Bland, Funnell, Dr Hall and Pope.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

PLA61/21 With reference to Planning application 20/03848/FULL – Paddock Wood Memorial Recreation Ground, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood Councillor Hamilton stated that as a Paddock Wood Town Councillor she would be fettering her discretion on this application as she had publicly stated her opposition to this site being used. Councillor Hamilton confirmed that she would withdraw from the meeting while this application was being heard.

DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING

PLA62/21 Cllrs Atwood, Fitzsimmons, Hamilton, Hills, Patterson, Poile, Pound, Warne and Backhouse advised that they had been lobbied by objectors on application PLA/20/03848/FULL – Paddock Wood Memorial Recreation Ground, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood.

Cllrs Hamilton, Hills, Pound and Backhouse, advised that they had been lobbied by supporters on application PLA/20/03848/FULL – Paddock Wood Memorial Recreation Ground, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood.

NOTIFICATION OF PERSONS REGISTERED TO SPEAK

PLA63/21 Details of Members and members of the public who have registered to speak will be given under the respective planning applications.

SITE INSPECTIONS

PLA64/21 Members had been given the opportunity to visit the site – application 20/03848/FULL Paddock Wood Memorial Recreation Ground, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 11 AUGUST 2021

PLA65/21 Members reviewed the minutes. No amendments were proposed.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 11 August 2021 be recorded as a correct record.

REPORTS OF HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES (ATTACHED)

PLA66/21

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 20/03848/FULL - PADDOCK WOOD MEMORIAL RECREATION GROUND, MAIDSTONE ROAD, PADDOCK WOOD

PLA67/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 20/03848/FULL - Paddock Wood Memorial Recreation Ground, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood and this was summarised at the meeting by Ms Jennifer Begeman, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – None.

Registered Speakers – There were 11 speakers registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

Objectors:

- Councillor Don Kent
- Mr Jeremy Thompson
- Ms Wendy Morris
- Mr John Haffenden

Supporters

- Mr Matthew Blythin
- Mr Rex Wakelin
- Mr Fred Lemont
- Ms Christine Spicer

Parish Council:

- Councillor Meryl Flashman

Borough Councillors:

- Councillor Rodney Atkins
- Councillor Sarah Hamilton

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

- It was confirmed, the beech tree, located on the south of the exit and on the boundary of the site had now been removed, and was a category B tree. The removal was supported by the TWBC Tree Officer. The tree was on the boundary with the neighbouring site which was currently being developed as terrace housing.
- Access to the site would be improved which would satisfy any concerns raised by Kent Highways.
- Information included in the report regarding the status of the Paddock Wood Cricket Club was received from Paddock Wood Town Council.
- Policy R1 of the Local Plan and paragraph 97 of the NPPF made clear

that building on existing recreation ground and on open spaces was permissible provided the proposed development did not result in a deficiency of recreation space within the catchment area.

- Further, that the loss of open space would be surplus to requirements and would therefore not materially impact upon the function of the open space nor its capacity for playing pitch provision. It was confirmed that the remaining land would continue to be retained for recreational use.
- There was a capacity issue with regards to sewerage. As such, Southern Water had factored this development into their plans. The three conditions included in the application ensured that appropriate measures would be taken.
- The car park, tennis courts and pavilion were all within 80 meters of the ball strike and therefore the existing cricket square was not compliant for hard ball cricket. There was no proposal to move the cricket pavilion.
- Management of the different uses of the community centre would ensure that the car parking spaces allocated would be sufficient.
- The time limits on S106 money were not imminent. The use of S106 money was not a factor for the consideration of this application.
- The site for the community centre would remain central to the town even allowing for any future housing development as set out in the Pre-Submission Local Plan.
- It was confirmed that the proposals met the conditions of paragraph 99 of the NPPF (paragraph 10.69 & 10.70 refers). The inclusion of a children's nursery was an additional community benefit for the wider Paddock Wood 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 application appeared to include too many components for one site.
- The arrangements for the sports facilities would seem to be too tight for the space available and there was doubt that it would work in practice.
- There was concern that the maintenance of the cricket square would be difficult if it overlapped onto the football pitches.
- The ability to play hard ball cricket should be preserved.
- There would be considerable community benefits to the centre.
- The loss of land would be found elsewhere.
- The role of the Town Council, who were broadly supportive of the scheme should be recognised. The Borough Council should support the decisions of the Town Council.
- The scheme met the needs of the local community and would provide significant benefits.

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 Fitzsimmons and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA/20/03848/FULL – Paddock Wood Memorial Recreation Ground, Maidstone Road, Paddock Wood be granted

delegated powers to officers to approve in line with the officer recommendation.

Please note that the requirements of the Delegated Powers, recommended Planning Conditions and Informatives were listed in the Committee Report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/02264/FULL - 1-9 SUSSEX MEWS, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA68/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA21/02264/FULL – 1-9 Sussex Mews, Royal Tunbridge Wells and this was summarised at the meeting by Peter Hockney, Development Manager and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – None.

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 canopy with would be ancillary to the other uses of the building.

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 Atwood and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA21/02264/FULL – 1-9 Sussex Mews, Royal Tunbridge Wells be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPEAL DECISIONS FOR NOTING

PLA69/21 **RESOLVED** – That the list of appeal decisions provided for information, be noted.

URGENT BUSINESS

PLA70/21 There was no urgent business for consideration.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

PLA71/21 The next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 20 October 2021.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 7.00 pm.