

TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held at the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Royal Tunbridge Wells, TN1 1RS, at 5.00 pm on Wednesday, 12 January 2022

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

Officers in Attendance: Peter Hockney (Development Manager), Richard Hazelgrove (Principal Planning Officer), Marie Bolton (Principal Planning Officer), James Moysey (Senior Planning Officer), Michael Taylor (Planning Officer), Jo Smith (Senior Lawyer) and Caroline Britt (Democratic Services Officer)

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors Allen, Rutland, Sankey and Willis

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

PLA98/21 The Chairman opened the meeting, introduced Committee members and officers in attendance, and outlined procedural matters of the meeting.

APOLOGIES

PLA99/21 Apologies were received from Councillor Warne. Councillor Hamilton arrived at 6:30pm. Councillor Dr Hall left the meeting at 8:20pm. Councillor Hills was not present.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

PLA100/21 No declarations of interest were made.

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

PLA101/21 Cllrs Atwood, Fitzsimmons, Funnell, Hall, Patterson, Poile, Pope, Pound, Backhouse and Bland advised that they had been lobbied by objectors on application PLA/21/01465/FULL – Scriventon Farm and Buildings, Four Winds Farm, Speldhurst, Kent.

NOTIFICATION OF PERSONS REGISTERED TO SPEAK

PLA102/21 Details of Members and members of the public who have registered to speak will be given under the respective planning applications.

SITE INSPECTIONS

PLA103/21 Members had been given the opportunity to visit application 21/01465/FULL, Scriventon Farm and Buildings, Four Winds Farm, Speldhurst, Kent.

TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED 8 DECEMBER 2021

PLA104/21 Members reviewed the minutes. No amendments were proposed.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting dated 8 December 2021 be recorded as a correct record.

REPORTS OF HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES (ATTACHED)

PLA105/21

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01465/FULL - SCRIVENTON FARM AND BUILDINGS, FOUR WINDS FARM, SPELDHURST

PLA106/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA/21/01465/FULL, Scriventon Farm and Buildings, Four Winds Farm, Speldhurst, Kent 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 - Two additional comments had been received which raised concerns about access onto Frank Hollows Road, impact on the skyline and woodlands, destruction of the footpath and infrastructure on services. It was considered that these concerns had been addressed in the report. An amendment to Condition 15 that would ensure Building A remained ancillary to the residential use of Building B and Building C.

Registered Speakers – There were 10 speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules):

Objectors:

- Mrs Clare McCulloch
- Mr Eric Maude
- Mr James Perry
- Mr Malcolm Harris

Supporters:

- Mr John Perry (agent)
- Ms Christine Fisher

Parish Council

- Cllr Kim Rajah

Borough Council

- Cllr Harry Allen
- Cllr Lucy Willis
- Cllr Matthew Sankey

Matters of Clarification by Officers and Committee Members' Questions to Officers:

- The application was for the conversion of existing buildings, not a rebuild. The existing buildings were considered to be sound and not in need of major reconstruction.

- The buildings would require a change in materials and this was considered acceptable.
- No objections had been received from the Landscape and Biodiversity Officer.
- The changes made to the scheme were considered to provide a more cohesive use of the buildings.
- Material changes included bringing in the application site boundary to the back of Building A, curtilage from the west would also be reduced. Additionally, access would now be from Franks Hollow Road, not Barden Road.
- The buildings to the North East did not form part of the current application. A separate application would be required which would be considered on its own merits.
- Local Plan Policy made provision under H13 for the conversion of existing buildings.
- The reuse and conversion of existing buildings was a permissible exception when considering development within the Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF). This was the same for the original application and was not one of the reasons it was refused. The Inspector also did not consider it an inappropriate development.
- The report dealt with issues related to the AONB (Page 128 of the report refers).
- Comments from the Council's Landscape and Biodiversity Officer were on page 134/135 of the report. No objections were raised. It was further stated that the scheme either met or exceeded policy requirements.
- The reduction in the number of units, 8 down to 5 was considered to be a material change to the application.
- Access rights were a private matter which would be undertaken between the landowner and the applicant and was not a planning consideration.
- Condition 9 addressed permitted development rights. However, it was suggested that Class B be included as part of this Condition which had been omitted.
- The Council's existing planning policy H13, that allowed the conversion of existing buildings to residential buildings did not require them to be in a sustainable location. This was because often by their nature, rural buildings were not situated in sustainable locations. It was noted that this development was not considered to be an isolated location.
- It was confirmed that there were no objections to the scheme from Kent Fire and Rescue (para 7.02 refers).
- It was confirmed that it was not usual practice for Building Regs to be submitted before planning permission had been granted.
- The size of the development was too small for it to be included in the Local Plan.
- The development and consideration of its impact on the AONB would include all aspects of the development e.g. gardens, car, parking provision etc.
- The gardens associated with Building A on the original application had been particularly prominent, the widening of the track to Barden Road and parking provision had also been raised by the Inspector. Two of the concerns raised (access and gardens) had now been removed from the application. Parking provision was now mostly within the envelope of the existing buildings.
- The requirements for new builds and the conversion of existing

buildings were different. The NPPF encouraged the reuse of existing buildings, there was no similar policy for new builds.

- Paragraph 10.15 summarised the differences of the two schemes and included the reduction in number of dwellings, the scheme was now more compact, the use of existing buildings and the change in access road.
- With reference to the previous refusal, the conversion was not considered unacceptable by the Committee or the Inspector, it was because of the use and extent of the development. It was further noted there was no previous objection to the development being in the greenbelt.
- In the previous application Building A was due to be converted into separate dwellings with gardens that would project down the slope towards the valley. This would have had a very different impact on the AONB. The revised application did not include these elements and did not exceed the footprint of the existing building.

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:

- It was not felt the development was inappropriate. But it was important to consider the impact on the AONB.
- Conversion would preserve the existing buildings (as the Oast House had done before).
- Planning permission could be granted without knowing details of the agreement with regards to access. Access not being a planning consideration.
- The gardens and car parking would not be seen from down the valley.
- The buildings were currently redundant. There was a need for housing and this was a site where buildings already existed. It was therefore deemed an appropriate use for development.
- The roof line was not being changed and the cars would be well hidden from view. As such there was little to suggest there would be an intrusion on the AONB.
- The reduction in the number of dwellings was sufficient to recommend the scheme for approval.
- The current application addressed the issues raised by the Inspector.
- The scale of the development was too small to require a Condition to include electric charging points. However, an informative could be added that consideration should be given that an electric charging point should be included for each property.
- Separate legislation applied for the installation of electric charging points for new builds.
- Condition 15 made clear the offices were ancillary to the residents houses and should only be used by them. This prevented any material change in use e.g. commercial office or other business premises.
- Some Members remained concerned about the impact on the AONB and sustainability and could not support the application for these reasons.
- The previous application submitted in 2018 was refused and it was suggested this was the right decision by the Committee. The Inspector supported that decision and provided details of the areas of concern. The developer had taken on board those comments and they had now been addressed in the revised application. It was

therefore suggested the Committee had no grounds to now refuse the application.

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 Pound and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation and with the following additions:

- That Building C be added to Condition 15.
- The addition of Class B to Condition 9.
- The addition of an Informative relating to electric vehicle charging points.

Councillor Bland requested that the vote for the motion to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation be recorded.

Councillors Atwood, Fitzsimmons, Patterson, Poile, Pope, Pound and Bland voted for the motion to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

Councillors Funnel, Hall and Backhouse voted against the motion to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application 21/01465/FULL, Scriventon Farm and Buildings, Four Winds Farm, Speldhurst Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report and the addition on Building C to Condition 15, the addition of Class B to Condition 9 and an Informative relating to electric vehicle charging points.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/01700/FULL - 69 CULVERDEN DOWN, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA107/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA/21/01700/FULL, 69 Culverden Down, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by James Moysey, Senior Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation - An additional Condition had been recommended as follows – ‘Details of pedestrian visibility displays within the curtilage shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any above ground works. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details’. This would be done for pedestrian and highway safety reasons and followed a similar Condition that had been applied to the previous application submitted in 2016.

Registered Speakers – There were 6 speakers that registered in accordance with the Council’s Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules):

Objectors:

- Ms Louise La Trobe
- Mr Tim Shaw
- Mr and Mrs Richard Prescott
- Ms Christine Fisher

Supporters:

- Mr Simon McKay (Agent)

Borough Councillors:

- Cllr Justine Rutland

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

- No legislation existed that limited the number of applications that could be submitted. Similarly there was no timescale.
- There was no increase in the scale/bulk of the building. There was no change to the width, depth or position, the only change related to the size of the roof to accommodate an additional unit.
- The building respected the building/roof line of similar buildings in the immediate area.
- This was a brownfield site inside the limits of built development and a sustainable location. The site was considered to make the most efficient use of the land.
- Para 10.24 onwards provided details of any potential impact on the neighbours.
- There would be a good level of screening on the boundaries to the side and rear of the property. The hard and soft landscaping Condition had been recommended that would ensure a good level of screening was retained.
- The principle of an apartment building had been approved by an Inspector and was therefore deemed acceptable.
- The scheme originally came forward with 9 parking spaces for 9 units. Following concerns from local residents this had been amended to 10 parking spaces.
- On road parking was not considered to be an issue as there was plenty of availability.
- Condition 15 that related to delivery/removal of plant equipment and waste could be amended to include an instruction that would require this to be done outside school drop off and pick up times.
- The existing application for 8 apartments included parking provision at the front of the property.
- Over the time of this application and previous applications there had been no issues around parking provision including at school drop off and pick up.
- The position of the apartment building had not changed from what was previously approved. The loss of light due to the increase to the roof height was not deemed significant to warrant refusal.
- The Leylandii was across both properties and could be pruned as necessary.
- The Landscaping Condition could require additional landscaping if appropriate.
- The original scheme did not include a balcony on the top floor. A balcony/terrace had been included as part of the revised scheme.
- Kent CC's parking standards document was a guidance document, to be used as a measure for parking provision. The parking provision met the guidance for residents but did fall short by 1.8 (2 spaces) in terms of visitor parking. However, it was the view of officers that this was a highly accessible location with bus stops nearby and also within

walking distance of the town centre. As such, the proposed number of spaces was appropriate for this development.

- There was also plenty of on street parking availability on Culverden Down, Huntley's Park and on Connaught Way.
- Site notices were placed as prescribed by legislation to ensure residents were aware of the planning application. The site notice on Connaught Way had subsequently been removed and so had to be reinstated. To allow for this, the Council allowed additional time for residents to respond.
- The site was not in a conservation area and none of the trees were subject to a TPO.
- Condition 18 required a scheme for the enhancement of biodiversity to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- Condition 17 dealt with tree protection.
- Condition 16 required an Arboriculture Method Statement to have been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- Condition 14 related to the protection of bats.
- The site constituted a previously developed piece of land, i.e. land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure. The site of the house was previously developed land and therefore was considered as a brownfield site.
- The maximum height of 10.7m did not include the central lantern on the top of the building.
- The difference in height of the previous scheme and the scheme currently being considered was 5.5cm.
- The development at the front had been consistent since the Inspectors decision in 2007.
- Officers reconfirmed that the property being proposed was on the same site as had previously been approved. The width and depth were also the same as previously approved. The only change was to the shape of the roof. It was acknowledged that there would be some loss of light to neighbouring properties but given that the height increase was minimal, the harm was not considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal.
- It was the view of officers that should the application be refused it would be successful at appeal and it was further likely that the Council might be liable for any costs incurred.
- The main points Members needed to consider was the additional unit and the associated increase in roof height to accommodate it.
- The construction and management Condition could be amended to include 'regular' liaison. It could also include prescribed times to avoid school drop off and pick up.
- The potential loss of light was subjective and would be dependent on a number factors. There still remained a considerable distance between the adjacent properties.
- Officers confirmed there was a terrace as part of the top floor flat but there were no issues with overlooking onto adjacent properties.

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 discussion. These included:

- It was important to consider the application on its own merits rather than issues related to previous applications/approvals.
- There were concerns about the overlooking, loss of light and the imposing sense of the development, particularly upon No 67

Culverden Down.

- The overlooking from the rear balcony onto the top floor towards Connaught Way was also raised.
- The Highways issues were also a concern and the fear that there was not enough parking for the development to ensure both the safe exit and entrance into the site and that the street did not become unduly cluttered with cars that should be parked off road.
- There was no time limit for submitting planning applications.
- A legitimate reason would be needed to refuse the application and some Members expressed doubt as to whether one could be found.
- NPPF paragraph 11 d)ii stated that the adverse impact of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This was cited by some Members as the reason why the application should be refused.
- It was important the word 'regular' be added in reference to liaison with residents.
- A Condition regarding electric charging points was already in place.
- Officers reconfirmed the access point had previously been considered acceptable for 8 units. The Highway Authority had not objected to the application. The previous application with only 8 parking spaces would have also been short of the Kent CC's guidance on parking standards.
- Applications must be viewed on their own merits. An application for 8 units had already been approved and would stand even if the Committee were minded to refuse the current application.
- Officer's had already advised of a likely successful appeal should the Committee refuse.
- If the Committee accepted the application, the Committee would want the developer to progress to the build without further delay.
- Officers confirmed the distance between the property and the properties on Connaught Way was between 70-75m

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 Patterson, seconded by Councillor Backhouse and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation and with the following additions:

- An enhanced Condition regarding site access during the building process so that it did not conflict with school drop off and pick up times.
- Regular consultation be maintained through the construction period with local residents.
- The inclusion of an additional Condition relating pedestrian visibility displays.

Councillor Bland requested that the vote for the motion to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation be recorded.

Councillors Hamilton, Patterson, Poile, Pope and Backhouse voted for the motion to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

Councillors Atwood, Funnell and Pound voted against the motion to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

Councillors Fitzsimmons and Bland abstained.

RESOLVED – That application 21/01700/FULL, 69 Culverden Down, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report and the enhanced Condition regarding site access, the inclusion of regular consultation and the inclusion of an additional Condition relating to pedestrian visibility displays.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03584/FULL - THE AMELIA SCOTT, MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA108/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03584/FULL, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove Principal Planning Officer 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:

- It was estimated the installation would extend down the wall but would remain high enough from the ground so as not to be within the reach of children.

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

RESOLVED – That application PLA 21/03584/FULL, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03585/LBC - THE AMELIA SCOTT, MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA109/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03585/LBC, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove Principal Planning Officer 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)

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 PLA 21/03585/LBC, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03805/FULL - THE AMELIA SCOTT, MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA110/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03805/FULL, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove Principal Planning Officer 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)

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 Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Backhouse and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA 21/03805/FULL, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03773/LBC - THE AMELIA SCOTT. MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA111/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03773/LBC, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove, Principal Planning Officer 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)

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 Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Atwood and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA 21/03773/LBC, The Amelia Scott, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03824/FULL - TW LAWN TENNIS CLUB, NEVILL GATE, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA111/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03824/FULL, TW Lawn Tennis Club, Nevill Gate, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Michael Taylor, Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

A

Updates and additional representation – None.

Registered Speakers – There was 1 speaker that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules):

Objector:
Ms Christine Fisher.

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

RESOLVED – That application PLA 21/03824/FULL, TW Lawn Tennis Club, Nevill Gate, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03819/LAWPRO - 98 FARMCOMBE ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA112/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03819/LAWPRO, 98 Farmcombe Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove, Principal Planning Officer 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):

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 Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Pope and a vote was taken to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED – That application PLA 21/03819/LAWPRO, 98 Farmcombe Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/02192/FULL - FRIDAYS OF CRANBROOK LTD, CHEQUER TREE FARM, SWATTENDEN LANE, CRANBROOK, KENT

PLA113/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/02192/FULL, Fridays of Cranbrook Ltd, Chequer Tree Farm, Swattenden Lane, Cranbrook, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove, Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

Updates and additional representation – None.

Registered Speakers – There was 1 speaker that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules):

Objector:

Ms Christine Fisher.

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

- It was noted by some Members that the company had been operating for over 40 years on the same site and they should be congratulated.

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 21/02192/FULL, Fridays of Cranbrook Ltd, Chequer tree Farm, Swattenden Lane, Cranbrook, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report

APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03790/REM - LAND NORTH OF 56 CULVERDEN DOWN, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS

PLA114/21 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA 21/03790/REM, Land North of 56 Culverden Down, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Richard Hazelgrove, Principal Planning Officer 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)

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

RESOLVED – That application PLA 21/03790/REM, Land North of 56 Culverden Down, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

APPEAL DECISIONS FOR NOTING

PLA115/21 **RESOLVED** – That the list of appeal decisions provided for information, be noted.

URGENT BUSINESS

PLA116/21 There was no urgent business for consideration.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

PLA117/21 The next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 2 February 2022.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 9.45 pm.