

## TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH COUNCIL

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held at the Committee Rooms A and B, Town Hall, Royal Tunbridge Wells, TN1 1RS, at 6.30 pm on Wednesday, 29 June 2022

**Present: Councillor Trevor Poile (Chair)**  
**Councillors Warne (Vice-Chair), Atwood, Fitzsimmons, Le Page, Moon, Patterson and Wakeman**

**Officers in Attendance:** Peter Hockney (Development Manager), Tracey Wagstaff (Senior Lawyer Mid Kent Legal Services), Jennifer Begeman (Principal Planning Officer), Richard Hazelgrove (Principal Planning Officer) and Emer Moran (Democratic Services Officer)

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillors Hayward

#### CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

PLA1/22 The Chairman opened the meeting, introduced Committee members and officers in attendance, and outlined procedural matters of the meeting.

#### APOLOGIES

PLA2/22 Apologies were received from Councillors Britcher-Allen and Pope.

#### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

PLA3/22 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)

PLA4/22 No declarations of lobbying were made.

#### SITE INSPECTIONS

PLA5/22 Members had not undertaken any site visits.

#### TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING DATED

PLA6/22 **RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting dated 28 April 202 be recorded as a correct record.

#### REPORTS OF HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES (ATTACHED)

PLA7/22

#### APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/03298/FULL LAND ADJACENT AND 15 - 16 ERIDGE ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT.

PLA8/22 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA8/22 Land Adjacent And 15 - 16 Eridge Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent 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** – Since publication of the agenda report, the presenting officers updated:

**Corrections:**

- **Page 59, Paragraph 10.58** – The date of the Site Investigation Report is 26 November 2021.
- **Page 66, Paragraph 11.0** – The fourth line of Recommendation (A), the date is 31 July 2022.
- **Page 72, Condition 13** – The fifth bullet point - delete “(1 condition for each block to aid discharge?)”

**Reword conditions to read:**

- **15) Electric vehicle charging points**  
Prior to commencement of development, details of electric vehicle charging points to be provided within the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be installed prior to the occupation of any unit. The development shall be built in accordance with the agreed details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In the interests of sustainable development.
- **18) Measures to reduce noise pollution**  
This condition should be “Prior to occupation” not “Prior to commencement”
- **20) Hard and soft landscaping**  
Last sentence should state 5 years not 10 years “within a period of five years”

**New planning condition 30 to read:**

- **30) Disabled access apartments**  
“That prior to commencement, details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to show at least 1 apartment to be built to M4(2) standard, and at least one apartment to be built to M4(3) standard. The development shall be built in accordance with the agreed details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: This information is required in order to ensure good quality design, and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development, which meets the needs of current and future generations.”

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

**Supporter:**

Mr Matthew Jeal, on behalf of the applicant.

**Matters of clarification by Officers and Committee Members' questions to Officers included:**

- i. Officers advised that Kent County Council (KCC) Highways had accepted the view of the Planning Services related to the bus stop improvements and after discussions were supportive of the scheme as a whole.
- ii. It was confirmed that the issues related to the car parking rear of Neville Terrace was a civil matter.
- iii. It was advised that the petrol station was outside the control of the applicant, page 37 of the report highlighted KCC highways final comments on the report.
- iv. It was confirmed that there were 44 parking spaces in total, 2 for the semis (one each), and 42 for the 40 apartments.
- v. Paragraph 10.63 of report stated that the eight parking spaces used by Nevill Terrace residents will be retained and are shown hatched on the plans.
- vi. The leased Nevill Crescent parking spaces did not form part of the 42 parking spaces for the apartments.
- vii. The density of the development was discussed, and it was confirmed that it was within range of the site allocation local plan, and towards the lower end of the range.

**Committee Member debate and Officer clarification included:**

- i. It was felt that the scheme offered a good use of land and was sensitive to the landscape.
- ii. Members acknowledged the narrow busy road and highlighted the possibility of the petrol station putting up boards that may obstruct the view.
- iii. The location of M(3) and M(4) properties was discussed and this would be made clearer by the use of floor plans as part of a condition along with further discussion.
- iv. Members were pleased to acknowledge the contribution to the Tunbridge Wells Commons Conservators and that the mitigations were acceptable by the Conservators.

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

**RESOLVED** – That application PLA8/22 be granted subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report and as shown above.

**APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 21/04232/FULL SUNHILL PLACE, HIGH STREET, PEMBURY, TUNBRIDGE WELLS ,KENT.**

PLA9/22 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA9/22 Sunhill Place, High Street, Pembury, Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Mr Richard Hazelgrove Principal Planning Officer and illustrated by means of a visual presentation.

**Updates and additional representation** – None.

Registered Speakers – There were 3 speakers that registered in accordance with the Council's Constitution (Planning Committee Procedure Rules)

**Objectors:**

- Mr Paul Roberts
- Ms Anna Murphy

**Supporters:**

- Mr Gerry Phoenix

**Matters of clarification by Officers and Committee Members' questions to Officers included:**

- i. Officers stated that there was no way the application would be recommended for approval if there was a risk of significant overlooking from the windows in the flank of the extension and this was addressed in condition 9 in the report.
- ii. Kent County Council (KCC) had different parking standards for one and two bedroom flats as opposed to one and two bedroom dwellings that were applied across the county.
- iii. Officers acknowledged that the development may result in a loss of sunlight however that would not be significant to be contrary to Policy EN1 and justify a refusal.
- iv. Officers advised there was no policy requirement for a sunlight report by a consultant to be submitted based on the scale of the development, the potential loss of light was addressed in the report.

**Committee Member debate and Officer clarification included:**

- i. It was felt that the building did look run down and the application would have a positive impact.
- ii. Paragraph 10.08 referred to the 2018 Housing Needs Survey and it was stated that a more up to date survey would have been preferred.
- iii. Some Members were not convinced about the potential public benefit of the development.
- iv. It was suggested that the application did not fulfil the parking requirements, this was addressed and it was advised that the conditions offered more control for the requirements to be retained.
- v. The issue about loss of light was acknowledged as a concern however it was understood that a refusal based on this would not stand at appeal.

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

**RESOLVED** – That application PLA9/22 be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

**APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 22/00840/FULL 26 AND 28 CAMBRIDGE STREET, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT.**

PLA10/22 **Planning Report and Presentation** – The Head of Planning Services

submitted a report in respect of application PLA10/22 26 And 28 Cambridge Street, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Mr 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 included:**

- i. It was confirmed the ridge height of the application had increased by 1.6 metres which was comparable to similar applications noted in paragraph 10.03 on page 103 of the report.
- ii. It was confirmed that as the reasons for refusal given in February which related solely to the design and impact on the character and appearance to the conservation area had been met, the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the application.
- iii. It was confirmed that the Local Planning Authority enforced conditions.

**Committee Member debate and Officer clarification included:**

- i. It was commented that a Member felt the design was unappealing.
- ii. Concerns were raised about the impact on privacy on nearby residents.
- iii. It was confirmed that the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the drop in the height of the roof, and they had not cited any refusal reasons based on appearance or impact to the streetscene.

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

**RESOLVED –** That application PLA10/22 be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

**APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 22/01156/LDLB TOWN HALL AND ASSEMBLY HALL, MOUNT PLEASANT ROAD, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT.**

PLA11/22 **Planning Report and Presentation –** The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA11/22 Town Hall and Assembly Hall, Mount Pleasant Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent and this was summarised at the meeting by Mr 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:

- i. It was confirmed that this was an application to certify that the works carried out did not require listed building consent and not actually an application for listed building consent.

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

- i. It was felt that the works had prolonged the life of single glazed windows when they could be upgraded to double or triple glazed to help be carbon zero by 2030.

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

**RESOLVED –** That application PLA11/22 be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

**APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION - 22/01324/FULL CALVERLEY GROUNDS, MOUNT PLEASANT AVENUE, ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS, KENT.**

PLA12/22 **Planning Report and Presentation –** The Head of Planning Services submitted a report in respect of application PLA12/22 Calverley Grounds, Mount Pleasant Avenue, 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:

- i. It was confirmed that the rink was slightly greater in size and

it was orientated differently.

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

- i. Concerns were raised about traffic footfall in the Santa Cabin and whether the pathway was wide enough.

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

**RESOLVED** – That application PLA12/22 be granted subject to the plans, conditions and informatives as set out in the agenda report.

#### **APPEAL DECISIONS FOR NOTING 21 APRIL 2022 TO 21 JUNE 2022**

PLA13/22     **RESOLVED** – That the list of appeal decisions provided for information, be noted.

#### **URGENT BUSINESS**

PLA14/22     There was no urgent business for consideration.

#### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

PLA15/22     The next Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for Wednesday 10 August 2022.

NOTE: The meeting concluded at 8.48 pm.