

**Tonbridge  
Medway**

**TM/13/01736/FL**

**Erection of a detached chalet style dwelling on land to the rear of 51 Hadlow Road and formation of new vehicular access to Hadlow Road and hardstanding to serve 51 Hadlow Road at 51 Hadlow Road Tonbridge Kent TN9 1LF for Mrs Jane Elks**

KCC (H&T): No objections. Planning permission does not convey any approval for construction of the required vehicular crossing or any other works within the highway for which a statutory licence must be obtained.

Private Reps: Since publication of the Committee report, a further 8 letters of objection have been received. Objections centre on the following issues:

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Approval would set a precedent for further development;
- Adverse impact on the outlook of adjoining houses in The Haydens;
- Insufficient parking provision to serve a dwelling of this size;
- Query how construction and delivery traffic will be managed;
- Question safety of another access onto Hadlow Road so close to the traffic lights;
- Reference made to the fact that the applicant is related to a Ward Councillor;
- Ongoing works in the Bourne Lane area causing long term disturbance to residents;
- Development on gardens should be resisted;
- Out of character with the area;
- Loss of privacy;
- Lack of detail concerning earthworks needed to achieve stipulated levels;
- Detrimental impact on tranquil atmosphere of the area;
- Question what would happen to the trees on site.
- Application states that pre-application advice was that the proposal was contrary to policy.

DPEHH: Dealing firstly with the fact that the applicant is related to a member of the Area 1 Planning Committee, the agent has declared the position openly and in these circumstances there is strict management control to guard against any conflict of interest occurring.

If Members are minded to grant planning permission, I would stress that this would not set a precedent for further similar development in the area. Instead, each case is assessed on its individual merits in light of the prevailing Development Plan policies and the particular characteristics of the site and its setting. Members will be aware that the general issue of

precedent has been the subject of some discussion recently, within the context of a variety of planning applications in the wider area, some of which have been approved and some refused (and successfully upheld at Appeal). This only serves to confirm the principle that each case requires individual assessment.

The reference to pre-application advice stating that the proposal was considered to be contrary to planning policy related to an earlier iteration of the proposal. It is not uncommon for advice to be given in this way and all such advice is given purely on an informal, without prejudice basis.

I can confirm that none of the trees within the site are covered by TPO and the site does not lie in a Conservation Area. If Members are minded to grant planning permission, I have recommended that a condition be imposed requiring a detailed scheme of landscaping and boundary treatment to be submitted for approval.

The remaining issues raised in these representations have been addressed within the body of the main report.

#### **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:**

##### **Additional Informative:**

**5. The applicant should carefully consider arrangements for the management of demolition and construction traffic, including movements to and from the site, in the interests of residential amenities and highway safety.**

---

**Tonbridge  
Castle**

**TM/13/01197/FL**

**Change of use from retail into 2 no. residential units including single storey extension to rear of both units including demolition of existing rear addition and chimney along with external alterations seeking to remedy works undertaken without approval at 4 Bank Street Tonbridge Kent TN9 1BL for Basi Construction Ltd**

KCC (H&T): No objections. Should any works be required in the highway a statutory licence must be obtained.

SARA: We are pleased that action is proposed to rectify this unfortunate development. The proposals are rather sketchy so it is difficult to be completely confident about the outcome but this seems bound to be an improvement on the current state of affairs. We are glad that a vigilant eye will be kept on the works and are particularly keen that efforts are made to reuse original materials when making good, in particular the roof tiles, many of which will have been removed to install the current oversized dormers. Where this is not possible

we expect the materials used to blend in with the original tile and brickwork. We would prefer a proper effort to restore the brickwork beneath the old shop sign rather than simply covering up the current unsatisfactory effort with a rendered panel. We strongly support the recommendations that the work be undertaken as soon as possible and that consideration is given to not working on Saturdays.

DPEHH: Since writing the Committee report, I have had an opportunity to further consider the level of detail contained within the submitted plans. The detail concerning the new front door to be installed in the western elevation of the building is rather lacking and therefore ambiguous. I would suggest that, in light of the nature of the works carried out to date, there would be justification for requiring this detail to be formally submitted for approval. This can be achieved by planning condition should Members be minded to grant planning permission.

Reinstatement of the brick arches above the doorways and windows is not proposed within this revised application; indeed the application seeks to regularise the removal of these features as part of the retention of the windows as installed. It is my view that this is not a feature the Council would be justified in insisting upon being reinstated in these circumstances and it would not have formed part of the Enforcement Notice should one have been issued. However, on the verbal request of one local resident, I see no harm in making the suggestion to the applicant that he might consider this, on the understanding that, should he decide to incorporate these features, he should liaise with Officers to discuss the details prior to undertaking any such works.

#### **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:**

##### **Additional Condition:**

**8. Prior to the installation of a front door into the western elevation of the building to serve unit 4a, full details of the design and appearance of the door shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and the work shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those details.**

**Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or visual amenity of the locality.**

##### **Additional Informative:**

**7. The applicant is advised that the Local Planning Authority would welcome the opportunity to discuss the possibility of reinstating the decorative brickwork above windows and doors as a further measure to improve the visual quality of the building.**

---