

**Tonbridge**                      **TM/14/02674/OA**  
**Vauxhall**

**Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 63 bedroom care home (use class C2), with associated parking and landscaping at 31 - 36 Quarry Hill Road Tonbridge Kent TN9 2RS for Castlemead Group Ltd, Porthaven Care Ltd & Thomas Aston Home**

Private Reps: A further 11 responses have been received from local residents objecting to the latest drawings of the proposed development. The reasons for objection are the same as the reasons referred to in my main report. Local residents have acknowledged the changes to the appearance/detailed design of the proposed building, but in their view these do not overcome their objections to this development.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**

---

**Hildenborough**                **TM/14/03644/FL**  
**Hildenborough**

**Demolition of existing buildings on site and construction of 2 detached residential dwellings and associated access and landscaping at Alexander Stables Vines Lane Hildenborough Tonbridge Kent for Kent & Medway NHS Social Care And Partnership Trust**

DPHEH:

It has been drawn to our attention that some neighbours who have made representations on the planning application did not receive written notification of the intention to report this application to this Planning Committee. Letters were sent in the usual way but clearly in some instances have not reached their intended addresses. As a result, residents are understandably concerned that this has meant they have not had sufficient time to study the contents of the Committee report and prepare to speak at the Committee meeting. With this in mind, it is considered prudent to withdraw the application from tonight's Agenda and report again at the next Area 1 Committee meeting, which will give all contributors ample time to prepare.

**APPLICATION WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA**

---

**Tonbridge  
Medway**

**TM/14/02628/OA**

**Outline Application: Demolition of the rear garage and the construction 6 new dwellings in total. The works will involve part conversion and extension to existing building at 82 Goldsmid Road Tonbridge Kent TN9 2BY for Mrs Olive Clinker**

DPHEH:

I would like to clarify the issue of car parking policy in relation to this proposal and I would refer Members to paragraphs 6.6 to 6.9 of my main report.

The Council's adopted car parking standards for residential developments are contained within Interim Guidance Note 3 (IGN3). It provides car parking standards for four separate categories of area, namely; "City/Town Centre"; "Edge of Centre"; "Suburban" and "Suburban Edge/Village/Rural". An application site must be classified within one of these four categories before assessing what the parking requirement might be for a given development. In the case of the current application, the site is classified as being within an Edge of Centre location. In this category (as well as the City/Town Centre category) IGN3 states that car parking standards are expressed as a maximum amount that can be required. For the other two categories, the standards are expressed as the minimum amount of car parking that should be required. The reason for this difference relates to the particular characteristics associated with each of the categorised locations. For example in town centres or sites on their edge, such as this one, there is generally greater access to public transport and town centre/shops services than sites in suburban or rural areas. Hence there is less likely to be a dependence upon the private motor car for people living in town or edge of centre locations than those living in suburban or village locations.

For the proposed development in this location, the adopted car parking standards (IGN3) requires a maximum of 5 car parking spaces to be provided. However, the application of the adopted car parking standards is a starting point for assessing the impact of a development upon highway safety and, inevitably, other factors concerning the particular circumstances of a case will need to be taken into consideration. Furthermore, the application of maximum car parking standards does not mean that the maximum number of car parking spaces must be provided on each and every occasion. Rather, the provision of less than the maximum number of car parking spaces can be considered to be acceptable in a particular case should the circumstances allow. I have set out in paragraphs 6.6 to 6.9 of my main report, why in the circumstances of this particular case, a nil car parking provision is considered to be acceptable. This has involved a comparison of the car parking requirements of the proposed development against those associated with the existing uses of this site, as well as the consideration of other types of retail use that could take place within this without requiring a specific planning permission. The location of the site in relation to the town centre is also a key factor to take into account as is its accessibility by modes of transport other than the private motor car. Taking these factors into account, I consider that providing no off-street car parking to serve this

development is acceptable and would not result in a severe detrimental impact upon highway safety.

**RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED**

---

**Tonbridge  
Judd**

**TM/14/03797/FL**

**Change of use to D1 to operate a children's day nursery at 1 Waterloo Road  
Tonbridge Kent TN9 1SN for Mr Graham Fuller**

DPHEH:

Having further considered matters concerning parking and the logistics involved in operating a nursery of this scale, Officers believe it would be appropriate for further discussions with the applicant to take place to encourage them to consider the benefits of developing a detailed Travel Plan in support of their application and also to encourage discussions between the applicant and Lidl's to establish whether use of their car park by parents would in fact be acceptable.

**APPLICATION WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA**

---

This page is intentionally left blank