SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTS

AREA 1 PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATED 7 April 2016

| Tonbridge | (A) TM/15/02817/FL |
|-----------|--------------------|
| Castle | (B) TM/15/02818/LB |

(A) Conversion of The Old Power Station, currently used as a training centre, into 5 no. dwellings and a new building comprising 7 no. dwellings built on the existing rear car park

(B) Listed Building Application: Conversion of the Old Power Station, currently used as a training centre, into 5 no. dwellings at The Old Power Station The Slade Tonbridge for Mr Hugh Gregory

Private Reps: Since publication of the main report, 6 additional representations have been received, including a further response from the Slade Area Residents' Association. These generally state that whilst external design changes have been made, previous concerns regarding scale/bulk, privacy, and a loss of light/outlook for Hildenbrook House have not been overcome. Other matters raised include parking concerns, the removal of trees, and the location of the development within a flood zone.

DPHEH:

The matters raised by the additional representations have all been addressed in detail within the main report.

Paragraphs 6.42 and 6.43 reference developer contributions in respect of education provision but do not overtly discuss potential for contributions to be made in respect of public open space (in accordance with policy PS3 of the MDE DPD). For the avoidance of doubt, that matter is subject to ongoing discussion and I recommend the following amendment to paragraph 7.2 accordingly:

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

Amend paragraph 7.2 to read:

7.2. The applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement covering:

- The provision of a total primary education contribution of £5312.16 towards Slade Primary School;
- A public open space contribution as deemed appropriate

Tonbridge Castle

TM/15/03844/FL

Change of use from use Class C3 (residential) to mixed use C3 (residential) and D2 (yoga studio) at 35A Yardley Park Road Tonbridge for Mr Guy Edwards

Private Reps: One further representation has been received since publication of the main report, stating that they feel encouraged by the recommendation to grant a temporary planning permission due to the change of timetable. Reference is also made to the presence of a restrictive covenant preventing business uses of dwellings, noting that this would be a separate matter between the various parties to take up should they deem it necessary.

DPHEH: As Members will be aware, and set out at paragraph 6.12 of the main report, the existence of a restrictive covenant is not a material planning consideration and can have no bearing on the determination of the planning application.

RECOMMENDATION REMAINS UNCHANGED