

TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

AREA 1 PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Thursday, 31st March, 2022

Present: Cllr D W King (Chairman), Cllr M R Rhodes (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Mrs J A Anderson, Cllr M D Boughton, Cllr V M C Branson, Cllr G C Bridge, Cllr A E Clark, Cllr A Cope, Cllr M O Davis, Cllr N J Heslop, Cllr M A J Hood, Cllr F A Hoskins, Cllr J R S Lark, Cllr H S Rogers and Cllr F G Tombolis

(Note: As Councillors Mrs P A Bates, N Foyle and J L Sergison were unable to attend in person they participated via MS Teams and were unable to vote on any matters).

Councillors D Harman and Mrs A S Oakley were also present pursuant to Council Procedure Rule No 15.21.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J L Botten and Miss G E Thomas

PART 1 - PUBLIC

AP1 22/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of application TM/21/03332/FL (Longmead Stadium, Darenth Avenue, Tonbridge) the following were declared:

- Councillor Bridge declared an Other Significant Interest on the grounds that he was a stakeholder with Tonbridge Angels Football Club who were the applicant. He withdrew from the meeting and did not participate in the discussion or vote on this matter.
- For reasons of transparency, Councillors Heslop and Hood declared that they were long-time supporters of Tonbridge Angels Football Club. The Chairman of the Football Club was also known to Councillor Heslop. As this did not represent either a Disclosable Pecuniary or Other Significant Interest there was no requirement to withdraw from the meeting.
- For reasons of transparency, Councillor Boughton advised that he had met with Tonbridge Angels Football Club, in his role as Leader of the Borough Council, to discuss a number of initiatives that were not related to this application. Legal Services had confirmed that this did not represent either a Disclosable Pecuniary or Other Significant Interest and there was no requirement to withdraw from the meeting.

AP1 22/17 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Area 1 Planning Committee held on 17 February 2022 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

AP1 22/18 GLOSSARY AND SUPPLEMENTARY MATTERS

Decisions were taken on the following applications subject to the pre-requisites, informatives, conditions or reasons for refusal set out in the report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health or in the variations indicated below. Any supplementary reports were tabled at the meeting.

Members of the public addressed the meeting where the required notice had been given and their comments were taken into account by the Committee when determining the application. Speakers are listed under the relevant planning application shown below.

DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF THE CONSTITUTION (RESPONSIBILITY FOR COUNCIL FUNCTIONS)

AP1 22/19 TM/21/03332/FL - LONGMEAD STADIUM, DARENTH AVENUE, TONBRIDGE

Installation of new all-weather playing surface. Removal of 8. No existing floodlighting columns and erection of 4 No. replacement LED Floodlights at Longmead Stadium, Darenth Avenue, Tonbridge.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be GRANTED in accordance with the submitted details, conditions, reasons and informatives set out in the report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health; subject to

(1) Additional Condition:

5. The pitch shall only be in use and at no other time outside the hours of 0900 until 2100 weekends and 0900 and 2230 on weekdays.

Reason: In the interests of general amenity of the wider area.

[Speaker: Mr Simon McKay (agent) addressed the Committee via MS Teams]

AP1 22/20 TM/21/01677/FL - 2 YARDLEY PARK ROAD, TONBRIDGE

Demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of 13no. apartments with associated access, landscaping, parking and infrastructure at 2 Yardley Park Road, Tonbridge.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- (1) The development by virtue of the density, bulk, massing and scale will result in an unacceptable development which will create less than substantial harm to the significance of the character of the Tonbridge Conservation Area, which when weighed against the public benefits of the proposal provide a clear reason for refusal under paragraph 11(d)(i) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
- (2) The development by virtue of the density, bulk, massing and scale in this prominent corner location would result in an overbearing and incongruous addition failing to accord with the surrounding built form and out of character with the area contrary to Policy CP24 of the Core Strategy, Policy SQ1 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Managing Development and the Environment DPD 2010 and Paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
- (3) The development by virtue of the density, bulk, massing and scale will result in an unacceptable oppressive development which will have an overbearing impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property known as Springhill Cottage, resulting in the loss of aspect and the creation of additional noise in particular from the activity associated with the use of the southern parking area, contrary to Policy CP1 and CP24 of the Core Strategy.
- (4) These harms are considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, such that the presumption in favour of sustainable development in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF does not apply.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8.6, Councillors Branson and Cope requested that their vote against granting planning permission be recorded.

[Speakers: Tonbridge Historical Society (Mr D Phillips), Tonbridge Civic Society (Mr Brittain) and Mr M Smith, Mr N Edwards, Mr T Freke, Ms J Matthews and Ms M Manson Smith (members of the public) addressed the Committee in person; Mr J Edis (on behalf of the applicant) addressed the Committee via MS Teams]

AP1 22/21 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm