

# **TONBRIDGE AND MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

## **AREA 1 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES**

**Thursday, 4th September, 2025**

**Present:** Cllr D W King (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Cllr L Athwal, Cllr K Barton, Cllr J Clokey, Cllr A Cope, Cllr M A J Hood, Cllr F A Hoskins, Cllr A Mehmet, Cllr R W G Oliver, Cllr B A Parry, Cllr S Pilgrim, Cllr M R Rhodes and Cllr K S Tunstall

An apology for absence was received from Councillor G C Bridge.

### **PART 1 - PUBLIC**

#### **AP1 25/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

For reasons of transparency, Councillor M Hood advised that he knew the applicant and the agent for application TM/25/00164/PA in a personal capacity. However, as this did not represent either a Disclosable Pecuniary or Other Significant Interest, there was no requirement for him to withdraw from the meeting or to not participate in the debate, but he considered it appropriate for him to stand down as the Chair for this meeting and decided not to be a voting Member of the Committee for this meeting.

For reasons of transparency, Councillor A Mehmet advised that he knew the agent for application TM/25/00164/PA in a professional capacity. However, as this did not represent either a Disclosable Pecuniary or Other Significant Interest, there was no requirement for him to withdraw from the meeting or to not participate in the debate.

#### **AP1 25/26 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting of the Area 1 Planning Committee held on 31 July 2025 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **AP1 25/27 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.

**MATTERS FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART 3 OF THE CONSTITUTION)**

**AP1 25/28 TM/25/00164/PA - 335 SHIPBOURNE ROAD, TONBRIDGE**

Erection of 2 pairs of semi-detached 4 bed dwellings and three detached 4 bed dwellings to the rear. An amalgamation of four existing planning consents.

After careful consideration of the points raised by the speakers and the submitted details and conditions set out in the main and supplementary reports of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health, Members expressed significant concern in respect of overdevelopment and poor design of the proposed scheme, practicality and safety of bin storage and kerbside collection on bin collection days given proximity to a busy pedestrian crossing, harmful impact on neighbouring properties, and unresolved concerns about a TPO protected oak tree, while being reminded of the high bar for refusal under the national policy.

It was proposed by Councillor A Mehmet, seconded by Councillor K Tunstall, that the application be refused, which was supported by the Committee unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** that planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. As a result of the additional unit at the back of the site, the proposal would be cramped and overdeveloped, including with insufficient space for the turning and manoeuvring of delivery vehicles and cars, and absence of on-site bin collection area leading to bins cluttering the pavement, to the extent that the development would not function well or add to the overall quality of the area, nor would it represent high quality design and would be detrimental to the built environment, and materially worse than the extant consent, in conflict with paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy and SQ1 of the Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document.
2. As a result of the height, scale and depth, and reduced separation to the boundary from the extra unit, the proposal would result in a harmful overbearing and overshadowing effects to adjacent properties on White Cottage Road, in conflict with policies CP24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy and SQ1 of the Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document.

3. The proposed development would, by reason of the provision of an additional dwelling and resulting overdevelopment, involve greater encroachment within the Root Protection Area and branch spread of the Oak tree of special amenity value standing at the neighbouring property to the south of the application site and included within a Tree Preservation Order than for the previous scheme, and will generate increased future pressures for additional tree works as a result of the proximity and orientation of the tree to the nearest proposed dwelling. The conflicting information submitted with the application (including the tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement documents) is insufficient to address such concerns and demonstrate that significant harm would not be caused to the tree as a result of the proposed development. Contrary to policies NE4 of the Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document, and paragraph 136 of the NPPF 2024.

[Speakers: Ms D Hill, Ms Esther Wheller (members of the public) and Mr S McKay (Agent on behalf of the Applicant) addressed the Committee in person.]

### **MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

#### **AP1 25/29 PLANNING APPEALS, PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS**

The report setting out updates in respect of planning appeals, public inquiries and hearings held since the last meeting of the Planning Committee was received and noted.

Frustration was expressed over the Planning Inspectors disregarding the Kent new parking standards in respect of the appeal for a scheme at 111 Douglas Road, Tonbridge, and the general ongoing challenges faced by Committee Members in having local decisions upheld were reflected.

#### **AP1 25/30 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

There were no items considered in private.

The meeting ended at 9.10 pm