

**Hildenborough                      TM/13/03930/FL**  
**Hildenborough**

**Shed to house a mobility scooter in front garden at 46 Riding Park Hildenborough  
Tonbridge Kent TN11 9JE for Mrs Sylvia Beevis**

Amended Plans:

The size of the proposed shed has now been amended from 2m by 2m by 2.5m high to 2.4m (long) to 1.8m (wide) to 2.3m (high at apex). Clarification has also been submitted that states that the shed will be freestanding with a felt roof.

DPHEH:

I consider that the proposed floor area is not substantially greater than that originally proposed and which was subject to a detailed assessment within the main Committee report. Furthermore, it should be recognised that the height of the proposed shed is now slightly lower than previously proposed.

Having further considered the proposal, it is felt that painting the structure a colour to match the main house could assist in reducing its visual prominence within the street scene. A condition can be imposed requiring this to be done and I would suggest requiring this within a month of the shed being erected would be reasonable.

We have also taken the opportunity to revisit the wording of Condition 4 and I would suggest that it would be preferable to restrict the development for the benefit of the applicant.

#### **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

**Amend Condition 4:**

**4. The consent shall enure only for the benefit of Mrs Sylvia Beevis and it shall not enure for the benefit of the land or any other person or persons for the time being have an interest therein.**

**Reason: In light of the personal circumstances of the applicant and the associated justification for granting planning permission.**

**Additional Condition:**

**5. Within one month of the building hereby approved having been erected, the building shall be painted or stained to a colour to match the main dwelling house.**

**Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.**

---

**Tonbridge  
Medway**

**TM/14/00655/FL**

**Hybrid Application: Development of site involving (A) Detailed Planning Permission for erection of a new replacement care home (Use Class C2) comprising 101 resident bedrooms, ancillary accommodation, communal facilities and gardens, and car parking; a new link road connecting the vehicular access from Tudeley Lane to the new replacement care home; creation of an acoustic fence along the boundary with the A26 Woodgate Way; and phased demolition of the existing Woodgate Care Home following the commencement of operations at the new replacement care home; (B) Outline Permission for the erection of extra care apartments comprising self-contained apartments, communal facilities and gardens, and car parking at Woodgate Residential Care Home And Adjacent Land Tudeley Lane Tonbridge Kent TN11 0QJ for GB Development Solutions Limited**

DPHEH:

The conditions as recommended in the main report are intended to allow the development to come forward in a sequenced way enabling any details pertaining to the new care home to be submitted before those relating to the extra care apartments, which come forward at a later time.

Condition 20 as recommended in the main report requires a scheme of affordable housing to be submitted for approval. It goes on to stipulate that 28% of the extra care units should be for affordable rent, with 12% for intermediate housing.

Subsequent discussions with Abbeyfield have confirmed that the principle of providing an element of affordable housing through submission of a scheme is acceptable to them. However, they have questioned the requirement to have an element of intermediate housing. The intention of Abbeyfield at this stage is to provide a total of 51 extra care apartments (although this element of the scheme is only in outline at this stage), with 28 of the units offered for affordable rent (which equates to just below 55%), and with the remainder offered for outright sale. This is subject to Abbeyfield securing funding from the HCA. They have indicated to us that if this funding does not become available, the mix in tenure will change, with a reduction in the number of affordable rented units to "approximately 40%". At present Abbeyfield advise that they have no plans to offer intermediate units here.

Although the tenure split would not accord with the adopted policy (indeed there would only be one type of affordable tenure offered), it would be at a level either greater than or in line with the adopted policy. This should be welcomed here particularly when considering the clear need that exists for this type of accommodation in general terms. I would therefore suggest that Condition 20 be amended to require the scheme to demonstrate the provision and retention of no less than 40% of the extra care units for affordable rent.

Since publication of the main report, further consideration has been given to the suggestion by KCC (Highways) that pedestrian infrastructure improvements be provided at the entrance to the site. This has in part been borne out of our ongoing discussions regarding the nature of the accommodation provided by the extra care apartments and the overarching ethos that they are intended to provide for/encourage independent living where possible. It is therefore perfectly feasible that occupants of the extra care apartments will, to varying extents, intend to use the amenities within the local area. Indeed, part of the case put forward by the applicant in terms of the suitability of this site for such accommodation centred on its connectivity benefits for both residents and staff. I continue to acknowledge the assertion by the applicant that because traffic flows along Tudeley Lane are light and the road alignment is straight, Tudeley Lane is safe for pedestrians to use to access the site (paragraph 6.34 of main report). However, there is a strong likelihood that those occupants wishing to travel along Tudeley Lane will have varying levels of mobility and appropriate measures should be taken to ensure these residents are able to get around safely, avoiding feelings of isolation or reliance on alternative means of transport such as taxis. This becomes even more pertinent when considering the fact that the applicant has overtly stated there will not be a regular mini-bus service for residents. I therefore recommend that an additional condition be imposed requiring a scheme for pedestrian improvements to be submitted for approval.

#### **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION:**

##### **Amend Condition 20:**

**20. The details submitted in pursuance to Condition 18 shall be accompanied by a scheme for the provision of affordable housing which demonstrates the provision and retention of no less than 40% of the extra care apartments for Affordable Rent. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annexe 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it.**

**Reason: To comply with the requirements of policy CP17 of the Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Core Strategy 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (paragraph 50).**

**Additional Condition:**

**22. The development hereby approved in respect of Area 2, cross hatched on plan number A-607 04 Rev, shall not commence until a scheme for the provision of pedestrian infrastructure improvements to provide a connection between the site access at road level and the elevated pedestrian route on the northern side of Tudeley Lane has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The occupation of the development on Area 2 shall not take place until those works have been completed in accordance with the approved scheme.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.**

---

