

## **25/00855/PA - 49 HALLSFIELD ROAD, CHATHAM**

### **Item AP3 26/5 referred from Area 3 Planning Committee of 29 January 2026**

Ground floor rear extension and change of use from use class C3 residential dwelling to C2 residential institution designed to provide accommodation and personal care for up to five individuals.

Further to Minute AP3 25/28 of the meeting held on 11 December 2025, the Committee considered the above application with the report of the Director of Central Services and Monitoring Officer set out in Part 2 of the agenda (Minute AP3 26/8 refers). Some Members continued to express significant concerns in respect of the potential impact of the proposed development on neighbouring amenities, specifically with regard to possible increases in noise and disturbance, inadequate parking provision, and highway safety considerations.

However, as there was no objection raised by the Kent County Council Highways regarding highway safety or insufficient parking provision, it was acknowledged that as a statutory consultee, their response to the consultation would carry significant weight in the determination of this application. It was proposed by Councillor P Hickmott and seconded by Councillor A Oakley that the application be approved subject to an amended Condition 2 as set out in the supplementary report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Regulatory Services. Following a formal vote, the proposal was defeated with seven Members voting against and five Members voting in favour and one abstention.

On the grounds of Members' continued concerns regarding site intensification and shortfall in parking provision, it was proposed by Councillor D Keers and seconded by Councillor A McDermott that the application be refused, contrary to Officer's recommendation, for the following reasons:

- (1) as a result of the increased comings and goings, additional parking of vehicles, staff movements, disruption and activity would result in an unacceptable intensification of the site, out of keeping with the character of this quiet residential area and harmful to neighbourhood, neighbouring amenities, in conflict with policy CP24 of the Tonbridge and Maling Core Strategy and policy SQ1 of the Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document; and
- (2) as a result of insufficient off-street parking, the proposal would not function well over the lifetime of the development and the parking plan would not be enforceable or provide sufficient mitigation for the failure to provide the necessary off-street parking spaces. This would amount to poor design and would be detrimental to the functioning of the development, in conflicts with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CP 24 of the Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy, policy SQ 8 of the Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document and the Kent Parking Standards SPD.

Following a formal vote, the proposal was carried with eight Members voting in favour and five Members voting against. On the grounds that the above refusal reasons were not considered could be substantiated at an appeal and there was likely to be a risk of significant costs being awarded against the Council at any appeal, the vote taken was a recommendation only in accordance with Council and Committee Procedure Rule 15.24, Part 4 Rules of the Constitution.

**RECOMMENDED\***: That consideration of the planning application stand ADJOURNED with the recommendation to refuse the planning application being referred for determination by Council in accordance with Council and Committee Procedure Rule 15.24, Part 4 (Rules) of the Constitution.

**\*Recommended to Council**