



10 March 2015

Mr A Ahmed
AA Studio Architects
485 Green Lane
Goodmayes
Ilford
Essex IG3 9RQ

Dear Mr Ahmed,

Application No: 15/500381/PAMEET

Location: Land Adjacent To 1 Cleveland, Royal Tunbridge Wells

Proposal: Pre-application advice (Meeting) Erection of 2 no. four bed town houses

Further to our meeting of 26th February 2015, please find below a summary of my comments:

The site is located within the Limits to Built Development and a Conservation Area. There is no objection to the principle of housing development on this site providing the proposal complies within all relevant planning policies and other material considerations.

The site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, as it is dominated by trees and greenery. The trees are protected by virtue of being within a Conservation Area. The majority of the trees on site are also protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

The vegetation along the frontage of Sandrock Road is identified in the Royal Tunbridge Wells & Rusthall Conservation Area Appraisal 2000, as enclosing space. The route from Pembury Road down Sandrock Road is classified as a 'key view/vista'. Any proposal to develop the site would need to demonstrate that the protected trees and boundary vegetation could be retained in a satisfactory way, so that the contribution made by the site to the landscape character of the area would not be undermined. Any development on this site should be of high quality and not be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The provision of a new access along the Sandrock Road is likely to result in the removal of vegetation and may harm the root protection area of the existing trees. The provision of a

MKPS – Working in Partnership with: Tunbridge Wells Borough Council

Please Note: All planning related correspondence for TWBC should be sent to:

Mid Kent Planning Support, Maidstone House, King Street, Maidstone ME15 6JQ

Tel: 01622 602736 email: planningsupport@midkent.gov.uk

Access planning services online at: www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk or submit an application via www.planningportal.gov.uk

new access, hardstanding and garage would be harmful to existing trees and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is unlikely to be supported by the Local Planning Authority. It is recommended that this access is omitted from any future scheme.

The provision of a 1.8m high fence along the boundary with Sandrock Road would impact on the existing 'green' boundary and cause harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and is unlikely to be supported by the Local Planning Authority.

It is recommended that you seek pre-application advice from Kent County Council (KCC) Highways and Transportation regarding the parking and access for the proposed development. <http://www.kent.gov.uk/waste-planning-and-land/planning-applications/planning-advice/highway-pre-application-advice>

The site lies outside of the Tunbridge Wells Central Access Zone (Residential) and therefore Policy TP6 of the Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006 is not applicable. KCC will be able to advise on the level of parking required for the development.

The proposed site plan shows parking on the corner of Sandrock Road and Cleveland. It is recommended that the parking area is relocated along the boundary with 1 Cleveland, in order to minimise the impact on the junction and prevent harm to highway safety. The site plan also shows that the front boundary would be predominately covered in hardsurfacing, this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Based on the information submitted, it appears that the rear garden of one of the units would be largely within the branch spread of the existing trees. The existing trees are likely to result in overshadowing to this dwelling and its rear garden. This is likely to result in future pressure to lop, top or fell the trees, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The provision of one dwelling instead of two may be a better alternative on this site, as this would provide some garden area that would not be shaded. Please note that any future planning application should be accompanied by a Tree Survey.

The dwellings to the north (1 Cleveland) are sited outside of the Conservation Area and are considered to be of low architectural merit. The Local Planning Authority has no objection to a contemporary approach; however, it is recommended that the proposed scheme does not replicate the adjoining housing development and is more sympathetic to development within the Conservation Area. The proposed development appears too large and fails to respect the context of the site and its important Conservation Area setting. It is recommended that any built form is lower in height than 1 Cleveland and space is provided between the building and the adjoining alleyway in order that the development does not appear cramped.

I have reviewed the photographs of different design approaches that were submitted on 27 February 2015. A design similar to 9 Ferry Hinskey Road may be appropriate on this site. The reduced height frontage with a maximum of three-storeys help to alleviate some of the design concerns associated with the originally submitted scheme. I am unclear how the other two options would respect the local character of the area and accommodate the level of accommodation required.

In this case, due to the substantial changes required to the scheme you may wish to seek further pre-application advice prior to submitting a planning application.

The opinions expressed in this letter are informal and are not binding on the Officers and Members of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council in their determination of any future application. Any formal application would undergo full consultation with neighbouring properties, and any other appropriate bodies. In addition, the Case Officer would carry out a site visit to make a comprehensive assessment of the proposal in its context.

Yours sincerely

Antonia James
Principal Planning Officer