HILDENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL

Pavilion and Recreation Ground – Riding Lane – Hildenborough – TN11 9HY telephone: 07818 329029
Email: clerk@hildenboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk
Website : www.hildenboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMITTEE
Held on 26th October 2026

Present
Cllrs – Wills, Sklavenitis, Haugh
Stephanie Dill (Parish Admin),

Apologies for Absence

Cllr Gorman, Leeson, Batchelor

1. Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests
The planning committee declared an interest on item 5.4

3. Public Open Session
None present

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 12th October 2026
The minutes of the previous meeting were approved and signed.

N.B. The 19th October minutes were not considered and should be carried over to the next meeting.

5. Applications

5.1 **TM/26/01869/CNA - Land adjacent to Brook Cottage, Leigh Rd, Hildenborough. Consultation by Sevenoaks District Council 26/02550/LDCEX Confirmation of existing use of land as residential curtilage. Deadline date 2nd November 2026**

Discretion of the Planning Officer

5.2 TM/26/01720/FL 57 Brookmead, Hildenborough. Demolition of existing garage and proposed loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension. Flat roof dormers to both sides. Single storey extensions to front and side elevations. To include new fenestration, a juliette balcony and associated works. Deadline date 3rd December 2026

See Appendix 1

5.3 TM/26/01862/NMA - Oakhill House 130 Tonbridge Rd, Hildenborough – Non-Material Amendment to planning permission to 23/03204/FL (Section 73 insultation) and 26 (approved plans) of planning approval TM/20/02245/FL (Redevelopment of site to include conversion, extension and alteration of existing office buildings and conversion and

alteration of Grade II listed office building to create 138 apartments and shared residents facilities, together with 27 houses within the grounds, including access, parking, hard and soft landscaping and areas of open space) (as amended by TM/22/00499/NMA and TM/22/02352/NMA) To remove reference to the internal substation noise insulation and to enable amendments to the apartment design and site layout, including additional residents facilities, changes to fenestration, plot boundaries, plant room, and associated hard and soft landscaping works) to remove the number of units from the description of development and to insert a condition limiting the number of homes to be delivered. Deadline date 02nd November 2026

Discretion of the Planning Officer

5.4 TM/26/01905/TNCA Virginia Cottage, 24 Mount Pleasant Hildenborough – 1 x Bay Tree (applicants ref T2) - Fell. Deadline date 20th November 2026

The Parish Council have declared an interest and hence will not comment

5.5 TM/26/01907/LB and TM/26/01828/FL The Lodge Nizels, Nizels Lane Hildenborough – Single storey orangery extension to the rear. Deadline date 04th December 2026

The Parish Council asks the Borough Council to assess the harm to the listed building on the basis of the Conservation Officer's pre-application advice, noting that the Heritage Statement finds no harm while the Design and Access Statement accepts the harm identified

5.6 TM/26/01840/FL Vines, Vines Lane Hildenborough – dismantle and relocation of existing greenhouse with residential garden. Deadline date 03rd December 2026

Discretion of the Planning and Conservation Officers

5.7 TM/26/01910/NMA 19 Hawden Close Hildenborough – Non Material Amendment to planning permission TM/26/00185/FL to revise the roof line. Deadline date 9th November 2026

Discretion of the Planning Officer

5.8 TM/26/01864/FL Selbys Oast Leigh Rd Hildenborough – Door & window replacements. Thermal upgrade of the wall panels and new radiators. External works to 2 x external walls, granular trench and 2 x corner posts. Deadline date 30th November 2026

We leave to the discretion of the Conservation officer

6. WWA – Support Required for Any Planning Applications

Nothing to discuss

7. **Local Plan**

The report from WWA was submitted to TMBC on 25th October 2026

8. Conservation Area – Review of Document and Framework

The Parish Council has delegated authority to the Planning Committee to review the conservation area document and framework, to consider the document and framework, and to agree a report or recommendation to the Parish Council on how it should proceed.

Due to time constraints this item is to be carried forward to the next Planning meeting

10. Date of Next Meeting

Monday 9th November 2026

The Chair closed the meeting at 7.15pm

Appendix 1

HILDENBOROUGH PARISH COUNCIL

Pavilion and Recreation Ground, Riding Lane, Hildenborough TN11 9HY

Telephone:07818 329029

Email: clerk@hildenboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk

Website: www.hildenboroughparishcouncil.gov.uk

Eugenia Davidson

Planning Officer

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council

Gibson Building

Gibson Drive

Kings Hill

West Malling

Kent ME19 4LZ

By email: planning.applications@tmbc.gov.uk

26 October 2026

RE: Planning Application TM/26/01720/FL - Demolition of existing garage and proposed loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension. Flat roof dormers to both sides. Single storey extensions to front and side elevations. To include new fenestration, a Juliette balcony and associated works - 57 Brookmead Hildenborough Tonbridge Kent TN11 9DP

Executive Summary

Hildenborough Parish Council **OBJECTS** to application TM/26/01720/FL and asks that it be refused. The Council does not oppose a loft conversion or the single storey extensions in principle. On the previous application, TM/26/00481/FL, the Council left the matter to the planning officer. It now objects because that application was refused for its front dormer, this revision does not overcome the reason for refusal, and the site lies in Flood Zone 3 without an adequate flood risk assessment.

- **The front roof does not overcome the reason for refusing TM/26/00481/FL.** The three front dormers rise to a single flat roof at ridge height across the full width of the house, and on the roof plan the roof between them is set back only slightly. The house sits on a bend between hipped-roof bungalows at Nos. 55 and 59. The Borough Council's character appraisal for this part of Brookmead describes "a regular uniform townscape" and lists over-sized dormers in bungalow areas as a negative feature.
- **The drawings of the front roof need clarifying.** The front elevation shows tiled roof slope between the three dormers, but on the roof plan and loft plan the dormer fronts are separated only by shallow set-backs under one flat roof labelled front dormer.
- **The site is in Flood Zone 3 and the flood risk assessment does not meet the current standing advice.** Brookmead has flooded regularly, most notably on Christmas Eve 2013. The assessment is a 2012 template that gives no estimated flood level, floor levels or flood resistance and resilience measures. The agent has written on it that he does not see why it is necessary.
- **The Juliet balcony doors have not been assessed for their effect on the privacy of Nos. 55 and 59.** They were also on the refused scheme, but the June 2026 report assessed only rear windows and oblique views. A neighbour has now objected to overlooking of gardens, and the Council asks that the doors be assessed specifically.
- **The published description does not mention the front dormer.** It refers to flat roof dormers "to both sides", while the application form describes front and rear dormers. The Council asks that the description be corrected and neighbours reconsulted.

Annex A sets out the Council's full case, including the planning history and the documents and policy relied on.

1. Grounds

1.1 The front roof and the previous refusal

TM/26/00481/FL was refused on 11 June 2026 because the full-width, flat-roofed front dormer would appear as "a dominant and incongruous feature that fails to respect the character of the host dwelling and the established street scene". The officer accepted the hip to gable roof and the rear dormer, which had been permitted in principle under TM/24/00321/PA. The Council's objection is therefore to the front roof.

Drawing CB 3283.02 Rev A records the front dormer as redesigned into three dormers. On that elevation the dormers and the strips of roof between them rise to one flat roof at ridge height spanning the full width, with tile-hung cheeks at each end. The scale and bulk the officer found harmful remain. The officer also noted that the house is on a bend, where the front roof is exposed to view from several directions. The proposal does not respond to its context as policy DP3(1) of the National Planning

Policy Framework requires, and no justification is offered, so DP3(3) indicates refusal. It also conflicts with policies SQ1(1) and SQ1(2)(a) of the Managing Development and the Environment DPD and policy CP24 of the Core Strategy, which are consistent with DP3. It does not reflect the character of the Brookmead Area (East) in the Character Area Appraisals SPD, which identifies over-sized dormers in bungalow areas as a negative feature.

1.2 Unclear drawings of the front roof

The front elevation (CB 3283.02 Rev A) shows tiled roof slope between the three dormers. On the roof plan (CB 3283.04) and loft plan (CB 3283.03 Rev C) the dormer fronts are separated only by shallow set-backs, under one flat roof labelled front dormer. The depth of those set-backs governs the bulk of the front roof and is not shown. Without it, conditions could not refer to plans that are clear about the front roof, as policy DP4(2)(b) of the Framework requires. The Council asks for a section through the front roof between the dormers, and to be reconsulted, before the application is determined.

1.3 Flood risk

The site is in Flood Zone 3 on the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning, so policy F4(1) of the Framework requires a site-specific flood risk assessment. The one submitted is the Environment Agency's householder form of April 2012. It selects floor levels no lower than existing with flood proofing but gives no proofing details. The current standing advice for minor extensions on GOV.UK does not offer that option and asks for the estimated flood level allowing for climate change, finished floor levels and flood resistance and resilience measures. None is provided, so the assessment is not appropriate to the development, as F4(3) requires. Without that information it cannot be shown that the extended house will be safe for its lifetime or appropriately flood resistant and resilient, so policy F7(2) of the Framework indicates refusal. The agent has annotated the form "Do not see why it is necessary for form". Brookmead has flooded regularly, most notably on Christmas Eve 2013. Flood risk was not assessed on either earlier application at this address.

1.4 Juliet balcony doors and the privacy of Nos. 55 and 59

The rear dormer and its Juliet balcony doors are the same as on the refused scheme, TM/26/00481/FL. The June 2026 delegated report assessed "new first-floor windows in the rear elevation" and found the oblique views acceptable, but it did not address the doors. They are 2.1 metres high, with a balcony rail projecting 200 millimetres, and allow a wider and more direct view over the neighbouring gardens than a window. A neighbour has now objected to "overlooking of gardens" and loss of privacy, where no objection was received on the earlier applications. The Council asks the officer to assess the effect of the Juliet balcony doors on the privacy of Nos. 55 and 59 specifically.

1.5 The published description

The published description refers to "Flat roof dormers to both sides". On the application form, "both sides" follows "hip to gable roof extension", and the dormers are described as front and rear. The front dormer is the element for which TM/26/00481/FL was refused, and a reader of the published description would not

know that one is proposed. The Council asks that the description be corrected and that neighbours be reconsulted on it.

2. Requested Conditions

Should the planning authority be minded to grant permission, and without prejudice to the Council's objection, the Council requests the following conditions.

- **Approved drawings.** The approved plans condition lists drawings that show the form of the front roof clearly and consistently, including the set-back between the dormers. Purpose: certainty about what is permitted. Ground 1.2.
- **Materials.** The roof and dormers to be finished in the reused existing tiles and plain tiles to match, and the extensions in brickwork to match the existing, as stated on the drawings. Purpose: to limit harm to the character of the street. Ground 1.1.
- **Floor levels and flood resilience.** Before the ground floor slab of the extensions is laid, details of finished floor levels relative to the estimated flood level, and of flood resistance and resilience measures following the current GOV.UK standing advice for minor extensions, to be submitted to and approved by the planning authority, then installed before first occupation and retained. Purpose: safety of occupants and the building. Ground 1.3.
- **Sustainable drainage.** Before any drainage works, a sustainable drainage scheme for surface water from the extended house, including soakaways sized from infiltration test results and maintenance arrangements, to be submitted to and approved by the planning authority, installed before first occupation and maintained. Purpose: to avoid increasing flood risk in an area that floods. Ground 1.3.
- **Flank windows.** No windows or other openings in the side gables other than those approved, and the window shown in the west gable to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7 metres above the floor of the room it serves, and retained as such. Purpose: privacy of No. 55. Ground 1.4.
- **Flat roofs.** The flat roofs of the dormers and of the single storey extensions not to be used as a balcony, roof terrace or sitting-out area. Purpose: privacy of Nos. 55 and 59. Ground 1.4.

The Parish Council reserves the right to make further representations should additional information be submitted in support of this application. The Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss any of the above points with the case officer.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Martyn Wills

Chair of Planning Committee

For and on behalf of Hildenborough Parish Council

Annex A: The Council's case on application TM/26/01720/FL

A1. Purpose of this annex

This is a householder application. If it is refused and the applicant appeals, the inspector will see only the representations made at application stage. This annex is therefore the Council's full case on each ground in the letter.

A2. Documents relied on

Application documents, identified by their titles on the planning authority's website:

- Part Application Form with Completed Proposal (marked as a re-submission)
- Existing Plans and Elevations (drawing CB 3283.01)
- Proposed Elevations (drawing CB 3283.02 Rev A)
- Proposed Floor Plans and Sections (drawing CB 3283.03 Rev C)
- Roof Plan Sections and Block Plan (drawing CB 3283.04; the latest revision letter is obscured on the published copy, and the revision box records "front dormers re-designed Sept/26")
- Photograph (39 Brookmead) and Photograph (44 Brookmead), both stamped 16 September 2026
- Floor Risk Assessment (Environment Agency form, version 3.1, April 2012, signed by the agent on 8 October 2026)
- Neighbour Comment (Objection) Submitted Online, two comments

Planning history documents from the planning authority's website:

- TM/24/00321/PA: Decision Notice (21 May 2024) and Delegated Report
- TM/26/00481/FL: Decision Notice (11 June 2026) and Delegated Report (endorsed 10 June 2026)
- TM/26/00481/FL: application summary page, Borough Council public access, viewed 26 October 2026 (received 11 March 2026, validated 16 April 2026, decision issued 11 June 2026)
- TM/26/00481/FL: Proposed Elevations (drawing CB 3283.02, no revision, dated February 2026, stamped 11 March 2026) and Proposed Plans (drawing CB 3283.03, no revision, dated February 2026)
- TM/56/10176/OLD: Decision Notice (23 October 1956)

Other evidence:

- Environment Agency, Flood Map for Planning, viewed by the Council in October 2026
- Google Street View images of Brookmead, captured March 2026, viewed by the Council in October 2026
- Kent County Council, Tonbridge and Malling Stage 1 Surface Water Management Plan, Appendix B, DA04 Tonbridge Town and Hildenborough, version 1.0, October 2013
- Environment Agency, Leigh Expansion and Hildenborough Embankments Scheme, GOV.UK (updated 7 July 2026)
- Hildenborough Parish Council, Centre Piece newsletter, July 2026
- Hildenborough Parish Council, Extraordinary Planning Meeting agenda of 27 April 2026 (item 5.13, TM/26/00481/FL), and Planning Committee agenda of 1 September 2026 (item 9)
- Local knowledge supplied by members of the Parish Council

Policy and guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework, published 17 August 2026: policies DM4, L2, P3, DP3, DP4, F4, F5 and F7, Annex A (Implementation) and Annex F, table 1
- Tonbridge and Malling Managing Development and the Environment Development Plan Document, adopted 20 April 2010: policy SQ1
- Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan, Regulation 19 publication version, September 2026: policy H10
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, Local Development Scheme, September 2026
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Core Strategy, adopted September 2007: policy CP24
- Hildenborough Character Area Appraisals Supplementary Planning Document, adopted February 2011: Hilden Park Area, typology J (Bungalows) and character area J5 (Brookmead Area (East))
- Planning practice guidance, Flood risk and coastal change, GOV.UK, paragraph 051 (revision date 25 August 2022)
- Flood risk assessment: standing advice, GOV.UK, section headed Advice for minor extensions (page last updated 28 May 2026)

The Borough Council published its new Local Plan for consultation under Regulation 19 on 11 September 2026 (Local Development Scheme, September 2026). The plan has not yet been submitted or examined, so under policy DM4 of the Framework its policies can be given only limited weight at this stage. Policy H10 (Residential Extensions, Alterations, Annexes and Ancillary Accommodation) bears directly on this application and is applied, with that limited weight, in A4 and A7 below. Hildenborough was designated as a neighbourhood area in January 2021 (Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council, Hildenborough Neighbourhood Plan delegated report), but no neighbourhood plan has been made; the Parish Council's planning agenda of 1 September 2026 records that the feasibility of a plan is still being considered.

A3. Planning history

TM/56/10176/OLD. Permission was granted on 23 October 1956 for 11 detached and 62 semi-detached dwelling-houses at Little Hilden Farm, Hildenborough.

TM/24/00321/PA. Permission was granted on 21 May 2024 for a loft conversion with hip to gable roof alteration, 0.3m increase in ridge height, skylight window to front roof slope and rear dormer. Condition 1 requires the development to begin within three years of that date. The Parish Council made no comment, because each member of its planning committee present declared an interest. The delegated report found that the proposal "would not be strictly in keeping with the surrounding street-scene" but, with the bulk contained to the rear, would not be overly incongruous.

TM/26/00481/FL. Permission was refused on 11 June 2026 for demolition of garage and chimney and construction of single storey side extension and porch extension to front, and a first floor extension to create a chalet bungalow with dormers to front and rear. The Parish Council's response was: "We leave to the discretion of the Planning Officer." The reason for refusal was:

"The proposed full-width, flat-roofed front dormer, by reason of its scale, bulk, and design, would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature that fails to respect the character of the host dwelling and the established street scene. It would result in significant harm to visual amenity, contrary to Policy CP24 of the Tonbridge & Malling Borough Core Strategy (2007), Policy SQ1 of the Managing Development and the Environment DPD (2010), and Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

The delegated report found the hip to gable extension, rear dormer, porch and side extension acceptable, and the relationship with Nos. 55 and 59 acceptable, with no neighbour objections received. It found that the front dormer "would occupy most of the front-facing roof plane" and that "the visual harm would be exacerbated by the position of the house on a bend, where the bulk of the front dormer would be fully exposed to public views from multiple vantage points".

Superseded national policy references. The refusal reason cites paragraph 131 of the December 2024 Framework, and the delegated reports cite paragraphs 130 and 135 of earlier versions. Those versions have been superseded by the Framework published on 17 August 2026. The current equivalent on design is policy DP3, which is applied in A4 below. The delegated reports' references on living conditions (paragraphs 130 and 135(f)) are also superseded. The current national decision-making policies on that matter are policy P3(2)(b), on neighbours' access to daylight and sunlight, and policy L2(1)(d)(ii), on neighbours' privacy where additional floorspace is created within an existing plot. L2 is applied in A4 and A7 below.

Change in the Council's position. The Council did not object to TM/26/00481/FL. It objects now because the planning authority has since found the full-width flat-roofed front dormer harmful, the revised front roof keeps the same scale and bulk, two neighbours have objected, and the flood risk of the site has not been addressed on any of the applications.

A4. Ground 1: the front roof

What the drawings show. The existing bungalow has a hipped roof on all four sides, a chimney and an arched front door, with a flat-roofed garage to the west (CB 3283.01). The roof plan (CB 3283.04) shows the whole of the new main roof as a single flat roof at ridge height, divided into areas labelled rear dormer and front dormer, with the front edge stepped so that three window bays stand slightly forward of the sections between them. Section A-A (CB 3283.03 Rev C) shows a full-height first floor of 2.3 metres. On the front elevation (CB 3283.02 Rev A) the three dormers and the strips of roof slope between them rise to the same flat roof, with tile-hung cheeks at each end rising from the eaves to that roof. The revision box records Rev A as "front dormer re-designed to be 3 no. dormers", dated September 2026.

Whether the refusal reason is overcome. The harm identified on TM/26/00481/FL arose from the scale, bulk and flat-roofed design of a front dormer occupying most of the front roof plane. The revised design keeps a flat roof across the full width at ridge height and tile-hung walls at each end, so the front of the house still reads as a two-storey flat-topped face. Dividing the windows into three does not reduce the height, width or bulk of the structure, and the roof plan shows all three dormers joined under the same flat roof as the rest of the main roof.

The street. Google Street View images captured in March 2026 show No. 57 as a hipped-roof bungalow with a chimney and arched front door, between hipped-roof bungalows at No. 55 to the west and No. 59 to the east, with Brookmead curving in front of the houses. Most of the houses in the views either way along the road are hipped-roof bungalows, some with rooflights or dormers. The second neighbour objection describes bungalows as "a defining feature of the street scene", and the 2026 delegated report refers to "the relatively uniform character of the street". The

2024 report found more variety in roof forms to the east and north east, but it was considering a scheme whose bulk was "contained to the rear of the dwelling", not a front dormer.

The character area. Policy SQ1(1) of the Managing Development and the Environment DPD states:

"Proposals for development will be required to reflect the local distinctiveness, condition and sensitivity to change of the local character areas as defined in the Character Area Appraisals SPD."

In the Hildenborough Character Area Appraisals SPD (adopted February 2011), the map for character area J5, Brookmead Area (East), includes the north side of Brookmead from No. 49 to No. 59, so No. 57 lies within it. The appraisal states:

"Red brick bungalows and chalet bungalows built along a curved road and straight cul-de-sac on flat land on the edge of the built up area. The red/brown brick detached or attached bungalows have hipped tiled roofs, some with chimneys, arched recessed porches and white casement windows. [...] The chalet bungalows have half hipped roofs facing the road. The repeated designs and constant roof height create a regular uniform townscape."

For bungalow areas (typology J), the SPD lists among the "Negative Features Worthy of Enhancement":

"Over-sized dormer additions on some properties do not relate well to the scale or form of the building and are prominent in the street scene."

No. 57 has each feature the appraisal names: a red brick bungalow with a hipped tiled roof, a chimney and an arched front door. The proposal replaces the hipped roof with a flat roof across the full width at ridge height and front dormers across most of its width, which is the kind of addition the SPD identifies as harmful, and it breaks the constant roof height of the group. It does not reflect the sensitivity to change of character area J5, contrary to SQ1(1). SQ1(1) is consistent with DP3(1) and DP3(3), which expect proposals to respond to the character of their setting and to comply with locally-specific design guides.

The applicant's photographs. The photographs of 39 and 44 Brookmead show dormers set within roofs that keep their hipped slopes on either side. In each case the main roof still reads as a pitched roof. The second neighbour objection also questions these comparisons. Neither is a precedent for a flat roof across the full front at ridge height.

National policy. Policy DP3 of the Framework is a national decision-making policy. Paragraph 1 states:

"Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3."

Paragraph 3 states:

"Development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally-specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals."

The front roof does not respond to the character of its setting or integrate with it. The bundle contains no statement explaining the design or offering a justification, and the planning authority has shown through TM/24/00321/PA what roof alterations it considers acceptable here. Paragraph 1 allows for change where an increased scale is justified under policies L2 and L3. Policy L2(1)(d) gives substantial weight to creating additional floorspace within existing plots, including through roof additions, but it states that such proposals should:

"i. Be consistent with the overall street scene, other than where: it is appropriate to have larger buildings (such as at street corners, or where building upwards would not cause substantial harm to the character of a building and its surroundings); the development would not be visible from the street frontage; or where specific changes are provided for through a design code which forms part of the development plan;"

The front roof faces the street on a bend where, as the planning authority found on TM/26/00481/FL, it would be exposed to public view from several directions. It is not at a street corner, it is visible from the street frontage, and no design code provides for it. It is not consistent with the overall street scene, so L2(1)(d) does not justify its scale and does not attract substantial weight. The test for refusal in DP3(3) is met.

Development plan. Policy SQ1 of the Managing Development and the Environment DPD states that all new development should protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance:

"(a) the character and local distinctiveness of the area including its historical and architectural interest and the prevailing level of tranquillity;"

SQ1(2)(a) seeks the same outcome as DP3(1) and is not materially inconsistent with it, so under paragraph 2 of Annex A to the Framework it keeps its weight. The planning authority relied on SQ1 and on Core Strategy policy CP24 in refusing TM/26/00481/FL. Policy CP24(1) of the Core Strategy requires that all development "must through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings", and CP24(3) states that "Development which by virtue of its design would be detrimental to the built environment, amenity or functioning and character of a settlement or the countryside will not be permitted." CP24 seeks the same outcome as DP3(1) and is consistent with it. The revised front roof fails both policies for the same reasons as before.

Emerging Local Plan. Policy H10(1) of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, which carries limited weight (see A2), permits extensions which:

"a Are well-designed and proportionate, subordinate and compatible with, and integrate coherently with, the character of the original building and surrounding context. In terms of elevational design, layout, size, bulk, mass, height and position, use of dormers and window placement and choice of materials which should be appropriate to, and where possible, complementary with the original dwelling and surrounding area;"

and H10(1)(b) states that "Roofs should be designed to complement the existing roof type". A flat roof across the full width at ridge height does not complement a hipped roof or subordinate itself to the original bungalow. The emerging policy points the same way as DP3 and SQ1.

A5. Ground 2: unclear drawings of the front roof

The front elevation on CB 3283.02 Rev A shows three dormers, each with its own fascia, separated by tiled roof slope. The roof plan on CB 3283.04 shows the three dormer fronts as bays standing slightly forward of the sections between them, all under one flat roof that also covers the rear dormer. The loft plan on CB 3283.03 Rev C shows the same stepped front wall. The revision boxes record the redesign (CB 3283.04: "front dormers re-designed Sept/26"; CB 3283.03: "loft redesign Aug/26"). On the plans the set-backs between the dormers appear shallow, which does not obviously match the depth of roof slope shown between the dormers on the elevation, and no section is provided through the front roof between them. The west side elevation shows a small window high in the gable that does not appear on the loft plan.

The refused drawings show what has changed. On the refused front elevation (CB 3283.02, no revision) the three windows sat in one continuous dormer face, with tile-hung panels between them. On the refused loft plan (CB 3283.03, no revision) the front wall of the first floor is straight across its width. In the current loft plan (CB 3283.03 Rev C) the same wall is stepped, with the sections between the windows set back, but the set-back drawn is small and the room layout behind it is unchanged. The current elevation shows the panels between the dormers as roof slope. A section through the front roof between the dormers would show how far back that slope actually is.

Policy DP4(2)(b) of the Framework states that the local planning authority should:

"Ensure that relevant planning conditions refer to clear and accurate plans and drawings which provide visual clarity about the design of the development, including the approved use of materials where appropriate;"

Without that information the approved plans would not give visual clarity about the front roof. The Council asks that the applicant be asked to show the depth of the set-backs between the front dormers, with a section through the front roof between them, and that the Council be reconsulted.

A6. Ground 3: flood risk

The Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning shows Brookmead, including No. 57, in Flood Zone 3. Policy F4(1) of the Framework states:

"To inform the assessment of flood risk and, where relevant, appropriate mitigation, a site-specific flood risk assessment should accompany all development proposals in Flood Zones 2, 3a, and 3b as defined in Annex F, table 1."

Policy F4(3) states:

"Site-specific flood risk assessments should be appropriate to the scale, nature, and location of development and should, where relevant, support an assessment of whether a development proposal satisfies the sequential and exception tests set out in policies F5 and F6."

Householder development is exempt from the sequential test under policy F5(2)(c), and the Council does not argue that the extension is in the wrong place. Its point is that the assessment does not show how the extended house will be made safe.

The submitted assessment is the Environment Agency's form "Householder and other minor extensions in Flood Zones 2 and 3", version 3.1, advice issued April 2012. It selects floor levels no lower than existing with flood proofing incorporated where appropriate. The form itself says this option requires details of flood proofing and resistance techniques. None are given.

The current standing advice for minor extensions on GOV.UK recommends floor levels set at least 600 millimetres above the estimated flood level, or 300 millimetres where that level is known with a high level of certainty, and where floor levels cannot be raised it asks for extra flood resistance and resilience measures. It says the assessment must include the estimated flood level allowing for the impacts of climate change, details of finished floor levels, and details of flood resistance and resilience plans. The submission contains none of these, and the drawings give no floor levels relative to Ordnance Datum.

The agent has annotated the end of the form, above his signature dated 8 October 2026: "Do not see why it is necessary for form".

Safety of the development. Policy F7 of the Framework is a national decision-making policy. It states:

"1. Development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.

2. Where development is proposed in a location known to be at risk from any form of flooding, now or in the future, it should be refused unless: [...] b. The development will be safe throughout its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users; [...] d. The development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment; and e. It can be demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere."

The planning practice guidance on flood risk (paragraph 051) says that for minor development, including householder extensions, a shorter, simpler assessment is likely to be sufficient, but:

"As a minimum, the assessment needs to show that the development will be safe for its users for the intended lifetime of the development, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and be sufficiently flood resistant and resilient to the level and nature of the flood risk."

The submitted assessment shows none of this. A dwelling is a more vulnerable use under Annex F, table 2, and the proposal adds bedrooms. On the information submitted, F7(2)(b) and (d) are not met, and the application should be refused unless a compliant assessment is provided.

Flooding in Brookmead. Members report that Brookmead has flooded regularly, most notably on Christmas Eve 2013; whether No. 57 itself flooded is not known. Kent County Council's Stage 1 Surface Water Management Plan (Appendix B, DA04, October 2013) records, for Hildenborough (south): "Hilden Park, Stocks Green Primary School, Brookmead was a affected by fluvial flooding of the Hawden Stream." The Parish Council's Centre Piece newsletter of July 2026 describes the Environment Agency's Hildenborough embankment scheme on the Hawden Stream; it does not say that Brookmead is no longer at risk, and the scheme does not remove the need for an assessment that meets the standing advice.

The Environment Agency's page on the Leigh Expansion and Hildenborough Embankments Scheme (updated 7 July 2026) records flooding in Tonbridge and Hildenborough in 1960, 1963, 1968, 1974, 2001, 2013 and 2014, and says the Hildenborough embankment "will further reduce flood risk to Hildenborough from the River Medway". It reduces the risk; it does not remove it. Annex F, table 1, of the Framework notes that the Flood Map for Planning does "not account for the benefits of flood defences or the possible effects of climate change", which is why a site-specific assessment is needed to establish the flood level the extension must be designed for.

The proposal takes the house from two bedrooms to four with a study, increasing the number of people living in a building at risk. Neither delegated report on TM/24/00321/PA or TM/26/00481/FL assessed flood risk.

Surface water. The specification on CB 3283.02 states that rainwater will discharge to new soakaways at least 5 metres from buildings. Members report that soakaways have been installed at neighbouring properties in Brookmead with suitable effect, and the Council asks that a sustainable drainage scheme be secured by condition.

A7. Ground 4: the Juliet balcony doors and the privacy of Nos. 55 and 59

The rear elevation on CB 3283.02 Rev A shows, at first-floor level, two windows and a pair of doors labelled 1500 x 2100, serving Bed 1 and Bed 2 on the loft plan. The east side elevation is annotated "Juliett balcony max projection 200mm". The existing bungalow has no windows above ground floor. Nos. 55 and 59 are the houses either side of No. 57.

The Proposed Elevations drawing refused under TM/26/00481/FL (CB 3283.02, no revision, dated February 2026) shows the same rear dormer, with two windows and the same pair of doors labelled 1500 x 2100, and the same annotation on the east elevation: "Juliett balcony max projection 200mm". The current drawing, CB 3283.02 Rev A, records only one revision since then, in September 2026: "front dormer re-designed to be 3 no. dormers". The rear of the scheme is unchanged from the one the planning authority considered in June 2026.

The delegated report on TM/26/00481/FL said:

"In terms of privacy, the proposed rear dormer would introduce new first-floor windows in the rear elevation; however, these would primarily overlook the application property's own rear garden. While there may be some oblique views towards neighbouring gardens, these would be comparable to existing arrangements, including the rear dormer at No. 55, and would not result in unacceptable overlooking."

The report does not mention the Juliet balcony doors. The 2024 report on TM/24/00321/PA reached a similar view on the rear windows of the scheme then proposed. No neighbour objections were received on either earlier application.

Two neighbour objections have been made on this application. The second (Neighbour Comment (Objection) Submitted Online) refers to "overlooking of gardens" and to the loss of privacy and enjoyment of "what is currently a private outdoor space". Members report that the houses in Brookmead are close together and that boundary planting would not screen views from the rear dormer.

A pair of doors opening at first-floor level onto a balcony rail allows a wider and more direct view across the neighbouring gardens than a window set in the dormer wall. Overlooking depends on what an opening looks into and at what angle, not only on distance. The current national decision-making policy on neighbours' privacy where floorspace is added within an existing plot is L2(1)(d)(ii) (see A3). Policy H10(1)(c) of the Regulation 19 Local Plan, which carries limited weight, states that "New windows and balconies should have their principal outlook so that it avoids direct overlooking into such areas."

The Council therefore asks the officer to assess the Juliet balcony doors specifically, against those policies. If permission is granted, the conditions requested on flank windows and on the use of the flat roofs remain the realistic protection for Nos. 55 and 59.

Fallback. Condition 1 of TM/24/00321/PA allows that permission, for a rear dormer with first-floor windows, to be implemented until 21 May 2027. Its approved drawings are not in the bundle, so the Council cannot say whether they included a Juliet balcony.

A8. Ground 5: the published description

The Borough Council's description, as shown on the neighbour comment records in the bundle, is:

"Demolition of existing garage and proposed loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension. Flat roof dormers to both sides. Single storey extensions to front and side elevations. To include new fenestration, a Juliette balcony and associated works"

The Part Application Form with Completed Proposal describes the works, in handwriting, as a loft conversion with "hip to gable roof extension both sides", flat roof dormers to the front and rear, and single storey extensions to the front and side elevations. On the form, "both sides" refers to the hip to gable extension. The published description moves it to the dormers, so it no longer records that a front dormer is proposed.

The front dormer was the sole reason for refusing TM/26/00481/FL and is the main subject of the first neighbour objection, which objects to the "flat frontage and top of the proposal". A person reading the published description would not know that a front dormer is proposed. The Council asks that the description be corrected to refer to flat roof dormers to the front and rear, and that neighbours be reconsulted on the corrected description.

A9. Weighing

The Council has weighed the benefits of the proposal: two additional bedrooms and a study for the occupants, the reuse of existing roof tiles, and brickwork to match the existing. It has also taken into account that a hip to gable roof and rear dormer have been permitted under TM/24/00321/PA. Policy L2(1)(d) gives substantial weight to additional floorspace only where its criteria are met, and for the reasons in A4 they are not. These benefits are therefore private and of modest weight, and they could be achieved without a full-width flat-roofed front. Against them, the harm to the character of the street from the front roof is lasting and has already been found unacceptable by the planning authority. The flood risk information and the unclear drawings of the front roof prevent the application being properly assessed, and the effect of the Juliet balcony doors on Nos. 55 and 59 has yet to be assessed.