

Mr R Hazelgrove  
Planning Department  
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council  
Town Hall  
Tunbridge Wells  
Kent TN1 1RS

Our Ref: K LW/16/135

Date: 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2021

Dear Mr Hazelgrove

**REF: ALTERATIONS TO THE RED LINE CURTILAGE, NEW ACCESS AND GATES AND REVISIONS TO LANDSCAPE SCHEME, ELIZABETH HOUSE, PENSHURST ROAD**

We write further to planning permission 18/03230/FULL and our recent discussions concerning a small anomaly on the red line together with alterations to the access point, new gates and a revised landscape scheme.

Peterscot is now called 'Elizabeth House' and it is substantially complete as a dwelling with final internal decorating and landscape works to be completed. The applicant, Mr Neil Wright, owns both this property and Petersbank, which has yet to be commenced.

By way of background, the applicant first purchased Petersbank and then subsequently purchased Peterscot. Both properties were the subject of replacement dwelling planning permissions. During the process of acquiring Peterscot, a small land swap between the Title deeds of each property took place. However, it transpires that an older red line plan was used for the Peterscot replacement dwelling planning application and this has inadvertently resulted in part of its garden being located outside the red line of the original permission. The proposals seek to address this. A by product of this is that the landscape plan needs to be resubmitted for approval together with some minor changes to the soft landscaping which have emerged during construction (these are outlined below). The final component of the scheme is to return the plot to its historic 'in/out' entrance and to propose two gates for security.

The Proposals

Red Line – the new red line now includes a small strip located between the existing access track and the garden of Peterscot. The access marks a physical boundary and from a practical point of view this land ought to be included within the red curtilage line of Peterscot simply because, 1) it was always garden land; and 2) it will ensure it is maintained and kept



in good order if it is within the garden area. A small anomaly on the south western corner is also proposed to be rectified. Again since it was originally part of the Petersbank curtilage and so this change makes no difference to the underlying land use either.

**New Access point** – the original layout of Peterscot had an in-out arrangement with an entrance just north of the Oak tree which served the house and a second entrance much further to the north serving the equestrian buildings, sandschool and sheds. The proposals seek to reinstate that twin access arrangement compared with the current approved situation, which only has a single entrance/exit. This change would not affect the character of the area in any material way given the site context and the historic character of the area.

**New gates** – The neighbouring scheme of the Petersbank replacement dwelling included a new built gate feature (this is subject to a minor material amendment to alter the design and positioning). The Peterscot replacement dwelling approval did not include any gates and so this planning application seeks permission for two new gates of similar style as those granted at Petersbank. The design is Georgian in style and the materials will be those specified in the attached schedule (as they are proposed for the Petersbank property), although the exit gate will include metal steel posts instead of brick. The gates are set back off the track and would be seen in the context of the wider site. They are of limited built construction and so would have no real effect on the Green Belt. They are mostly of metal ironwork which does not harm openness. Such features are so minor as to not be classed as inappropriate development.

**New landscape Plan** – the new landscape plan reflects the change to the red line boundary applied for here. In addition, during implementation of the scheme it became apparent that there were a number of banks covered in scrub which, when cleared, presented some abrupt level changes. For safety reasons the proposals include reinforcement works to some selected areas comprising gabion cages with stones covered in soil and grassed over. Other alterations include the new access with details of the materials to be used, a small paved terrace and some minor alterations to the planting.

**Summary** – in themselves the proposals are limited in extent and scale. The red line changes do not change any of the underlying land use but just correct some minor errors in the original red line curtilage. The new access point is a fairly minor change and reverts the scheme back to the original access arrangement. The plans set out the materials to be used in the landscape scheme. The two new gates include a small amount of built development (the piers) and in the context of the Green belt and character of the area this would not be inappropriate. Finally, the new soft landscape scheme picks up on some alterations including addressing unsafe banks with dressed gabion walls and of course the new access layout.



If you have any questions please contact me.

Yours sincerely



Martin Hull MRTPI  
Kember Loudon Williams Ltd  
Martin.hull@klw.co.uk

