



# A G E N D A

**Thursday 14 September 2017 at 6.30 pm  
Council Chamber, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent TN1 1RS**

**1 Apologies for absence**

**2 Membership changes**

a Membership applications

An application for membership from **The Forum** has been approved by the Town Forum's Management Group. The Forum's representative is Carolyn Gray, with Jason Dormon as the substitute.

b Changes of representatives (for information)

**3 Chairman's announcements (5 mins)**

**4 Minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 July 2017 (Pages 1 - 10)**

**5 Actions from previous meeting**

Minute no. Subject and action

- 5 Public health and deprivation in Tunbridge Wells – Town Forum members were encouraged to consider some of the volunteer opportunities which this topic offered.

**6 Update from Councillor Jukes, Leader of the Council (10 mins)**

**7 Community Speedwatch (10 minutes)**

David Scott, a Town Forum member who has been actively involved in transport issues for many years and was key in the implementation of the 20mph zone in the St John's ward, will give a demonstration of how a 'community speedwatch' campaign operates.

**8 Infrastructure issues in the town (15 mins)**

A number of infrastructure issues have been raised by Town Forum members as matters of concern in the recent past, such as: (i) repeated problems with foul water flooding in the Warwick Park area – and the potential for further housing development worsening the situation; (ii) increasing demands on school places created by additional housing development, including across the county border; (iii) broadband speeds.

In order that these concerns can be addressed, some detailed (rather than general) questions need to be asked of various authorities and agencies, such as Southern Water and Kent County Council. The purpose of this item is, therefore, to agree what those concerns are, so that these can be put to representatives of Southern Water, Kent County Council etc at a subsequent meeting.

- 9 Report of the Strategic Planning Working Group (10 mins) (Pages 11 - 14)**
- 10 Report of the Transport Working Group (10 mins) (Pages 15 - 16)**
- 11 Report of the Water in the Wells Working Group (10 mins) (Pages 17 - 22)**
- 12 Report of the Culture, Leisure and Tourism Working Group (10 mins)**
- 13 Report of the Finance and Other Issues Working Group (10 mins)**
- 14 Any other business (5 mins)**

**Date of the next meeting**

Thursday 16 November at 6.30pm (including the AGM at the start of the evening)

Subsequent meetings (at 6.30pm):

Thursday 18 January 2018

Thursday 22 March 2018



## ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS TOWN FORUM

### ROYAL TUNBRIDGE WELLS TOWN FORUM

Thursday 20 July 2017

**Attended:** Stuart Anderson, Caroline Auckland, Sally Balcon, David Barnett, Cllr Ronen Basu, Adrian Berendt (Chairman), Lorna Blackmore, Mark Booker, Stephen Bowser, Cllr Peter Bulman, David Bushell, Cllr Ben Chapelard, John Cunningham, Andy England, Irene Fairbairn, Helen Featherstone, Jane Fenwick, Chris Gedge, Tim Harper, Cllr Lawrence Heasman, Dorothea Holman, Michael Holman, Dean Kenward (sub), Kyrios Kyriacou, Linda Lewis, Brian Lippard, Katharina Mahler-Bech, Paul Mason (sub), Cllr Tracy Moore, Marguerita Morton, Karen Pengelly, Peter Perry (sub), Nick Pope, Cllr Catherine Rankin, Kate Sargeant (sub), Anne Stobo, Tim Tempest, David Wakefield (sub), Mary Wardrop, Denise Watts, Cllr Lynne Weatherly, Simon Weatherseed (sub) and Pat Wilson

**TWBC officers present:** JJ Almond (Assembly Hall Theatre Director), William Benson (Chief Executive), David Candlin (Head of Economic Development and Property), Adam Chalmers (Head of Communities and Engagement), Jane Clarke (Head of Policy and Governance), Sarah Richards (Healthy Lifestyles Officer), Gary Stevenson (Head of Environment and Street Scene) and Mike McGeary (Democratic Services Officer)

**Also present:** Robert Banks, Vivian Branson, Robert Chris, Ben and Mary van Grutten, Diane Huntingford, David Rose, Carol Wilson and Peter Woosted

**Guest speakers:** Dr Bob Bowes, Lesley D'Arcy and Marianne MacDonald

#### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were reported from: Bill Acker, Cllr Mrs Barbara Cobbold, Alex Green, Cllr David Jukes, Sue Kaner, Bill Kern, Charles Pope, Cllr James Scholes, Alastair Tod and Cllr Chris Woodward.

#### 2. MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Mike McGeary advised that there had been no membership changes since the last meeting.

#### 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting dated 11 May 2017 were submitted for approval.

Two corrections were made: (a) Kyrios Kyriacou asked that his apologies for absence be recorded; and (b) with minute 7 (Local Plan: Issues and Options), Denise Watts asked that her contribution at the foot of page 3 be amended to read: "...stressed that she wished to see the housing occupied by UK citizens *and not the super-rich from overseas...*".

**RESOLVED** – That, with the above two amendments, the minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2017 be approved.

## 4. ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

- (a) Local Plan: Issues and Options – It was noted that responses to this consultation paper had been encouraged – either from individual Forum members or from the groups they represent.
- (b) Civic complex: draft planning framework – (The same action requested as above)
- (c) TWBC's draft Five Year Plan – (Once more, the same action requested as above)
- (d) Parking on Tunbridge Wells Common – It was reported at the meeting that Targetfollow had been granted an established use certificate for parking. William Benson, TWBC Chief Executive, said that, in the absence of any other evidence, the Borough Council had no choice other than to grant this certificate.

## 5. PUBLIC HEALTH AND DEPRIVATION IN TUNBRIDGE WELLS

Adam Chalmers began this presentation by introducing the following speakers: (i) Dr Bob Bowes, Chairman of the NHS West Kent Clinical Commissioning Group); (ii) Sarah Richards (TWBC's Healthy Lifestyles Officer); and (iii) Marianne MacDonald and Lesley D'Arcy from Nourish.

Dr Bowes began by setting out the historical reference to the link between the social standing of people and how this directly affects their health and life expectancy. He added that the modern day context for this had been set out in great detail through the published works of Professor Sir Michael Marmot. In short, Dr Bowes said, people's health suffered significantly more the lower down the social order they were, because they were less in control of their lives and the effect this had on their metabolism.

Dr Bowes added that, while the 'indices of deprivation' showed that Tunbridge Wells Borough was not considered to be a priority for funding or action, there were certainly some distinct parts of the town where there were high levels of health inequality, one such area being parts of the Sherwood ward. Dr Bowes said that some of the less obvious consequences of this were that health inequality was linked to higher levels of anti-social behaviour and crime.

Sarah Richards, TWBC's Healthy Lifestyles Officer, continued with this theme. She advised that Tunbridge Wells Borough Council was working closely with other agencies in delivering specific public health services which would address these socio-economic factors which, she stressed, acted negatively upon the health outcomes of people.

Working under the 'One you' initiative, Mrs Richards said that individuals were being helped with issues such as: improving mental health; weight loss; and smoking cessation. These, she added, were considered to be helping to resolve some of the 'basics' which were apparent in the most deprived wards, adding that the Borough Council had a wider role in terms of environmental matters such as air quality, the provision of disabled facilities grants and promoting 'active travel'. Mrs Richards also said that work was taking place with a number of businesses in how they could provide relevant support for their staff.

Adam Chalmers, the Head of Communities and Engagement, provided some examples of the partnership working which TWBC was actively involved in. He advised the Forum of how the Council had secured some central government funding to employ a 'family worker' to work with the Town & Country Housing Group, KCC, the Police and other relevant agencies; this, he added, had resulted in some significant improvements for the 43 families involved, helping to address long term issues such as

changing an 'out-of-work cycle'. Mr Chalmers added that, while the central government funding had been time-limited, the results of this positive intervention had enabled TWBC funding to be found for some further work to continue as part of this initiative, principally by means of providing the vital link between families and support services.

On some other aspects of partnership working, Mr Chalmers said that work had been taking place on two initiatives involving young people, where Tunbridge Wells had not been performing well when compared with national averages: one was within the 'not in employment, education or training' group; the other was aiming to address the issue of 'not school-ready' children.

Finally by way of an introduction to some of the deprivation issues affecting the town and wider Borough, Marianne MacDonald from Nourish ('community foodbank') addressed the Forum. Ms MacDonald reminded members that the core function of Nourish was to provide a three-day supply of emergency food to people in crisis, who had been referred from statutory and voluntary organisations. She added that, in the case of domestic abuse clients, food packs were delivered within two hours.

Ms MacDonald explained how Nourish operated on the basis of reliance for its funding and its food upon donations from the public, local businesses, supermarkets and charitable trusts; she added that a significant secondary source of support came through donations 'in kind' from organisations such as the Big Yellow Self-Storage company, Tesco and from Childrensalon.

Ms MacDonald drew attention to some statistics of particular interest and relevance for the town: she advised that, once housing costs had been taken into account, 17% of children across the unparished part of the Borough lived in poverty. In Sherwood, it was noted that the figure was 31%. Ms MacDonald said that, as with last year, Nourish was running a 'holiday hunger' campaign, targeting support for families in need across the six weeks of the summer holiday period. She said that, in 2016, this campaign had resulted in a 57% increase in children receiving foodbags when compared with the previous two months.

Ms MacDonald revealed the latest data in terms of how the demand for Nourish services had increased in 2016/17 from the previous year: she said that there had been a 47% increase in the number of people provided with the emergency food packs, a total of 4,614 individuals. She added that the principal reason for referrals to the service had been because of benefit changes (32% of the total), followed by 13% due to domestic abuse, 12% because of debt, 12% as a result of an unexpected bill etc.

Members of the Town Forum were invited to ask questions and comment on the presentation.

Anne Stobo said that, previously, there had been a '**Surestart**' programme in place for families of children within the 0-5 age range in Sherwood. She asked what the current support arrangements were. Councillor Weatherly said that there was a multi-agency **children's centre** still present within the ward, providing the same level of services as 'Surestart'.

Tim Tempest advised that he was the leader of the '**Men's Shed**' initiative in Sherwood, aimed at providing support within the ward; he added that, due to demand, this had been extended to include a '**Women's Shed**'. He thanked Councillors Weatherly and Backhouse for their support in the provision of this service.

Jane Fenwick thanked the presenters for raising the awareness of public health and deprivation issues. She felt that it showed how much beneficial joined-up work with

agencies was taking place. She asked if TWBC's **financial contribution** to these initiatives was ring-fenced for future provision. Mr Chalmers said that, currently, it was only TWBC and the Town & Country Housing Group (T&CHG) which had made a longer term financial commitment, although other agencies were still considering their respective positions. He added that TWBC's and the T&CHG's commitment was for the next two years and focused on the three most deprived wards. He added that both KCC and the Job Centre had committed to provide financial and 'in kind' support, respectively.

William Benson said that one of the significant beneficiaries of the partnership work which was delivering **positive outcomes** was the **NHS** – GP surgeries as well as hospital services. He added that evidence needed to be collated over the coming two years to demonstrate the scale of those benefits.

Cllr Catherine Rankin said that it was not just joined-up agencies that were helping to deliver positive outcomes but **joined-up communities** too. She felt that there were other projects within the town in which individuals and groups could become involved.

The Chairman said that he would like to see greater representation on the Town Forum in terms of public health and deprivation issues.

Denise Watts asked what initiatives were being followed in working with **older people** and enabling them to stay in their own homes, through the provision of suitable adaptations, for instance. Mr Chalmers said that there were three specific areas of partnership working which were relevant: (i) assistance for people – mostly elderly – being discharged from hospital, back into their homes; (ii) funding towards a 'handyman' service; and (iii) a general targeting of work such as disabled facilities grants within the three most deprived wards, in partnership with the T&CHG.

Mrs Richards added that there were initiatives being undertaken to address cases of **social isolation**, in partnership with GP surgeries, largely through more targeted use of volunteers. Dr Bob Bowes acknowledged the worsening problems society faced in tackling loneliness and isolation; he added that this was a very real cause of concern in terms of health outcomes.

Ms MacDonald said that Nourish were aware that its service was not reaching older people as much as she would like, principally because not enough referrals were being made from the relevant agencies. This was an area where the organisation aimed to improve its provision, she added.

Peter Perry said that he worked with the **Prince's Trust**; he added that he was aware that the town was not making best use of funds which the Trust could use to address some of the issues which had been raised through this presentation.

Paul Mason drew attention to the health problems caused by **inactivity**, which he said were made worse because of our reliance as a society on cars. He stressed that building the necessary infrastructure to provide safe cycleways should be given far greater priority at a national and local level.

The Chairman thanked all of the presenters for their very interesting and thought-provoking contributions and for the engagement of Forum members in the debate that followed.

There were no immediate action points agreed, although Forum members were encouraged to consider some of the volunteer opportunities which the topic offered.

## 6. THE NEW CIVIC COMPLEX

Ahead of the presentation, Stephen Bowser wished to challenge a statement made by the Leader of the Council, who had stated that the Town Forum was supportive of the proposed new theatre and offices.

The Chairman said that the Town Forum's official position was that its support was cautiously welcoming, and conditional upon what plans there were for the future use of the current Town Hall complex. He added that he did not see this item as re-opening up the debate over the Forum's position on the proposed scheme, more that it was an opportunity to feed in the views of member groups and ask questions of TWBC officers leading on the work.

David Candlin, TWBC's Head of Economic Development and Property, provided a summary of the formal committee (and Full Council) consideration given to the Borough Council's plans for a new theatre and offices over the past four years, leading towards the current position. He also listed the core consultants with whom the authority had been working, showing the breadth and scale of expertise assisting the Council in making as well-informed a decision as possible, which it would be required to do later in the year.

Mr Candlin also set out the costs to date and reiterated that the authority would need to service loan repayments of £2.4m per annum throughout the life of the loan which would be sought to fund construction; he added that this included the £100k per annum additional subsidy being identified for the initial running of the new theatre.

Mr Candlin said that the authority was currently mid-way through RIBA Stage 3 ('developed design') in the project. He demonstrated how, as part of this stage, certain aspects of the design had been reviewed, partly due to feedback provided by key stakeholders such as the Town Forum and others. Mr Candlin added that pre-application discussions were currently underway with the Planning Service.

Mr Candlin said that some of the design changes involved reducing the visual impact of the theatre fly tower on the residents of Grove Hill House. He was also keen to address the allegation that the scheme would result in the loss of a significant area of Calverley Grounds. He showed that, in fact, the extent of the encroachment was 993 sq.m. which represented approximately 2% of the overall area of Calverley Grounds, adding that new public realm was being created (i) on the terrace of the civic building and (ii) in the public space between the new proposed buildings.

Next, Mr Candlin addressed the issue of town centre car parking. He advised that it was intended that the extension of Crescent Road car park would provide additional spaces before the Great Hall car park was demolished. He added that, once both schemes had been completed, there would be an additional net increase in town centre car park spaces.

Mr Candlin said that the Borough Council was very aware of the importance of ensuring that the current Town Hall and Assembly Hall Theatre did not become a repeat of the vacant cinema site. He said that there were good reasons to be optimistic, principally because the Borough Council owned the site, which it had never done in the case of the cinema.

Mr Candlin also addressed the argument that the Assembly Hall could have been considered for major refurbishment on its current site. He advised that there were both practical and operational objections to this suggestion: first, a 1200 seater theatre could not be provided without losing a significant part of the other listed building – the Town Hall; secondly, the estimated cost was still in the region of £31m, without

addressing the physical and technical constraints of the building, which would not enable west end touring shows to benefit from the Theatre; and thirdly, it would have required the closure of the building for up to three years, causing an interruption to service which theatre experts advised would be very difficult to recover from in the short to medium term.

In terms of the economic benefits that a new theatre would bring, Mr Candlin said that independent advisors had estimated this to be in the region of £15m to £18m per annum.

JJ Almond, the Assembly Hall Theatre Director, explained how very few theatres nationally operated without subsidy. He added however that the new theatre had the potential to operate subsidy-free after 10 years if it were part of a long-term contract with a commercial operator.

Mr Almond also explained how the authority had examined a number of options regarding the size of the new theatre, with a 1200-seater offering a sound commercial option. Mr Almond added that 60% of current ticket sales were from households in Tunbridge Wells town and 40% from the rural parts of the Borough; he said that this demonstrated that audiences would be attracted from all parts of the Borough – and potentially well beyond our borders.

Mr Almond summarised the responses of the theatre market to questions such as: was this a theatre project they would support; would you bring your touring product to the new theatre; is a 1200-seat venue the right size? etc. The responses given clearly demonstrated that production companies were enthusiastic about the prospect of the new theatre and would bring their shows to Tunbridge Wells. Mr Almond listed 25 touring shows and demonstrated how at least 20 could be accommodated in the new theatre, compared with just four in the existing Assembly Hall.

Finally, Mr Almond said that work was continuing with the arts consultants Bonnar Keenlyside on the production of a robust business plan, focusing on key elements such as: a reducing subsidy model; audience growth; budget, programme mix; and the economic benefit to the Borough.

The issue was opened up for general debate and the following topics were raised:

Dorothea Holman sought clarification over the **management of HGV traffic** associated with productions, to and from the new theatre. Mr Candlin explained the intended access route for vehicles, adding that there would be space for three HGVs at any one time. He said that the exit route would be to the rear of Hoopers, into Grove Hill Road.

Dr Holman also asked what the current position was in respect of negotiations with **Hoopers** and the necessary access to land in their ownership. Mr Candlin advised that the Council was still in detailed discussions with Hoopers; he underlined that the store would not lose any of their service area under the scheme proposals.

Robert Chris felt there had been a **lack of transparency** in the Borough Council's decision-making; his specific allegation related to why there was only one possible location determined for the new theatre and offices. He considered that there had been very little effort taken to work with the residents in the area most affected, to find an agreeable solution. Further, he asked why the planning for the scheme had reached this advanced stage – and had cost such a considerable sum – without having secured the **co-operation of Hoopers**.

Mr Almond advised that all of the necessary information would become publicly available as part of the Stage 3 report, which would be completed and presented in the Autumn. He added that the Stage 3 report would involve assembling detailed information from a wide range of consultants, which would be presented to elected members first, before being made available for the public. He reiterated that the decision to opt for a 1200-seat theatre had been based on the very reliable advice of leading consultants.

Mr Candlin added that the timetable for consideration of the Stage 3 report would include discussions with key stakeholder groups before formal submission to the Cabinet in November and the Full Council in December.

Jane Fenwick said that the Town Forum had responded to the Council's **draft Planning Framework** by the due deadline, in which a number of concerns had been set out. She understood that the final document was to be considered by the Full Council in September. She asked how the document would feed into the Stage 3 decision-making process. Mr Candlin confirmed that the timetable for the Framework was: Cabinet on 3 August; followed by the Full Council on 27 September. He added that the Planning Framework should, therefore, be in place to provide the necessary guidance within which a planning application – should the Council decide to move to the next stage – will be assessed.

The Chairman asked how the **Framework interacted with the Stage 3 process**. He also asked why the Council would proceed with the Framework process unless it was already assuming that Full Council would approve moving ahead with the civic development into Stage 4. Mr Candlin emphasised that the purpose of the Planning Framework was to provide guidance in general terms – and to set out planning principles – within which any specific planning application could be assessed, over a wider area than just Calverley Grounds. He added that Stage 3 was part of the development process which came forward within the Planning Framework that had been set out.

John Cunningham asked whether the Council's figures in respect of the future **subsidy** for the theatre were making a like-for-like comparison in respect of the Marlowe Theatre. He asked this in the context of Canterbury City Council's website stating that the Marlowe Theatre began with a £600k subsidy per annum. Mr Chalmers highlighted that Canterbury's accountancy approach was slightly different and therefore not like-for-like in that they included internal recharges (costs linked to internal services such as accountancy, facilities etc). William Benson reassured Forum members that a genuine like-for-like comparison on costs was being made.

Stephen Bowser asked how much **office space** for the Borough Council was included in the new office building. Mr Candlin advised that it was proposed that there would be 20,500 sq ft provided as tenant space (i.e. lettable) and 12,000 sq ft of office space for the Council's own use, together with a flexible-use Council Chamber and other meeting rooms. He added that these figures were likely to be refined and set out in greater detail as part of the Stage 3 report.

Lorna Blackmore was keen to see the detail of **drainage** for the scheme; Mr Candlin confirmed that this would form part of the Stage 3 report too.

Michael Holman **welcomed** the proposals. He asked what might possibly prevent the scheme on the current site from proceeding. Mr Candlin said that there were three key elements which were crucial: funding for the scheme; access arrangements via Hooper's land; and use of statutory powers to meet the Council's strategic objectives.

In terms of impact on Calverley Grounds, Caroline Auckland noted that there was no separate **wc provision**, once the public conveniences were removed. She asked whether any subsequent wc facilities (in the theatre, maybe) would make provision for disabled people. Andy England asked what opening hours there would be for any wc facilities in the new theatre.

Mr Candlin said that the new theatre would have wc facilities available for general use, adding that this would make their management simpler than the existing public conveniences. He also said that these would be DDA compliant, for disabled people. Mr Candlin added there would be broader look at where else in Calverley Grounds might be appropriate or viable for additional facilities.

Mr Almond reiterated the point about the new theatre making wc facilities available, adding that, while the theatre would be open seven days a week, the actual opening hours of the building had not yet been determined.

Katharina Mahler-Bech said that Calverley Grounds was proud of its **Green Flag status**, reflecting its excellent condition and facilities. She asked how the Grounds would look, once the development had been completed. Mr Candlin said that part of the Stage 3 report would include a landscaping plan for Calverley Grounds, which would help to address the continuing appearance of the park.

Peter Perry said that his residents' association was largely **opposed** to the scheme and wished to prevent its progress on this site. Mr Candlin said that the scheme proposals had been discussed on a number of occasions with Historic England, who had been supportive. He added that they were happy with both the landscape reinstatement and the tree planting plan elements of the proposals.

Andy England asked whether it would be possible to retain the **skating rink** facility during the construction period. Mr Almond advised that formal planning consent had been given for the skating rink for the next two years. Mr Candlin added that it was hoped that this popular attraction could remain throughout the construction period and that the Council would endeavour to achieve that.

Nick Pope asked whether, if the scheme proceeded, there was a **landscaping scheme** which would apply to the whole of Calverley Grounds and not just the area affected by the development. Mr Candlin said that, while the civic development scheme would not address this, the Council was keen to work with the Friends of Calverley Grounds to try and address the wider landscaping needs of the park.

Cllr Moore reminded the Forum of one of the key principles behind the Borough Council's proposals, namely to try and **widen the Borough's cultural offer**. She stressed that the approach which was being taken was based on the following key issues: public interest; non-partisan; non-generational; and in partnership. She added that the Council was listening to the concerns raised by some stakeholders and, as a result, had removed some of the 'massing' of the office building. Cllr Moore said that it was important that interested parties had a role in shaping the landscape plan and she welcomed the views of Forum members on this element. Finally, Cllr Moore emphasised that all of the Stage 3 reports would be made available for public viewing, leading up to the decision in the Autumn on whether to proceed with this scheme.

Stephen Bowser said that the key aspects for him were (i) the **affordability** of the scheme and (ii) the impact the cost would have on **Council services**.

Cllr Moore acknowledged the point about affordability, adding that the Council had been clear that it would cost £2.4m per annum to service the debt created by the loan.

She added that the affordability aspect would be subject to external audit scrutiny, as part of the Stage 3 documentation.

Andy England asked whether the existing Assembly Hall Theatre would remain operational until the new theatre opened. He also asked if the impressive entrance would be retained, once the theatre was no longer functioning on its current site. Mr Almond confirmed that there would be **continuity of a theatre service** but with a short gap while the new theatre underwent its commissioning stage.

Pat Wilson acknowledged the 'not fit for purpose' argument regarding the current civic complex. He asked what the position was if the Council could not re-let the building.

Mr Candlin said that it was the intention that the existing office and theatre buildings would undergo a change of use. He added that there would need to be discussions with Historic England as to which **elements of listing** would remain as part of that transition.

Paul Mason thanked Messrs Candlin and Almond for their visionary presentation. There was one element which he felt was **unnecessary**, namely the **car park**. He believed that the pace of change was such that this would not be needed within 20 years – a period which was well-before its reported breakeven point.

Ben van Grutten welcomed the proposals for the new theatre but felt this might be in the wrong location. He added that this was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for the town and that the Borough Council should aim for a **more ambitious proposal**, one which would include a conference centre.

Denise Watts was concerned that Calverley Grounds would become an area just for the **town's elite** once the development was complete, and unwelcoming for use by families who enjoyed it in its current format for its green, open spaces. Cllr Heasman disagreed, citing one of the town's other centres of attraction – the Pantiles – where people of all ages congregated and enjoyed the atmosphere and facilities.

Robert Chris asked whether the Stage 3 report would include a comprehensive analysis of the **traffic impact** of the development. Mr Candlin confirmed that there would be a comprehensive traffic impact assessment included at that stage, adding that it would set out issues which the Borough Council and KCC, as well as others, would need to address.

The Chairman thanked Messrs Candlin and Almond for their very detailed presentation and for responding so fully to the questions raised. He also thanked Town Forum members – and others in attendance – for their very active engagement in this debate.

Members of the Forum joined Mary Wardrop in thanking the Chairman for his management of what was a very interesting and informative special meeting.

There were no specific action points arising from this presentation.

## REPORTS OF THE (A) WATER IN THE WELLS AND (B) TRANSPORT WORKING GROUPS

7. Due to the lateness of the hour, the above reports were not discussed. They are, however, available to read as part of the agenda papers circulated.

## 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

(a) **Tunbridge Wells Common** – Sally Balcon said that a long-standing resident was facing High Court action brought by Targetfollow; she asked for whatever contributions Forum members could offer to help fight this unfair action.

(b) **Flooding** – John Cunningham asked that, in view of the return of flooding problems to the Pantiles, infrastructure issues be added to the agenda for the September meeting.

## 9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 14 September 2017 at 6.30pm

The meeting concluded at 9.25pm.



*The voice of the residents of Royal Tunbridge Wells*

---

## **Tunbridge Wells Town Forum Strategic Planning Working Group**

**Update report for the meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

### **1. Local Plan developments**

Members may keep up to date with developments by going to the TWBC website: Follow Business/Planning/New Local Plan. The most interesting detail is contained in the Evidence Base section and the Call for Sites section, which has an excellent updated interactive map which allows you to view in considerable detail each of the sites put forward by would-be developers under the 2016 and 2017 Call for Sites.

#### ***Call for sites***

A preliminary evaluation of the sites submitted last year has been published, divided into sections, including one which covers the Royal Tunbridge Wells unparished area. As mentioned at an earlier meeting, this is intended to be factual and non-judgemental about the sites but it contains a few inaccuracies which would need correcting if any site is taken forward for further consideration. Also some 15 sites in AONB or Green Belt were submitted under the first Call for Sites, many of them clearly unsuitable according to the various studies since carried out for the evidence base. Beyond RTW, a very large amount of land has been submitted around the Tonbridge to High Brooms railway line (one of the TF red lines on landscape approaches to the town), all around the A21 towards Tonbridge and Capel and either side of the A21 at Pembury, including in the AONB. No land has been submitted around the north eastern end of the Borough outside the AONB and Green Belt, which was thought to be a possible location for a Garden Village.

#### ***Issues and Options***

The TF submitted a very comprehensive response to the Issues and Options consultation (already circulated) and prepared a model response form so that individual member associations could also respond. Originally the TWBC intention was to analyse all the responses and, together with data from the evidence base and the Call for Sites, to proceed direct to a draft Local Plan. It is now possible that an intermediate document may appear, on which we may be able to comment. For the time being TWBC is giving no further indication of which of the options or combination of options in the Issues and Options document is likely to be taken forward.

#### ***Green Belt review***

A detailed review of Green Belt land and also land already safeguarded for possible development (Rural Fringe) has recently been published. The review principally concerns Royal Tunbridge Wells but also some neighbouring villages. There is a main report with useful maps and, as with the Call for Sites, data has then been broken down into different

---

Formed in 2005, the Town Forum is the voice of the 50,000 residents of Royal Tunbridge Wells on issues of common interest

#### **Town Forum Management Group**

---

Adrian Berendt (Chair); Alex Green (Deputy Chair); Alastair Tod (Deputy Chair); David Wakefield (Finance); Jane Fenwick (Transport); Linda Lewis (Culture, Leisure & Tourism); Mark Booker (Strategic Planning); Michael Holman (Water in the Wells)

areas, including one for the Royal Tunbridge Wells unparished area. The review follows on from equally detailed Landscape Character Assessments and a fine historical landscape survey, all published on the New Local Plan website. Overall, the level of harm which would result from release of most of the Green Belt land around the town is classified as “*very high*” and this is corroborated in landscape and historical terms by the other evidence studies. This should normally secure its long term protection as it should act as a strong constraint to development. However, given current Central Government policy on the overriding importance of housing targets, nobody is in a position to be too sure any more.

## **2. Homelessness consultation**

The TF submitted a response to the joint Sevenoaks/Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells boroughs’ report on homelessness and inadequate social housing provision. The TF response has been circulated to all members. We welcomed the consultation report as a well researched and clearly expressed exposition of the serious and growing problems of homelessness and affordability across the three Boroughs. We welcomed its vision to increase the availability of good quality affordable homes for purchase and rent. However, we commented that the unacceptable situation concerning homelessness and affordability appears to result from the cumulative effects of nearly 40 years of central government policies under successive administrations. The present concept of “affordability” is little short of farcical in Royal Tunbridge Wells. Household incomes of some £58,000pa and a deposit of some £67,000 will not be available to the overwhelming majority of the 341 households per annum stated to be in need of affordable housing in RTW. So, home *purchase* of any kind, even under government schemes, will not be an option for them. As no two bedroom properties are available for commercial rent within the Local Housing Allowance cap of £765 per month, a significant majority of the same demographic will also never be able to *rent privately* in the area either. Even the concept of an “affordable” rent in national terms has no meaning in Royal Tunbridge Wells where a rent of 80% of a typical market rent cannot seriously be considered to be “affordable” within the normal meaning of that word.

We strongly encourage the three authorities to militate for changes which might present them with more effective tools to tackle their problems, which are also our problems because the homeless and inadequately housed are all part of one local community.

## **3. Major Developments**

### *RVP Ely Court*

While we welcomed the news that the proposed development is to go ahead and found the minor proposed changes to plans broadly acceptable, we were not happy with the proposals for the new Fiveways entrance which have also been the subject of a planning application and have been illustrated in the local press. The primary objection is that this entrance would be over-scale relative to neighbouring buildings and to the relatively small Fiveways public space. While earlier discussions with the developers on the Ely Court scheme were quite fruitful, there has been no indication of a willingness to reconsider the Fiveways scheme in any respect.

### *Cinema Site*

While discussions took place with the developer earlier in the year and a number of TF suggestions were noted, the planning application recently submitted does not seem to have addressed these. So we have written to TWBC broadly supporting the pessimistic appraisal

made by the Civic Society. It is also unfortunate that one of the “joined up” pieces of thinking on improving permeability and green routes in the town between parts of the Cinema Site and Calverley Grounds seems to have been abandoned, not by the developers this time but by TWBC on some ill-defined “security grounds”. There is of course a distinct danger that if the present scheme does not go ahead, it will be some years before any other plans emerge for the Cinema Site, let alone lead to actual construction. The further views of members would therefore be most welcome.

### ***Theatre and Civic Complex***

Developing plans for a new theatre, offices and civic centre remain as controversial as ever. There are so many different aspects to the proposals that it is very difficult for most lay people to form an informed judgement on all of them. Issues remain to be clarified over the size of the theatre and its location and programming, over the wisdom of providing expensive underground parking in a time of such uncertainty over the future of present-generation motor transport, over the re-use of the Town Hall and Assembly Hall buildings and lastly over the impact on much loved Calverley Grounds. As with the Cinema Site, there would, however, be adverse repercussions flowing from any total collapse of present proposals. This is what happened to the ill-fated Regeneration Company plans of 2009-11 and it took nearly a decade for a different scheme for the town centre to emerge. The Council’s overall plans are part of a conscious policy which the TF has strongly supported to develop Royal Tunbridge Wells as a distinctive destination town attracting British and overseas visitors. This appears to be a sound strategy in the long term, one which may assist in conserving those aspects of the built and natural environment in the town as a whole which are greatly valued. Those aspects are also very vulnerable in the context of the current Local Plan review unless they can be economically justified by a viable concept of Royal Tunbridge Wells as a place of leisure and resort.

Mark Booker Leader Strategic Planning Working Group 04.09.17

This page is intentionally left blank



*The voice of the residents of Royal Tunbridge Wells*

## **Report of the Transport Working Group to the Town Forum on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

**Members:** Jane Fenwick (chair), Lorna Blackmore, Pat Wilson, Peter Perry, Adrian Berendt, Katharina Mahler Bech, David Wakefield, Sally Balcon, Jennifer Hemmings, David Scott and Cllr Peter Lidstone (St Johns).

The TWG met on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2017. Since the last Town Forum meeting the following has been undertaken:

### **1. Consultation responses**

The TWG has drafted and submitted on behalf of the Town Forum the following consultation responses:

- **Draft Planning Framework** for the new theatre and civic offices on Mount Pleasant Avenue highlighting the highlighted - in particular - the dangers of pedestrians accessing the sites in the same space as HGVs servicing the theatre and cars leaving the underground car park.
- **Belvedere:** highlighting the limited examination of increased pedestrian flows on Mount Pleasant/Crescent Road/Church Road junction, the impact of extending shared space to that junction on pedestrian numbers and flows, the hazards created by access to parking and loading bay facilities, and the impact of news shops and cinema on pedestrian access issues.
- **Crescent Road Car Park extension:** Jane Fenwick presented the Town Forum's response (see below) to the Crescent Road Car Park extension at the Planning and Transport Cabinet Advisory Board on 24<sup>th</sup> July, and Jennifer Hemming presented for the CPG RA
- **KCC Rights of Way** – a response is being prepared

**2. Calverley Park Gardens:** Jennifer Hemming and the Residents Association for Calverley Park Gardens are continuing to work for improved pedestrian safety, reduced vehicle speeds and the number of HGVs which use Calverley Park Gardens, and are in contact with KCC concerning the progress of the feasibility study and a full report promised (by March 2018) on actions to be taken to improve the area.

**3. Parking:** Revised plans for changes to Residents Parking in Zones A and C are expected soon and new restrictions for Zone B will follow.

***For members information the statement on the Crescent Road Car Park at the P&T CAB was as follows:***

“There is no need for this extension to Crescent Road Car Park and its consideration as part of TWBC's overall plans for the proposed theatre, civic office, underground car park and redevelopment of the Town Hall site redevelopment is entirely premature.

1. The Council's perceived need for more town centre parking is entirely self-inflicted by its own plans to demolish and build on the Great Hall and Mount Pleasant Avenue car parks. The final plans have not even been approved by the Council itself.

---

Formed in 2005, the Town Forum is the voice of the 50,000 residents of Royal Tunbridge Wells on issues of common interest

### **Town Forum Management Group**

Adrian Berendt (Chair); Alex Green (Deputy Chair); Alastair Tod (Deputy Chair); David Wakefield (Finance); Jane Fenwick (Transport); Linda Lewis (Culture, Leisure & Tourism); Mark Booker (Strategic Planning); Michael Holman (Water in the Wells)

2. Furthermore, the Council's own review of car park occupancy across the town shows that there is plenty of capacity in the other car parks to accommodate the 96 space to be created at Crescent Road. The Council argues that it is need to maintain parking income which is hard to believe when so many car park spaces are empty now and have given no income towards Council services for many years.

3. If there was to be any development of car parks in the town centre, this is not the place. There is already imbalance of off street parking between the south of the town and the centre and north which this car park extension will exacerbate. Another 96 vehicles entering and leaving Crescent Road CP onto the A264 at Crescent Road and thence to Carrs Corner and the Pembury Road in one direction, and to Church Road and London Road junctions in the other, will be an unwelcome addition to the town's reputation for congestion.

4. The Council has already approved strategies for more active travel facilities for walking and cycling within the town. If these approved strategies received a fraction of the investment planned for Crescent Road car park it would radically reduce the need to more parking in future.

5. We are told in the documents for this meeting that the provision of 26 cycle stands will 'support the Council's healthy Borough priority'. If it is a priority, then why provide more parking for polluting vehicles that support unhealthy lifestyles. Furthermore, how exactly are the cyclists expected access these cycle stand as the existing passageway is a footpath only, and the roadway is a busy car park exit. It will be hazardous for both cyclists and pedestrians. This passageway deserves to be enhanced not diminished further. It is a vital link for pedestrians and could be for cyclists too, and a gateway to healthier lifestyles which is supposedly a 'priority' for the Council.

6. This is not a wise project on a number of fronts. The decision is premature not only for the overall plans for the theatre and new civic offices, but also for the future development of the Town Hall site. On the other hand it is also too late. Personal transport is moving on fast and not only will residents be walking and cycling more, but will also be using more public transport or dial up vehicles to deliver them to the town centre. Vehicles will be powered differently and accessed in wholly different ways which will not involve private ownership.

Looking ahead 30-40 years when the loan for this extension is finally paid off, the ratepayers will wonder why significant investment in parking for polluting personal vehicles was made at this time instead of a transformational investment in enabling people to move cleanly, quietly and healthily around their town.

I urge you to vote for option 1 and reject option 4."



## **MAKING A DIFFERENCE WITH WATER REFRESHING OUR SPA-TOWN HERITAGE**

*'In five years' time, the thriving town of Royal Tunbridge Wells will have attracted growth and investment to secure its future. It will have a vibrant retail trade and a rich cultural heritage based on music, the arts, leisure and **water** to continue its spa tradition. It will be a place where people want to live and work.'*

**(Councillor David Jukes, Leader of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council,  
foreword to *OUR FIVE-YEAR PLAN 2014 – 2019*)**

The 'Water in the Wells Working Group' of the Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum was formed in 2012. This was followed in 2013 by the incorporation of the 'Water in the Wells Community Interest Company (CIC). The Working Group and the CIC share the same objectives, namely to work for the regeneration of the spa-town heritage of Royal Tunbridge Wells by promoting the installation of high quality water- and water-themed features at key points in and around the town for the benefit and enjoyment of residents and visitors alike.

Water in the Wells envisages a public art strategy for the town firmly based in its long-recognised heritage of water, health, leisure and pleasure. To this end we have been able to establish a new charity – a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) called 'Refresh Tunbridge Wells'. The declared objects of the CIO are 'To advance art for the public benefit by the provision, refurbishment and maintenance of publicly available works of art in Tunbridge Wells', whereby water features are considered to fall within the definition of 'works of art'. We therefore now have in place the two organisational structures that can assist in the realisation of our aims.

This is a large, long-term project, that will be realised in small-scale interventions, each new water-themed feature helping to establish the concept and grow the town's identity. Over the past five years we have been greatly assisted in our aspirations by a wide variety of other organisations and individuals who share our aims: private developers, friends groups and both officers and elected members of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council. By identifying common objectives and working together a great deal has already been achieved. Much, however, remains to be done if our spa-town heritage is to be kept alive and working for the benefit of a vibrant future.

This report aims to provide a record of the progress of the main water-linked projects in Tunbridge Wells over the past five years. Some were conceived before Water in the Wells was formed, some have already been completed, some are ongoing and many are either still at the planning stage or merely identified as potential opportunities. In their different ways, they all demonstrate a coming together of individuals and organisations anxious to build on our heritage to make Tunbridge Wells an even better place to visit, live and work.

Professor Michael Holman  
(Chairman 'Water in the Wells' and 'Refresh Tunbridge Wells')

## PROJECTS COMPLETED:

### **Fountains Lodge Nursing and Residential Home**

Private, new. 2013-15.

Fountains Lodge, London Road, Southborough, Tunbridge Wells TN4 ORJ.

3-spout fountain installed in forecourt, visible from London Road, one of the main entry points to Tunbridge Wells. Fountains added to plans and name adopted following consultation with Water in the Wells.

### **Sherwood Lake and Woodland**

Public park, regeneration project. 2013-15.

De-silting lake, improvement to dam and construction of new paths round lake and in woods.

The project was carried out by Town and Country Housing Group in conjunction with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, The High Weald Partnership and Friends Group. The Sherwood Lake and Woodland area enjoys village green status.

### **Grosvenor and Hilbert Park**

Public park, regeneration project. 2014-16.

Restoration of park including Marnock Lake, Victorian Dripping Wells and creation of wetlands area. Supported by grant of £2.5 million from Heritage Lottery Fund. Jointly undertaken by TWBC and contractors, assisted by active Friends Group.

Re-opened May 2016. Wetlands completed summer 2016. Marnock Lake suffered from severe flooding in July 2017.

### **Calverley Grounds**

Public park

1. Christmas Ice Rink, new. 2011-

Planning permission granted summer 2017 for two further years.

Water and electricity installed for the rink suitable for potential water feature.

2. Potential for splash and play water feature with recessed spouts and seating area on site occupied by ice rink.

### **Royal Wells Park**

Private developer, new. 2012-16.

Site of former Kent and Sussex Hospital, Mount Ephraim, Royal Tunbridge Wells.

Two independent water features: one visible from Mount Ephraim and incorporating water table at top, stepped rill and three water walls; the other, visible from the lower end of the development, consisting of two parallel channels coming together in an impressive wide cascade.

Completed summer 2017.

Berkeley Homes development.

(Water Feature cited in draft Public Art Strategy Document)

### **Knights Wood**

Private developer, new. 2015-17.

Town/village entrance square adjacent to new school. Incorporating triangular water feature 22 metres long by 4 metres wide tapering to almost zero. With still and flowing water areas and fifteen illuminated bubbling spouts. Motto on stepping stones as suggested by Water in the Wells: 'SOMETHING IN THE WATER' adds conceptual link to spa-town heritage of Tunbridge Wells. Focal point provided by nature-inspired sculpture in bead-blasted stainless steel by Brighton-based artist Will Nash.

Completed summer 2017. Official opening and unveiling of sculpture 8 September by Mayor, Councillor Julia Soyke.  
A Dandara development.

## **Tunbridge Wells Railway Station**

**Murals on Platform 2.** New, 2016-2017.

Commissioned and financed by Southeastern. Additional financial support from 'Royal Tunbridge Wells Together' and 'Refresh Tunbridge Wells'. A community-linked project to replace the destroyed Brian Barnes murals. Created by local artists Chris Burke and Elaine Gill, the mural is inspired by our spa-town heritage and called the 'Tunbridge Wells Helix Timeline'. It is united by the overlapping themes of iron-bearing rocks, health-giving water and visiting royalty.

The new mural was unveiled by the Mayor, Councillor David Neve, on 27 March 2017. In addition to providing financial support, 'Refresh Tunbridge Wells' played a major part in the project's conception and successful realisation.

## **NEARING COMPLETION:**

**Calverley Grounds** Public park in town centre.

**Calverley Adventure Grounds.** New. 2015-17.

Community-led project to transform the former bowling green into a children's community play space (designed by Jennette Emery-Wallis) that reflects the town's spa origins with a sand-river feature. Friends of Calverley Grounds CIO (Charitable Incorporated Organisation) established May 2016. Successful fundraising completed within a year. Anticipated completion late summer 2017. (We have established that the water channeled into a culvert in Calverley Park does flow immediately below the bowling green.)

## **UNDER CONSTRUCTION**

### **Former Dairy Crest Depot: The Dairy**

87a St John's Road, Tunbridge Wells. Private developer, new. 2015-48 extra care apartments for people in later life. Includes water feature in courtyard and agreed funding provision under Section 106 for refurbishment of existing traditional fountain in St John's Recreation Ground.

A McCarthy and Stone development.

## **PLANNING APPLICATION SUBMITTED**

### **Union House**

Southern end of Pantiles. Private developer, new. 2015-

Design drawings in preparation for major interactive water feature in new development on site of former Pump Room/Union House adjacent to Linden Park Road.

Planning application for demolition and new build June 2016 (16/504331). We are in communication with the developer concerning the design of the water feature.

Anticipated demolition start late 2017. A Dandara development.

(Potential for water feature cited in draft Public Art Strategy Document)

## **ABC Cinema site: The Belvedere**

This is a high-profile, town-centre site perfect for a major water-feature. Altitude UK followed up public exhibitions and consultations with a full planning application on 7 July 2017. Following suggestions from Water in the Wells and widely supported by the general public, the application includes a crescent-shaped water wall at the junction of Mount Pleasant and Church Road. We will work closely with Altitude UK to ensure that the commitment to a water feature will be honoured.

A development by Altitude UK.

(Potential for water feature cited in draft Public Art Strategy Document)

## **INFRASTRUCTURE IN PLACE:**

### **North Farm Roundabouts**

Public highway, KCC. 2015-16

Ducting for electricity and water ingress and egress installed at roundabouts GS2 (Kingstanding Way) and GS3 (Great Lodge) as part of Longfield Road Improvement Scheme, in readiness for eventual water-themed features. KCC has erected large directional signs on the roundabouts, but is still opposed to any other feature.

### **Fiveways, Tunbridge Wells**

Public open space, TWBC and KCC. 2015-17.

As part of Fiveways refurbishment, power and ducting for ingress and egress of water have been installed in readiness for eventual water feature installation.

(Potential for water feature cited in draft Public Art Strategy Document)

## **PLANNING UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

### **Owlsnest Wood**

Tonbridge Road, Pembury. Private developer, new. 2015-

Application (15/505823/FULL) for creation of 76-bed health and wellbeing facility plus 22 independent extra care lodges on site opposite entrance to Tunbridge Wells Hospital at Pembury. Developers propose to refurbish lake and provide community access for recreational and leisure use. This access needs to be made into a permanent public right of way to the lake.

Quantum Group joint venture.

### **Arriva Bus Depot, 36-40 St Johns Road, Tunbridge Wells**

Planning application submitted March 2017 for demolition of existing buildings and construction of 3 new buildings comprising 89 units to provide extra care accommodation for older people. The current application includes a small water feature either side of the entrance on St Johns Road.

## **UNDER REVIEW:**

### **Pantiles**

#### **1. Chalybeate Spring**

Public / private space. Despite the water flow having reduced to an occasional trickle, dippers were engaged for the summer season operating on Fridays, at week-ends and also for prearranged groups. The search for additional dippers continues. Offers to Stephanie Cavey at the Tourist Information Centre (01892 554164). The Borough

Council arranged for the buildings and railings to be repainted before the opening of the season. Water in the Wells has initiated discussions on the future management structure of the Spring.

## **2. Sussex Mews**

Public space. We would like to draw public attention to the fact that the Grom Brook still flows in a large culvert below Sussex Mews. We are considering proposals to open up to the light a small section of the culvert and cover with strengthened glass so that the water can be seen flowing below.

## **Brighton Lake**

Originally top of our list, on a main entry route to the town, this small lake continues to be an ideal site for a small water feature. Set slightly higher than the road and not currently noticed by car drivers, it would also benefit from the aeration provided by a water feature. Approximate costings for provision of power and installation of small floating fountain (cf Goudhurst Village Pond, Lindfield Pond) were obtained in 2013. Plans were put on hold following a negative response from the Commons Conservators. We hope to re-open discussions soon.

(Potential for water feature cited in draft Public Art Strategy Document)

## **POTENTIAL SITES IDENTIFIED IN DRAFT PUBLIC ART STRATEGY DOCUMENT**

### **Calverley Grounds**

**Interactive splash and play water feature.** There is strong potential for this on the site used by the Ice Rink. Water and power supply already in place.

(Potential for water feature cited in draft Public Art Strategy Document)

### **TW Culture and Learning Hub**

Great potential for water-themed public art in this major development in the centre of town. Representations continue to be made to the planning team and to architects and internal space designers to ensure that the water and health heritage of Tunbridge Wells is considered in their deliberations.

### **Civic Centre Complex**

Consultations with architects and planners continue.

### **Calverley Terrace forecourt**

This must be considered in the context of the redevelopment of the Civic Complex. A water feature in the centre of the space would provide a fine focal point.

### **Vale Road Gateway**

This small triangle of grassland, for many years the final resting place of a rusting First World War tank, forms part of Tunbridge Wells Common. Dependent on traffic-flow re-organisation.

### **Carr's Corner**

Possible site for water-themed public art. Dependent on re-organisation of traffic flow.

## **Charles the Martyr forecourt**

Dependent on re-organisation of traffic flow.

## **Southborough Hub**

A joint project involving KCC, TWBC and Southborough Town Council. Despite our representations, a water feature was not included in the initial designs. We will press for the installation of the necessary services (water ingress and egress, power etc.) to be included so that a water feature can be added at a later stage at reduced cost.

## **Beacon, Happy Valley**

The top lake has been dredged and extended. Plans are in hand for renovation of the central lake, the lower walkways, and the area round the former Cold Bath. We will continue to liaise with the owner and support plans for further renovation.

## **Great Hall piazza**

Dependent on re-organisation of traffic flow.

*September 2017.*

*(Professor Michael Holman, Chairman, 'Water in the Wells CIC' and 'Refresh Tunbridge Wells CIO').*

*[michaeldekholman@gmail.com](mailto:michaeldekholman@gmail.com), [info@waterinthewells.org](mailto:info@waterinthewells.org),*

*Mobile: 97799456524*