

January 2026 Planning decisions

25/505088/MOD106	Land North Of Old Ashford Road Lenham Kent	Lenham Parish Council objects in principle to this proposed modification. The need for affordable Housing has been highlighted by Government. The 40% requirement for affordable in new build is an integral part of both the Maidstone Local Plan and the Lenham Neighbourhood plan. If however the planning officer is minded to accept the change proposed. we would ask that any such change is reflected in increased 106 payments.
25/505065/SUB	St Mary's Church Church Square Lenham ME17 2PJ	Lenham Parish Council is disappointed that not all of its proposals to the original application were adopted. In particular the positioning of one of the heat pumps as again detailed in the Biodiversity Enhancement Report. We again ask that acoustic studies are undertaken prior to installation of heat pump 1 to determine the effect on the gardens and bedrooms of the neighbouring properties which are within 20m. We cannot understand why both heat pumps cannot be situated behind the toilet block in the position of heat pump 2. It may be possible that acoustic fencing rather than a bush screen would be necessary with the current positioning.
25/505038/LAWPRO	Lenham Storage Ltd Ham Lane Lenham ME17 2LH	No objection though we are commenting that it is unclear whether the application is for 5 charging points or 6 as detailed in 25/505039
25/505039/FULL	Lenham Storage Ltd Ham Lane Lenham ME17 2LH	As per 505038 above.
26/500081/SUB	Land North Of Old Ashford Road Lenham Kent	Lenham Parish Council does not object to this application. However we require clarification in respect of Clause 4 of the SUDS maintenance plan issued by SPD consulting. The clause itself is satisfactory but it does not specify who will be responsible for this work. Please note that LPC will not agree to take on this responsibility.
26/500058/LAWPRO	Blackberry Acre Headcorn Road Sandway Kent ME17 2NE	No comment
/26/500012FULL	Warren House, Headcorn Road, Sandway, ME17 2AG	Lenham Parish council does not object to this application. We would however ask for a condition that the side extension which is built as an annex should not in the future be sold as a separate property.

25/504020/FULL	11A High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	<p>Lenham Parish Council were asked to respond to the document issued by KDS in respect of this application. See our previous comments submitted to MBC where we objected to the application and still do object. We fully support the latest Neighbours comments in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed blockage of light from the existing window – it is obviously a window (it is not bricked up) and cannot be blocked simply to accommodate a new adjoining property. 2. Movement of materials – there is as yet no transport management plan, only vague proposals in the KDS letter. We reiterate that Parking in the Village itself is at a premium and we cannot see how building material deliveries could be made without an official suspension of parking bays outside the property. 3. The materials used for construction should be reclaimed as this is part of the Lenham Square conservation zone – this has not been specified. Please also see our comment relating to roof pitch heights and rainwater drainage from required tile designs. 4. Trees – any removal or modification to trees will require approval from the MBC tree officer as this is part of the conservation zone – there are doubts that this is fully understood. 5. Structural integrity - where in the application has it been demonstrated that the construction of a new adjoining property will not affect the integrity of the old existing property and who would be responsible financially if the structure was compromised. It is simply not good enough to say that this will be completed in the future after application approval especially since the neighbour is objecting to the building being built to adjoin her property. 6. Party wall agreement – we think KDS has the wrong property in mind – how can you co-join to an existing building without a party wall agreement which will specify future liability. We are not commenting about a building 3m distant. 7. Drainage (surface water run-off) there are no technical reports by a qualified drainage consultant to investigate the effect on the banking at the foot of the garden where there is a drop down to the lower level of Church Square. Again this needs to be done in advance to specify future liability should problems occur on future years. 8. Satellite dish are KDS really suggesting that they can move a satellite dish without the express agreement of the owner – this agreement has not been given.
----------------	--	--