



## Report of the Planning and Implementation Committee

Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2025 at 7:30pm

**PRESENT** Cllr. A Walmsley presiding.

Cllrs. P. Culver, D. Garland, C. Wood, J Murray & A Ratcliffe

Deputy Clerk S. Newell, Officer A Ratcliffe

R Greenwood and V Woollven

### **Public Participation**

3 Members of the public present – A member of LWFC asked about the East Lenham Farm planning conditions. **ACTION** Officers to forward decision notice once available.

A resident from the High Street reiterated their comments on the 11a High Street planning application. To be discussed at point 5.

The chair opened the meeting at 19:30

### **1. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs. J. Britt & S. Heeley

### **2. Nominations for Substitutions**

Cllr. D. Garland is substituting for Cllr. J. Britt.

All agreed.

### **3. Declarations of Interest on the Agenda**

R Greenwood and V Woollven declared a conflict of interest with St Mary's Church. Members of the group who stand on LPC declared an interest in relation to William Pitt Field. All declared conflicts of interest are non-pecuniary; this also relates to all previously declared conflicts of interest.

### **4. Minutes from P&I Committee meeting 10<sup>th</sup> December 2025**

The minutes of the P&I meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2025 were agreed as being accurate.

### **5. Current Planning Applications to consider**

25/504020/FULL– **ACTION** Officer Ratcliffe to contact case manager for update.

### **6. Update on Workplan (circulated with agenda)**

Cllr. A Ratcliffe reported on an initial discussion with Onarchitecture for potential future developments on LPC land. **ACTION** L. Westcott to review budget.

Proposed to take to Full Council.

Workplan updated.

### **7. To consider request from HLAA to erect a Communal Shed**

LPC has no objection. Cllr. A Ratcliffe suggested they make it 12x12 and install a compostable toilet. Also to reiterate no reduction in rent.

## **8. Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2024 – update**

Feedback noted.

## **9. Update on other Development**

- a. WPF – Cllrs. A Ratcliffe and A Walmsley attending a meeting with Vistry 23/01/2026.
- b. East Lenham Farm – outline planning granted by MBC, awaiting full decision notice.
- c. Panattoni – Overall promising engagement with community. Work due to take 2.5 years. Cllrs re-enforced to Panattoni that traffic flow data and mitigation would be paramount to success of enterprise. The suggestion by Panattoni that they would consider lowering the carriageway at Harrietsham to increase the bridge clearance was noted.

## **10. Highways Improvement Plan**

- a. Double yellow lines on High Street – Cllrs votes are 9 No votes / 4 Yes votes & 1 abstains. To be removed from HIP.

## **11. Matters Arising from Planning Decisions**

None

## **12. Correspondence (for information only)**

None

## **13. Date of next meeting**

The next P&I meeting is on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> February 2026.

**The meeting closed at 21:10**

Signed as a true record on this day 4<sup>th</sup> February 2026.....

Chair of the Planning and Implementation Committee

## APPENDIX A

Application Number	Address	Comments
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 <b>who</b> 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 comments
25/505065/	St Mary's Church Church Square Lenham ME17 2PJ	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
26/500012 /FULL	Warren House, Headcorn Road, Sandway, ME17 2AG	<p>Lenham Parish council does not object to this application.</p> <p>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.</p>
25/504020 /FULL	11a High Street, Lenham, 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.</p> <p>We fully support the latest Neighbours comments in respect of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--	--