

Planning decisions May 2023

23/501841/FULL	3 Chilston Road Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2PR	See Appendix A
23/501939/SUB	Parapet House Maidstone Road Lenham Kent ME17 2QJ	No Comment
22/502753/FULL	1 Rose Cottages Lenham Forstal Road LPC no comment	Response to appeal APP/U2235/W/22/3312759 Lenham Parish Council wishes to support the submission of the MBC Planning Officer's report dated 23/9/22. Originally the Parish did not comment but in retrospect the Planning Officer has highlighted some relevant issues.
23/502111/FULL	The Barn Fairview Faversham Road Lenham Kent ME17 2EX	No Comment
23/501606/FULL	Swift Oak Hook Lane Lenham Heath Lenham Kent ME17 2BX	The Parish has had discussions with the applicant and would wish to support this application. We note that the site is adjacent to the M20 motorway and the Offices will be erected on the existing hardcore surface of the timber yard (possibly Brownfield). We would only ask that details of the drainage (both storm and foul) are presented prior to approval (this being part of the Stour catchment.)
23/502016/FULL	The Marvel Old Ashford Road Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2DG	The Parish is happy to approve this application with the proviso that a planning condition is created to ensure the privacy of the Neighbours e.g. by use of frosted glass windows on the new first storey overlooking the Neighbours.

Appendix A

1. The proposal will close up a beneficial gap in the front facades of the properties in Chilston Road, which provides relief to the overall mass of the streetscape. It is noted that other than the four properties 1, 3, 5 & 7, all others in the road are bungalows. As such the street presence by these two pairs of semi-detached properties is all the more important, especially when it is noted that they are on the very edge of the village, addressing the rural fringe. The LPC do not feel that this proposal is beneficial to the street scene which should be protected from over development and an extension of such 'mass' in this location. The impact of this added mass on the adjacent properties should not be underestimated. Such a proposal leaves little or no opportunity for the neighbouring property and any subsequent application would result in a terrace style approach which LPC regard as entirely unacceptable and not in keeping with the aesthetic of the neighbourhood.
2. The proposal seeks to remove the garage and bring the development line forward from the existing garage to 'just behind' the existing façade. While the step back is considered and has (limited) benefit of bringing the ridge line down when seen against the existing, the impact on the mass of the property in the street scene and on the immediate neighbours cannot be overlooked. LPC believe that this is an example of an overdevelopment of the plot in a manner which is insensitive to the neighbourhood. LPC believe that the existing building line must be observed to avoid detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties and the street scene.
3. The submitted drawings show an additional parking space on what is currently grassed area – such that the property will have two available spaces (for a four-bedroom house?). LPC believe this parking provision is insufficient and will lead to on street parking. There are already issues with hard surface runoff affecting the neighbouring property. Adding to this surfacing will exacerbate matters. This approach is also contrary to the ecological aspirations within the Lenham Neighbourhood Plan and the MBC ecology policies – where removing green space for parking provision is less than ideal.
4. The proposed site plan appears to include ecological mitigation proposals of a 'log pile' and a 'hedgehog house'. While LPC actively encourage ecological improvements, in this instance, we regard the inclusion of these as woefully inadequate and a blatant attempt to 'greenwash' a submission, with insignificant 'token' ecological benefits. There is no credible argument or example where such simple 'applied' tokens have been maintained and proven to aid ecology/diversification. Serious ecological measures include permanent installations which cannot be simply removed in a 'garden tidy up' as these can.
5. In addition to point 3 above, the width of Chilston Road is such that any on road parking severely limits access for emergency vehicles as well as dustbin lorry access. LPC are aware that there are a number of elderly residents in this area, and they regularly use ambulances for appointments (and in emergencies). The property

increase to four-bedrooms will result in additional parking on the road as only two spaces can be accommodated to the front of the property (off the carriageway). This has already presented an issue for neighbours since the applicant moved into the property. A continuation of any such parking will cause significant inconvenience to the residents and may impact on emergency access. LPC object to the application where it will result in any on road parking in Chilston Road or adjacent roads.

Note: It is understood that there are historic covenants on the properties in Chilston Road and Royton Avenue. LPC remind MBC that such covenants do not fall away with time and planning applications/decisions are still subject to the requirements of any such covenant as may apply to that property. MBC should be aware of such limitations when considering applications.

Summary: LPC objects to the application mainly with a focus on the impact and mass on the neighbours and the street scene. There is also concern regarding the visual impact and overlooking issues as well as potential loss of amenity in the rear gardens both through mass or the rear part of the development, potential shading, and overlooking.

LPC believe that the application is ill considered in this location and should be rejected.