

Planning applications finalized - July 2021

21/503129/FULL	Lenham Rail Station Station Approach Lenham Kent ME17 2HR	No comment
21/503502/FULL	Vine Cottage Lenham Heath Road Sandway Maidstone Kent	<p>We have reservations about the practicality of this application and we wish to object. The entrance here would have to be quite significant to accommodate both the narrow width of the lane and the topography of the bank - we would be happy to have a site meeting if needed to discuss the issues.</p> <p>The property is significantly higher than the Roadway which is narrow at this point. In order to generate the required traffic sight lines and to allow vehicles to turn into the narrow lane without "grounding" it will involve significant earthwork removal. No plans detailing this have been made available.</p>

21/503665/NMAMD	The Farmhouse Business Centre Headcorn Road Lenham Kent ME17 2HT	<p>We object to this application.</p> <p>The applicant has known that it was a requirement to install a footway before first occupation since the original outline planning permission was granted on appeal some five years ago. There is no possible justification to delay the provision of this essential highway safety infrastructure regarded necessary by the Planning Officer and Inspector to support this development.</p> <p>It would appear that the UK Network Power cable has already been installed across the Railway Bridge. A trench has been dug and filled in from the start of the overhead lines at the Station which are to be removed, ending at the entrance to the development where the High Tension cable is currently visible. We can see no reason why UK Network power would require further access to their cable over the Railway Bridge.</p> <p>The contention that the ongoing works could damage the pavement is wrong headed. How much damage will the ongoing works do to a young mother with pram, taking her child to the Nursery along the busy Headcorn Road which currently has no pavement? We would also point out that the Headcorn road is busy with some 9,000 vehicles per week passing along it in both directions (18,000 total) the ongoing development site traffic is minimal compared to this.</p> <p>If the Planning Officer is of a mind to grant this application we would ask that it was called into committee.</p>
21/502635/FULL	Greenways Warren Street Road Charing Ashford Kent TN27 0HJ	No comment
21/503767/TNOT56	Warren Street Reservoir Rayners Hill Lenham Kent ME17 2ED	No comment

21/503318/FULL	Highfield Faversham Road Lenham Kent ME17 2EX	<p>The Parish council objects to this application and supports the all comments made separately by Mrs Shotter.</p> <p>Development under the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act is quoted as: <i>"the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operation in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any building or other land."</i></p> <p>There is no requirement to initiate a planning application to fence in a public right of way footpath. However we would point out that if the line of footpath KH436 is to be changed then the permission of the KCC footpaths department would be required.</p> <p>The line of the footpath is straight up from the gate at the cottages on the Faversham Road with a dogleg near the top of the field leading to the top gate – this would therefore involve two lines of unsightly fencing 1.5 to 2m apart running up the scarp slope. It would also be the responsibility of the landowner to maintain the footpath keeping it free of weeds (brambles, nettles etc.)</p> <p>Currently there is no evidence of any maintenance being carried out near the top gate from the dog leg onwards - the meadow itself below the dogleg appears to be weed-free and passable.</p> <p>Despite what is shown on the site plan we do not believe that the car park on the Faversham road below the bottom gate is part of the meadow under the ownership of the applicant.</p> <p>The point has been made before in previous applications that the dumping of the spoil from the neighbouring site would have required a planning permission and was dumped illegally. Although the current application shows in the drawing that the amount of spoil will be taken down to original levels (which has not happened), the reshaping of the landscape does not form part of the wording of the planning application. The question is whether it is part of the planning application or not. If it is then the Environment Agency ought to be consulted because the application relates to a 'mining operation' (see letter by the Environment Agency).</p> <p>In summary:</p> <p>The application is not for mineral working (this was done illegally) nor a change of use (it remains an agricultural meadow) nor any works which need planning permission.</p> <p>The re-seeding of an agricultural meadow and the erection of a fence below 2m height does not constitute development. Therefore a planning permission for sustainable development should not be given as the suggested work does not qualify as development.</p>
----------------	--	---

21/503057/FULL	Kilnwood Farm Old Ham Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2LT	No Comment
21/503543/FULL	Paradi Dickley Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent	No Comment
21/503862/FULL	2 Ham Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2LJ	<p>The Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed extensions as shown on the block plan are simply too large for the site extending at the side to the plot boundary. 2. There appears to be no provision to enable the refuse bins to be moved from the rear of the property to the front. <p>If however the planning Officer is of a mind to accept this application we would ask that a planning condition is imposed to require a refuse bin enclosure to be installed at the front of the property.</p>