July and August Planning decisions

25/502489/SUB	Land At Old Ham Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent	See our comment in respect of 25/502482
25/502487/FULL	Sunnyside Lenham Heath Road Lenham ME17 2BP	We note that this is an extensive addition to the property and wonder about any MBC restrictions in this respect. We also note that there is no proposed site plan to show the completed project. However, this is an extensive plot capable of accommodating the extension and it will not affect the visibility from the Roadway. We have no specific objections.
25/502482/SUB	Land At Old Ham Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent	LPC has found it difficult to decide on this application and the accompanying applications 25/502489 and 25/502490 as we cannot find detail of the material lists (they are given as "as per drawing" but the drawing is not available.) Given that this application includes the new fence line by the entrance to the neighbouring Playing Field. Would it be possible to re-order the plot numbering to bring the completion of 19/20 much closer to 2/4 – it would seem to be the group in the road and would thus complete the front of the site rather than leaving the entrances half finished to the very end.
25/502490/SUB	Land At Old Ham Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent	See our comment in respect of 25/502482
25/502613/TCA	24 Tolhurst Way Lenham Kent ME17 2BY	No Comment

25/502043/FULL	30 High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	Objection: The is not a suitable design for inclusion within the village conservation area, specifically: to reflect the local vernacular in this location a building of this size should at least have a pitched roof and appropriate roofing material (i.e. it is surrounded by buildings, many of them listed with Kent Peg tiles).
25/502694/SUB	66 High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QB	No comment
25/501979/FULL	The Old Goods Yard Headcorn Road ME17 2HT	Objection: there are a number of issues with this proposal. The parish council acknowledges this is Strategic Site 4 within the Lenham Neighbourhood Plan however: 1. The parish council has noted the comments from Kent Police, under the remit of Safer by Design, and would wish to see the proposal modified to match the requirements as set out in that comment. Additionally, given the experience of the Lenham Springs development, the parish council would wish to see this development achieve accreditation under the SBD scheme. 2. The density is at odds with the existing co-development presenting an overbearing quality to the existing scheme of which it is part - this needs addressing The amount of traffic generated by this facet of the overall scheme requires an additional exit onto Headcorn Road. The issues now evident as a result of the Lenham Springs facet of the development indicate that the additional traffic cannot be safely handled by using the exit at Arrow Way
25/502987/SUB	Parapet House Maidstone Road Lenham ME17 2QJ	No Comment
25/502948/SUB	Parapet House Maidstone Road Lenham ME17 2QJ	No Comment – subsequently withdrawn
25/502817/LDCEX	Biggin Farm Sandway Road	No Comment.

	Sandway Kent ME17 2LU	
25/503101/TCA	Lenham Fire Station High Street Lenham ME17 2QB	No Comment.
25/503055/FULL	Westbury Waterditch Lane Lenham Kent ME17 2DY	The Parish Council notes that this application is now much closer to that suggested in our previous comments given that the scheme is now much closer to existing footprint of the existing structures and with a low pitch slate roof. However we are still concerned that this could end up as a separate independent dwelling and we would suggest a condition that it is linked to the main house to prevent future separation/sale. It could, in theory, have a direct entrance formed off Waterditch Lane in the future – which we would need to avoid. We also think that there should be further clarification of the window/door frame colours as these are not listed in the documents.
25/502893/LBC	Corner House The Square Lenham Kent ME17 2PQ	See our comments on 25/502892/Full
25/503060/FULL	Westbury Waterditch Lane Lenham Kent ME17 2DY	The Parish Council objects to this retrospective application on the grounds of detrimental visual impact to the rural environment. Stock fences are perfectly satisfactory in the countryside and six-foot close boarded fences are a creeping urbanisation of rural roads. This is especially pertinent in the North Downs Landscape area. As such we would always prefer to maintain the rural feel – which is not to permit such fences. The preference should be to manage and grow hedgerows which are better for nature, ecology etc and just as effective at breaking the view if that is the intention here.