

# Planning decisions July / August 2022

---

22/501563/FULL	The Coach House Lenham Court Old Ham Lane Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2LS	No Comment
22/503393/FULL	Whittiker Cottage Lenham Heath Road Sandway Maidstone Kent ME17 2NB	No Comment
19/504724/HYBRID	Land Off Old Ashford Road Lenham Maidstone Kent	Lenham Parish Council approves of this application subject to the assumption that the proposed wetland is confirmed by Natural England as meeting the requirements of Nutrient Neutrality relating to the Stodmarsh Nature Reserve
22/503125/TPOA	1 Grovelands Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2QR	TPO application to carry out works to one Copper beech; Shorten branches on western side by up to 4 metres to clear conservatory, also shorten branches on northern side by up to 4 metres to clear house. Final minimum radial distance of 10 metres.
22/503304/NMAMD	23 High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	Non-material amendment in relation to planning permission 20/501375/FULL.
22/502753/FULL	1 Rose Cottages Lenham Forstal Road Lenham Heath Kent ME17 2JL	No Comment
22/503526/NMAMD	Land West Of Loder Close And Westwood Close Ham Lane Lenham Kent	No Comment
22/503528/TCA	Yew Tree Cottage 36 High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	No Comment
22/503456/LBC	9A High Street Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2QD	<b>See attached document below</b>
22/503700/SUB	Land North Of Old Ashford Road Lenham Kent	No Comment
22/503652/SUB	Tanyard Farm Old Ashford Road Lenham Kent ME17 2DH	No Comment
22/503760/SUB	Blue House Farm Warren Street Lenham Maidstone Kent	No Comment
22/503871/SUB	Elmstone Hole Farm Elmstone Hole Road Grafty Green Kent ME17 2AJ	No Comment
22/503701/FULL	Land At Highbourne Park Lenham Kent ME17 2PE	The Council is generally in favour of this application although we cannot quite understand why the 15 ground based solar

		<p>panels are being installed so remote from the nearest Housing.</p> <p>We would ask the Planning Officer to consider the following condition given that the site is part of the AONB scarp slope:</p> <p>“The Installation shall be screened from view from both the Pilgrims Way trackway and the A20”. This is from the viewpoint of reflected sunlight affecting the View of the AONB and from a Road Safety viewpoint.</p>
22/504034/NMAMD	Russell And Russell Roofing Ltd The Farmhouse Business Centre Headcorn Road Lenham Kent ME17 2HT	No Comment
22/503964/SUB	Land West Of The Old Goods Yard Headcorn Road Lenham ME17 2HT	No Comment

# Response to 9a High St.

---

In considering this application Lenham Parish Council wishes Maidstone Planning Authority to have regard to a policy SHDS 1(8) in Lenham Neighbourhood Plan. This policy requires a construction method statement to be submitted with development proposals, which this application does not contain. While the policy is phrased in the context of the strategic housing delivery sites it is clear that the imposition of a condition requiring such a construction method statement in this case may be of assistance in monitoring and mitigating the construction process in a neighbourly manner.

Paragraph 4.2 in the neighbourhood plan deals with small-scale development such as this current planning application. policy D2(2) contains a set of four criteria which planning applications should meet in relation to small-scale householder development. Lenham Parish Council submits to Maidstone Borough council as local planning authority that this planning application should be supported both by a construction method statement and by a statement explaining how the criteria in policy D2 have been applied.

Lenham Parish Council therefore invites the Borough council not to grant planning permission for this planning application until the above matters have been submitted and considered by the local planning authority.

Other than these procedural issues, Lenham parish Council wishes to object to planning application 22/503456/LBC on the following grounds:

1. Fire place drawing is unhelpful – a far more detailed drawing is needed to ascertain the impact of the work – this should also show photos of the room in the existing condition.  
Historic buildings and places have made a similar comment on this issue.  
We also support their contention that the documentation does not adequately identify the age or significance of the areas of the building to be altered and as such, the application does not adequately address the requirements of paragraph 194 of the NPPF 2021.
2. The 'notes' are also limited and unhelpful. Are the 'matching tiles' new or reclaimed? They should be reclaimed as per the Lenham Square Conservation area document issued by MBC - but this is not stated.
3. Elevations – unhelpful not to have both sets rendered (but would ease reading them and look less like something is being hidden)
4. Roof lights to main roof: these MUST be conservation type if all are approved. We believe that 4 roof lights are excessive for this space.
5. Lower outbuilding – again roof lights MUST be conservation area type and again – we believe that 4 are excessive for this space. This is proportionally wrong for the area of roof available and will require careful design and installation for weathering. We would suggest this is reviewed.
6. Block plan – We are unsure how this application has been validated when the requirements of the block plan as listed on the planning portal are that it must be either 1:1250 or 1:2500 scale and must show at least two road names. These block plans do neither.
7. There is a window shown in the store at second floor on the plans which is 'in' the chimney – this is not shown on the elevations.
8. We would need to look at the flank elevation where they are proposing to open up a closed window at first floor. Subject to how it was closed up this may be acceptable – although we would prefer it to be left as it is – as it tells some of the story of the buildings past – and is mentioned on the conservation area listing.
9. The intended use of the terrace and the logic for opening up the wall is unclear – possibly future development is being considered – especially with the number of roof lights proposed.
10. **The latest comments dated 21<sup>st</sup> July from JPD Architecture UK Ltd about the mezzanine floor are totally confusing there is no mezzanine floor detailed in the available drawings.**

**We have also read the submitted letters from the immediate neighbours focussing on access for work, duration, noise and dust, impact on business and gardens.**

**We would ask that MBC carefully monitor methods and issue conditions concerning delivery and parking of**

contractors' vehicles to ensure that the adjacent owners are not inconvenienced.

The rear of the building has restricted accesses which are essential to the local businesses, the neighbours who have commented are refusing access across their properties.

Access from the busy High Street which is part of the 10X bus route would be totally impractical.

From the viewpoint of the contractors private vehicles there are issues – parking in the Square which is oversubscribed is limited to 2 hours and the residents of the private Church Square would not allow additional parking of the likely number needed.

Should the planning officer be minded to accept this application we would ask that it be called in to Committee for their consideration and we would wish to participate in Committee.