Report of the Planning and Implementation Committee

Wednesday 16th July 2025 at 7:30pm

PRESENT Cllr. J. Chair presiding.
Cllrs. P Culver, D Garland, K Hammond, S. Heeley, J. Murray & A Ratcliffe
L. Westcott (Clerk & RFO), R. Greenwood

Public Participation

1 member of the public present – David Knight (Landowner strategic site 3) to listen

The chair opened the meeting at 19:35.

1. **Apologies for absence:**
   Apologies were received and accepted from Valerie Woollven
2. **Nominations for Substitutions**
   Cllr. D Garland is substituting for Cllr A. Walmsley.
   All agreed.
3. **Declarations of Interest on the Agenda**
   Cllr. P Culver declared a conflict of interest to land to the east of Old School Close. Cllrs. J Britt declared a conflict of interest in relation to Warren Lands. 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.
   Cllr. J. Murray declared a pecuniary interest for 66 High Street.
4. **Minutes from P&I Committee meeting 18th June**
   The minutes of the P&I meeting on 18th June 2025 were agreed as being accurate.
   ACTION Cllr. M. Michaelas has contacted Riz Barbers. Cllr J. Britt to follow up.
   Land opposite Wishful Thinker has been reported to MBC who have visited. Neighbour has called into the office a number of times with her concerns.
5. **Current Planning Applications to consider – see Appendix A**
   a. 37 High Street – No objections in principle to installing a parking space outside property, more parking spaces are always required in the village. Concerns raised over whether there is space for a car to park, Cllr. A Ratcliffe measured space and confirmed length as 7.5 (compliant) but 2.4m (not compliant). This is not for consideration by LPC. Recommended applicant speaks to Conservation officer.
      ACTION L Westcott to respond.

   Please see Appendix A for responses to planning applications.
6. **Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2024 – update**
   Cllr J Britt has circulated a report on the meeting.as well as the draft SPD. No CIL or Section 106 will be included as this will be a bespoke funding agreement. Discussion to take place on 3rd September at MBC, with public consultation by end of September.
   ACTION Cllr J. Britt to send letter to MBC leader expressing disappointment of the quality of the SPD.
7. **Lenham Neighbourhood Plan Review (NHP)**
   No update

8. Update on the Workplan

a. East Lenham Farm may go to MBC planning committee in September.
b. Sports and Recreation Group – Cllr. A Ratcliffe asked to set up a working group, Cllrs. P Culver, J Murray and D Garland to be involved.
c. Countryside/Vistry – moving on. No signing until outstanding work has been completed.
d. Abbey Homes – no update
e. Maidstone Road Carpark Extension – reports to be interpreted by Evans and Langford. **ACTION** Cllr A. Ratcliffe to summarise what is expected.
f. Nursery – Project management meetings – 1 taken place, 2 planned. CIL application to be re-drafted with advice from MBC Cllr. Kathy Cox.

9. Update on Other Development

a. Caloo report- Manufacturers have provided advice on locations. **ACTION** Cllr. A Ratcliffe to draft email to LWFC as a holding response while LPC decide on locations.
b. No response from Meopham fencing.
c. Discussed under item 8.
d. Discussed under item 8.
e. Maidstone Road Toilets – doors are fitted. Still not sorted a workable connection for payments. Disabled alarm: we need to understand what happens when the alarm is used – decision needed as to where to send.

10. Highways Improvement Plan (HIP)

Cllr. A Walmsley reported to Cllr. J Britt that KCC have granted permission in principle for 20 speed roundels in the 20mph zone, this has been sent to their design team.

11. Matters Arising from Planning Decisions

Nothing to report

12. Correspondence (for information only)

a) Hedge Maintenance – Cllr. J Britt suggested a campaign to ask public to look after their own hedges. **ACTION** A. Ratcliffe to start work on poster.
b) Elmstone Hole Road O2 Mast – consultation circulated.
c) LWFC – to discuss at F & GP
d) David Jackson questioned what can be covered in next Lenham Focus (i.e. Marley Site). Cllr. J Britt to contact Rob Jarman
e) Cllr. Ratcliffe to write an article following visit from new Core Colonel from REME

13. Date of next meeting

The next meeting is on Wednesday 20th August 2025.

The meeting closed at 9.35pm

Signed as a true record on this day 3rd September 2025……..

Chair of the Planning and Implementation Committee

Appendix A

Application number	Detail	Response for consideration
Pre-planning enquiry	37 High Street - creation of a parking area	No comment - our discussion related to non-planning related issues
25/502043/FULL	30 High Street - erection of a detached annex	Objection: This 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 - enhancement of ecology	No comment
25/501979/FULL	Erection of 59 dwellings at the Old Goods Yard (Russell's) site - site 4 in LNP	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 detailed 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 issue needs addressing 3. the amount of traffic generated by this facet of the overall scheme requires an additional exit onto Headcorn Road. The issues now evident because of the Lenham Springs facet of the development indicate that the additional traffic cannot be safely handled by using the exit at Arrow Way