



Report of the Planning and Implementation Committee Wednesday 16th October 2024 at 7:30pm

PRESENT Cllr. A Walmsley, Chair presiding.
Cllrs. J Britt, P Culver, D Earl, K Hammond, S Heeley, J Murray & A Ratcliffe
L Westcott (Clerk), V Woollven, R Greenwood

Public Participation

Two members of the public and the Planning Enforcement team leader from MBC, Sue King were present.

2 members of the public were invited to join in discussions regarding 11A when that item is reached on the agenda.

A technical issue meant Sue King's presentation wasn't ready.

The chair opened the meeting at 19:35.

1. Apologies for absence:

No apologies received.

2. Nominations for Substitutions

There were none.

3. Declarations of Interest on the Agenda

V Woollven declared a conflict of interest arising from the land to the rear of Tithe Barn. Cllrs. N Osborne and P Culver declared a conflict of interest to land to the east of Old School Close. Cllr. 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 and 1A High Street. All declared conflicts of interest are non-pecuniary; this also relates to all previously declared conflicts of interest.

4. Minutes from P&I 18th September 2024

The minutes of the P&I meeting on 18th September 2024 were agreed as being accurate.

Points to note:

- L Westcott has requested an update on the Harrow from MBC community protection team.
- Cllr. J Britt reported that the s106 amendment for the Paddocks is going ahead.

5. Current Planning Applications to consider:

Please see Appendix A.

All agreed to suspend standing orders to allow public to discuss the application at 11A High street.

Standing orders remain suspended for Sue King (MBC) to provide a presentation, this will be circulated.

Cllr. A Walmsley reported on work being carried out to 91 Robins Close, that doesn't appear to have planning permission. **ACTION** L Westcott to report this to MBC.

6. Maidstone Borough Local Plan 2024 - update

No update.

7. Lenham Neighbourhood Plan Review

No update.

8. Update on the Workplan

- a. **WPF car park handover** – Cllr. A Walmsley reported that work has still not been completed as agreed. Cllr. J Britt will send an email to chase this again with a view to escalating the issues within Vistry.
- b. **Footpath KH399A diversion** – Cllr. A Walmsley reported that the objection has been withdrawn.
- c. **Lenham Wanderers Football Club** – future liaison and meetings need to be discussed, but no representative from LWFC at the meeting to discuss.
- d. **Heathlands** – Cllr. J Britt has been invited to a steering group. He requested the terms of reference for the group and this was circulated – the last two specific points are not agreeable. All agreed for Cllr. J Britt to attend the first meeting to address concerns over the group aims and set up.
- e. **Maidstone Road car park extension** – Cllr. J Britt reported that he has met with RB Plant and has agreed further meetings are required. A core group from LPC will be required. TSP has agreed to act on behalf of LPC.

9. Update on Other Development

- a. The Gables – Cllr. A Walmsley attended the MBC planning committee meeting, the application was not permitted. The applicant is likely to appeal, which LPC may support.
- b. Warren Lands appeal – Cllr. J Britt reported that the appeal hearing was last week.

10. Highways Improvement Plan (HIP)

- a. A20 safety Improvements – Cllr. J Britt reported that there was no update.
- b. Lorry parking on the “new” Old Ham Lane – Cllr. A Walmsley has noted lorry parking on the new section of road, double yellow lines maybe required.
ACTION All to record/photograph evidence of lorry parking.
- c. Unsuitable for lorries signs on Pilgrims Way/A20 junction – these have been installed.

11. Matters Arising from Planning Decisions

None.

12. Date of next meeting

The next meeting is on Wednesday 20th November 2024

The meeting closed at 21:55

Signed as a true record on this day 6th November 2024.....

Chair of the Planning and Implementation Committee

Appendix A

Application Number	Address	Comments
24/504046/AGRIC	Land And Buildings At Swift Oak And Fox Framing Hook Lane Lenham Kent ME17 2BX	No comments.
24/503955/FULL	Shepherds Lenham Forstal Road Lenham Heath Kent ME17 2JG	No comments.
24/503948/FULL	Theohurst Cottage High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	We have no objection in principle to this application but we would like to point out that it is in the Lenham Conservation area and we are asking for a condition to be imposed that the materials to be used for both the extension and the garage should comply to the Lenham Square Conservation documentation as published by MBC. Obviously the materials being used will require the approval of the Conservation Officer. We also note that the dimensions of the proposed single? Single storey? garage have not been specified.
24/503821/FULL	11A High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	<p>The Parish Council objects to this application which is hugely lacking in detail and over densifies the centre of the village, The spaces between buildings need to be considered as much as the buildings themselves.</p> <p>From the drawings on the portal, it is difficult to gauge the height of the proposed outbuilding as there are no dimensions given. (typically this should normally prevent validation?)</p> <p>The drawings do not mention the significant change of level between properties on the High Street and those in Church Square - there really should be a site section in this sort of case. We understand that there is a 2m plus difference in ground levels with a retaining wall in the neighbouring Church Square property. By situating the outbuilding next to "on top of" the retaining wall damage to the retaining wall is inevitable as well as ground "sinking" under the proposed outbuilding caused by landslip.</p> <p>At the very least there should be a gap between the proposed outbuilding and the property boundaries to strengthen the foundations and allow for maintenance and to prevent rainwater from falling directly on to the neighbouring properties when gutters are filled with leaves or other debris.</p> <p>We understand that home offices, have to be a certain size/height e.g. approx.. 3m to fall within PD rights. However given the additional 2m of ground level, the 5m+ height will severely affect the overshadowing of the Church Square properties.</p> <p>As said given the proximity to the boundary retaining structure and the height difference this should have triggered a more detailed analysis.</p> <p>We would also point out that the proposed outbuilding is within the Lenham Square conservation zone and that the proposed construction materials e.g a slate roof, do not comply with the Lenham conservation policy as detailed in the MBC published Lenham Conservation Area and Management Plan. Obviously the conservation officer should be given the opportunity to review the proposals and materials prior to granting any approval.</p>

		<p>On a similar note this is part of the Historic Part of the Village (lying between the High Street and Church Square which itself borders the Church and the 14th century Tithe barn. An archaeological investigation must surely be undertaken as per the investigations carried out in Church Square itself.</p> <p>No drainage details have been given either for stormwater soakaway or for sewage connection – given the location sewage connection is likely to be not straightforward yet detailed drawings have not been supplied.</p> <p>The environmental study including the layout out of trees has not been detailed.</p> <p>Finally please note that access is only from the High Street and extremely limited either by through 11a itself or down a narrow passageway and across a neighbours garden. No work plan detailing how the work should be carried out has been given.</p> <p>Given the parking limitations on the High Street we would suggest at the very least the following conditions should be specified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No contractors’ vehicles to park on the High Street other than for unloading. 2. No unloading to take place during opening hours of the business next door which will be affected by use of the narrow passageway and the garden of the business. <p>In conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This proposal is simply too large for the property footprint and is not in keeping with the Conservation Area. – The proximity to the neighbouring property boundaries is simply wrong and the likely landslip caused by the differences in level and stormwater run-off has not been taken into account – The detail provided in respect of drawings, effect on the Conservation area. connection to drainage is totally inadequate. – There is no workplan submitted to take account of the affect to the next door business or the limited access to the proposed outbuilding. <p>If the planning officer is minded despite the above to approve this application, we would request that it is called in to Committee.</p>
24/503822/LBC	11A High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	See 24/503821/full.
24/503651/LBC	1A High Street Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2QD	No comments.
19/504724/HYBRID	Land Off Old Ashford Road Lenham Maidstone Kent	We should reiterate that we are in favour of this application which is part of the approved Lenham Neighbourhood plan.