

Planning decisions January 2023

22/505650/FULL	9A High Street Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2QD	See Appendix A January 2023 planning decisions
22/505651/LBC	9A High Street Lenham Maidstone Kent ME17 2QD	See Appendix A January 2023 planning decisions
22/505871/SUB	The White Horse Inn Lenham Heath Road Sandway Kent ME17 2HY	No Comment
22/505900/FULL	Coast Cottage West Street Lenham Maidstone Kent	No Comment
22/505927/SUB	3 Hatch Road Lenham Kent ME17 2HL	No Comment
22/505953/SUB	Land North Of Old Ashford Road Lenham Kent	No Comment
22/505965/AGRIC	New Shelve Farm Cottages Ashford Road Lenham Maidstone Kent	No Comment
23/500169/TCA	The Russells Maidstone Road Lenham Kent ME17 2QJ	No comment
22/505716/TCA	Yew Tree Cottage 36 High Street Lenham Kent ME17 2QD	<p>Whilst we are supportive of residents maintaining their trees we would like to point out that these are probably the oldest trees in the Village.</p> <p>We would ask that a tree officer study the proposals on site, to determine whether or not the pollarding (shaping) is reasonable and not likely to lead to the demise of these aged specimens.</p>

Appendix A

Lenham Parish Council objects to the some of the detail in these applications.
(22/505650/FULL and 22/505651/LBC)

We note and fully support the objection of the conservation officer to 505651/LBC. We confirm that in our opinion both these applications are “woolly” and lack sufficient detail to allow approval to be granted.

We note in the design access and heritage statement from the consultant’s report that no mention has been made to the Lenham Square Conservation Area Plan as published by MBC which does list the conservation area requirements.

An example of this wooliness is the statement ‘**generally external windows and joinery will be retained and refurbished**’ - this statement is too nebulous. It should state/confirm that any replacement works to joinery will be on a like for like basis and will follow the submission of a detailed report into the condition of the windows as well as a subsequent approval of a 1:1 sample. Report to be submitted as part of this application, not post decision.

Note that anything other than hardwood will be unacceptable.

In response to our objections regarding parking made in respect of the previous application the Design + Access Statement by JPD Architecture (Doc 5749615) does contain a very brief commentary (management plan?) suggesting that access will only be from the High Street with contractors vehicles parked mainly in the Square. This is insufficient detail and is unworkable in practice. Parking in the Square is limited to 2 hours with no return within 1 hour – this has to be impractical from the contractor’s viewpoint. Spaces in the square are marked out for cars and are entirely unsuitable for contractors vans which have a larger footprint. It is also impractical from the viewpoint of the Village where existing parking in the square and the surrounding area is at a premium. The businesses in the Square already complain about the parking limitations affecting their footfall. We would suggest here a planning condition requiring contractor’s vehicles to be parked in the Maidstone Road long term car park and not in any circumstances in the Square or the High Street. A detailed traffic management plan including parking and unloading is required. LPC must have sight of the traffic management plan prior to any approval.

There is little detail in the application regarding issues with scaffolding on the High Street.

The scaffold could (and should) be designed to maintain the footpath at all times – it should be close to the façade with standards on the edge of the pavement. A scaffold design will have to account for the possibility of cars hitting the scaffold (preventing this preferably) and should not require the parking to be suspended. Looking at the depth of the steps up to the shop – it should be possible to build the scaffold to maintain that (and the clear space in front) such as pedestrian access is maintained throughout. Naturally, this depends on the skill of those appointed.

It could be argued that, subject to programming, there is no need for a temporary lid when the re-roofing of the building. As a further question – if there is no change to the fenestration etc. – why strip off the roof anyway? Additional insulation can be introduced from below if necessary (inside). If the roof is stripped off, then the existing tiles retained from the rear should be used to replace any broken on the front with reclaimed tiles being used on the rear.

Is it the intention to raise the roof and roofline whilst installing the insulation externally?

Again no detail has been provided.

The drawings show 2 bedrooms on the first floor and a “dressing room with ensuite” on the third floor. Again the application is quite “woolly” in detail on this point at times suggesting 3 bedrooms as per the initial application. The access to the ensuite and dressing area is from within the bedroom

at first floor. To later make it a separate bedroom there would be implications of access/fire to consider (fire doors etc) to ensure that no-one is escaping through another space. Perhaps this future probability should be taken into account and fire proofing installed between the second and third storeys.

We have concerns regarding:

1. On the current building it is apparent that it will be necessary to renew pointing to the façade (front and rear)
2. Why the roof is being stripped?
If it is for additional insulation – there could well be an increase in roof height by the thickness of the insulation – but this will impact on the façade, eaves details etc
3. How the building will achieve the relevant U Values
4. How the scheme will achieve the relevant fire regulations for conditions of rooms within rooms and means of escape.