

## Planning Decisions September 2023

23/503835/SUB	The Cow Shed West Street Lenham Kent ME17 2EP	We object to this application in respect of a lack of detail. We would point out that an example the 1.8 / 2.0 m high fence is given as post and rail system whereas post and rail will not reach this height. Of more importance is the lack of detail for the lighting. There should somewhere in the application a sketch showing the extent to which the light will fall and this to be agreed by all parties. This area is part of the AONB with wildlife including we would presume bats and light spillage should be minimised.
23/503856/FULL	Portable Buildings The Station House Station Approach Lenham	No Comment
23/503926/NMAMD	3 Chilston Road Lenham Kent ME17 2PR	No Comment
23/503995/TCA	Lowenva Lenham Heath Road Sandway Kent ME17 2NB	No Comment subject to approval by the tree officer especially in respect of the Oak tree. We would again point out the poor drawings now apparently being accepted by MBC planning.
23/504018/SUB	Land West of Loder Close and Westwood Close Ham Lane Lenham Kent	No Comment
23/503008/FULL	St Mary's Church Old Ashford Road Lenham Maidstone Kent	See Appendix A
22/504368/FULL PINS reference: APP/U2235/W/23/3325102	Little Gaynes Faversham Road Lenham	It was agreed that P McC should be asked to quote to prepare a response to the Appeal – this concentrating on additional points over and above those already submitted by LPC to the Planning officer. This recommendation to be submitted to the October LPC along with the costs.
23/501294/FULL	The Coach Park Old Ashford Road Lenham Kent ME17 2DG	Attendance at the MBC meeting to be requested LPC to verbally point out that the Environment officer's report had largely been ignored especially where he had requested a site visit by the Planning Officer which has not been undertaken. LPC is also unsure as to why this application is being treated separately for the application for a burger Van to be situated on this site. These two applications should be considered together especially in respect of opening times. The LPC would wish to see this application deferred until the above points are resolved.

## Appendix A - submission in respect of the Church 23/503008/FULL

We object to this application given that in the main our previous comments have been ignored.

We welcome the addition of the cesspool tank to take grey water from the sink but would still like to point out that given the increased footfall intended for the Church that the toilets draining to the arch drain will be totally unsatisfactory. Surely by use of a macerator or otherwise the toilets should now also be draining to the cesspool tank. In addition we would like to comment on our confusion about the red / blue boundary lines on the proposed site plan drawing. The Blue line obviously represents the Church and Church graveyard. Is the red boundary incorporating the SE corner (including the cesspool) implying that there are no graves in this area – if not what is being suggested?

We also believe that the proposals for the inside of the Church will obscure the lower window to the left of the main entrance which we feel is wrong for what is a historic building.

We would like to repeat our previous comments below which were not considered in the updated application.

The proposed site plan makes no suggestion about any additional paths around/through the cemetery from the toilet fire door to a place of safety (the path to the lynch gate). This is addressed as a 'hard paving threshold' which is barely sufficient depth to accommodate the swing of the door. If this is a push for improving wheelchair egress then surely there needs to be a hard surface path from the door to the main church path? Otherwise, wheelchairs using this exit in an emergency will get stuck in the grass just outside the door.

The proposal makes little sense without additional landscaping.

The proposal also highlights the need for external lighting (the emergency exit and the path to the Lynch Gate should have lights). These should only need to be in operation when the emergency door is opened.

It is worth noting on the portal documents that Historic England have submitted a comment noting that they are not offering advice but suggesting that MBC contact specialist conservation and archaeological advisers We would support this and wish also add ecclesiastical advisers.

Mid-Kent Environmental have commented noting the acoustic issues of the ASHP's (air source heat pumps) for the adjacent neighbours who will be subject to a constant low-level hum.

The proposal only appears to visually mask the ASHP1 (air source heat pump) unit with hedging (hopefully 1.5m high at planting) which is obviously not going to ameliorate any noise. If this unit is to remain in this location acoustic boarding should be considered.

ASHP2 behind the toilet block (on the Eastern elevation) is in a better position regarding noise nuisance to the neighbours.