

**SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee  
Meeting held on 21 July 2016 in Shorne Village Hall**

**PRESENT** Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)  
Mr R Theobald  
Mr R Lane  
Miss P Clifton

**APOLOGIES** for absence were received Mr J Bugg

**18 Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 June 2016**

The minutes were AGREED as a true record.

**19 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

There were no matters arising from the Minutes not otherwise on the agenda.

**20 Correspondence**

Taken with agenda items.

**PLANNING MATTERS**

**21 Planning Applications/Issues pending**

- (a) Nuralite (British Uralite) Land Clearance: Mr Theobald reported that he had spoken to the Enforcement Officer at the Borough Council who said they were expecting a planning application but this has not yet been received.
- (b) Long Acre, Pear Tree Lane: Correspondence received advised that activity had quietened down following a letter being sent by the Enforcement Officer to the owner however the site needs to be kept under review.
- (c) Proposed Telephone Transmitter in Parish Church Tower: Mrs Lindley had some e-mail correspondence with Andrew Moffat and was advised that this was being handled by the agent, who has been a bit premature in his dealings. There are still several processes to go through with conservation architects etc. The Parish Council would want to be consulted. Nothing further will be done until the autumn.
- (d) Ringland, Pear Tree Lane: There had been discussions with the applicant over the excessive mass of the proposed modifications.

**22 Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii)Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with by the Chairman/Vice-Chairman in Consultation with Members**

Please see Table at end of minutes.

**23 Decisions of the Borough Council**

- (a) Possible Ceasing of Paper Plans Circulation by GBC: There has not been any official notification that there will be any change, only the reports noted in minutes of Gravesham Borough Council Committees. Mr Theobald had drafted a letter which Miss Clifton put forward at the Local KALC meeting. It is proposed that it should be sent on KALC headed notepaper and signed by all of the Parish Councils.

**24 Notices of Appeal**

No Notices of Appeal.

**25 Parish/Neighbourhood Plan (8)**

Nothing further to report.

**26 Major Plans Affecting the Parish**

- (a) KCC Active Travel Strategy Consultation: Encouraging people to walk to work. Mrs Lindley had responded discussing the potential impact of a Lower Thames Crossing and the negative impact of safety concerns for both pedestrians and cyclists.
- (b) Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area Consultation: Mrs Lindley had responded stressing issues of pollution to the river and marshes that might result from a Lower Thames Crossing.

**26 Developments outside the Parish but with impact on Shorne (reported for information)(10)**

- (a) Thames Estuary 2050 Growth Commission: This is headed by Lord Heseltine and has issued a “Call for Ideas” consultation. Mrs Lindley will make a suitable response, the response deadline is midday on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2016.  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/thames-estuary-2050-growth-commission-call-for-ideas>
- (b) Paramount Developments: Further consultation on access routes is reported to be happening soon but nothing has been published or received yet.
- (c) Transforming Strood: This Medway consultation is mentioned for information. There are proposals to revamp several junctions in Strood which could affect traffic flows.  
<http://www.medway.gov.uk/businessandinvestment/medwayregeneration/transformingsstrood.aspx>

- (d) Millbrook Garden Centre: They are applying to demolish and rebuild part of the centre, and create a larger café area
- (e) Dering way business estate proposal: Mrs Lindley had noted this on the Gravesham website, it is adjacent to Chalk Marshes. Mr Theobald confirmed that the relevant land had for some time been already zoned for industrial development.

## **HIGHWAY MATTERS**

### **27 Accident Reports**

No specific accidents reported since the previous meeting.

### **28 Traffic Monitoring & Speedwatch (12)**

Miss Clifton had sent out the latest speed watch figures to members.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Start Time</b>	<b>Finish Time</b>	<b>No of vehicles over 35mph</b>	<b>Total No of vehicles</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No of letters generated for Mid-Range Speeding</b>	<b>No of letters generated for High-End Speeding</b>
10/06/2016	See Ho (W)	07:50	08:45	17	65	26%	4	0
21/06/2016	See Ho (W)	07:50	08:40	11	56	20%	5	0
12/07/2016	See Ho (W)	07:50	08:40	8	55	15%		

### **29 Street Lighting**

Nothing further to report.

### **30 Condition of Roads in the Parish (13)**

Mrs Lindley and Mr Bugg had met the Highways Team on 30 June 2016. Matters raised included:-

- (a) The footway in Tanyard Hill
- (b) Yellow lining
- (c) The Street surface needs to be re-done properly, also the footway with green railings
- (d) Drains. Tanyard Hill is subsiding, the cause of which is due to a mixture of paving and draining problems.

Regarding the condition of the highway on the bend in The Street by the Rose & Crown, Mr Theobald suggested writing to the KCC Cabinet member with photographs.

#### **Vegetation Overhanging Roads & Footways**

It was suggested that the Parish Council writes to the owner of the property and then, if no remedial action is taken, report this to Kent Highways who will undertake the work

and recover the costs for dealing with the vegetation from the owner. It is a slightly complicated process that needs two stages of letters, Mrs Lindley will endeavour to write a protocol.

### **31 Lorries Parking Beside the A2 (14)**

- (a) It was reported that the lorry parking area at Marling Cross has been closed. It is supposed to be being resurfaced, there is some confusion about ownership
- (b) Park Pale: It was reported that there was some motorbike activity the previous night.

### **32 Parking/Traffic Problems**

At the meeting with Highways staff Mrs Lindley was given a Parking Handout, Version 2 which she will scan and circulate. Attention was drawn to parking on the pavement e.g. at the Country Park and obstructing driveways. It was suggested we could ask for monitoring in the village at 3pm when parents are collecting their children from school.

### **33 Highway Modifications (15)**

- (a) Racefield Close: Mr Theobald reported that this has not been further progressed.
- (b) Footway at Shorne Ridgeway: The position on and ownership needs to be checked. Highways will be asked, otherwise it might be possible to check via the Land Registry.
- (c) Waiting Restrictions (Yellow Lining Including Park Pale): The Parish Council needs to ask for traffic calming. Need to get this on the Joint Transportation meeting as an item for discussion.

### **34 Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board (16)**

No meetings had been held due to the Chairman being unwell.

### **35 Matters Raised by Members**

- (a) Annual Report – discussion about the final numbers required and cost.
- (b) Mr Theobald reported that Clive Gilbert is retiring. Wendy Lane will take over as GBC Head of Planning.
- (c) Lock on recreation ground – this is broken. Mr Lane will arrange repair or replacement.
- (d) KALC log-in – Mrs Lindley queried whether the Parish Council has a log-in which can be used to access documents etc. Mrs Martin agreed to circulate the information.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.27pm.

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH SINCE 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016

<p>GR/2016/0499</p> <p>(Standing orders, minuted 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016)</p>	<p>The See Ho Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JX</p>	<p>Erection of a rear extension and refurbishment of existing toilets.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the application but notes the following:</p> <p>The See Ho Public House is located within the envelope of the Shorne Ridgeway settlement. It is a longstanding local business/employer. The proposal seeks to refurbish and continue the business use, with expansion. The improvement to disabled access and toilet facilities is to be welcomed. The overall depth of the building is to be increased by four metres, and the rear of the new dining area has double bi-fold doors that can be opened up as well as a large side door. The design and access statement mentions in section 4.5 that it is proposed to “re-landscape the rear garden area as part of the proposals”. Improvement is to be welcomed but details need to be included in the application now so that visual and noise impact on neighbouring residents can be fully considered.</p> <p>The Design and Access statement refers in section 4.7 to “extra trade and staffing levels generated by the proposals”. From the seating plan, the extension will accommodate an additional 42 diners, who will largely arrive by car traversing narrow village roads, as will the staff. There will also be increased delivery and other commercial vehicles accessing the site. On-site parking is good but we would like to see a plan showing that 50+ vehicles can be consistently accommodated, as stated in section 4.7 of the Design and Access statement. We still have concerns that there could also be parking on nearby roads. Sightlines on exiting the car park are now good (assuming there is no overspill parking on the road) but we have concerns about the additional traffic through residential areas and the safety aspects of turning in and out of the car park in various directions due to the volume and speed of traffic already using the road. It would be helpful to have expert Highways department input into the proposals.</p> <p>We would also request information about proposed opening hours, and that noise levels should be monitored and kept under review.</p>	
<p>(20160632)</p>	<p>Brackenside Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JX</p>	<p>Application for the approval of condition 8 attached to planning permission reference number 20150719 relating to the details of the scheme for the</p>	<p>Not consulted, rainwater harvesting and recycling system.</p>	

		whole site providing for the disposal of surface water run-off and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS).		
GR/2016/0651 And GR/2016/0664  (Standing orders, minuted 21st July 2016)	Cemetery And Crematorium Land Rochester Road Gravesend Kent	Application for a non-material amendment to planning application reference 20130923 to allow amendments to the crematorium chimney and the increase in height of two chimney flues. <u>And</u> Application for the approval of condition 11 attached to planning permission reference no. 20130923 relating to revised details of chimney cowl/flue.	This development is in Chalk but has impacts on Shorne Parish. These present applications are modifications that create concern over increased visual impact. Given that the designers/operators should have known what is required under their operating regulations, we question how designs were submitted for and received planning approval that were not going to be deliverable. The previous designs had the flues largely hidden behind louvres while the new designs have both shorter louvres and taller chimneys, thus there will be increased visual impact for a wide landscape area and the nature of the buildings will be more obvious. The new plans state that the top of the flue will be colour coated but we would like to see detailed technical information about how a permanent colour finish can and will be achieved. The planning history to date means that we cannot object to matters of operational necessity but we would still like to express displeasure at the increased visual impact due to these belated design changes.	
GR/2016/0653  (Standing orders, minuted 21st July 2016)	Communication Station Adj Inn On The Lake Watling Street Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HB	Installation of a 1.8 m diameter transmission dish and three 1.2 m diameter transmission dishes on the existing 35m high mast.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to the application.	
GR/2016/0659  (Standing orders, minuted 21st July 2016)	14 Marling Way, Gravesend, Kent DA12 4DN	Erection of a single storey rear extension to form an orangery.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to the application.	

<p>KCC/GR/0387/2 015</p> <p>GR/2015/1192</p> <p>(Standing orders, minuted 21st July 2016)</p>	<p>Unit 4, Apex Business Park, Queens Farm Road, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent</p>	<p>AMENDED DETAILS: Improvement and enhancement of existing waste transfer site by erection of a replacement building to provide covered working area and ancillary site improvements together with retrospective provision for trommel, picking station and wall.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for asking us to comment on the revised plans. Please see also our previous comments submitted on 28th December 2015 (copy provided for ease of reference). We do not want to repeat these here however many of the points made are still pertinent so we would be grateful for them to be carried forward to this present consultation.</p> <p>We also wish to draw to your attention that, since the previous submission, Shornemead Crossing has been reopened for public use hence pedestrians and cyclists have resumed using Queens Farm Road for accessing the Canal towpath and Fort Road, and the National Cycle Route. Numbers doing so are likely to increase more as word spreads.</p> <p>The Parish Council still wishes to OBJECT to the application. Examination of the newly submitted documentation occasions the following additional comments:</p> <p>1. The Amended proposal: At this point in time the amended proposal is fundamentally to legalise the situation whereby the previously approved vehicle numbers, sizes and access routes were ignored - the expanded traffic data confirms local observations in this regard, that HGV movements are three times greater than what was agreed, and with much larger vehicles being employed.</p> <p>The revised building is actually taller at 12.02 metres (compared to the previous 11.5 metres) so will have greater visual impact.</p> <p>2. Visual/Landscape issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Visual screening plantings: It is stated that there is no space for visual screening plantings on the RS Skips part of the Apex site itself however in that case we would like to see collaboration between RS Skips and all relevant closely located landowners to co-operate over achieving some useful visual screening plantings of the whole site.</li> <li>o Landscape and visual assessment: The information provided was very interesting and informative but, as it states, is qualitative and also subjective. The photographs actually show that the vivid green new trommel is highly visible over a wide distance, and the new building will likely be more so. The</li> </ul>	
---	--	--	---	--

			<p>assessment largely considered horizontal views whereas the greatest concern is over adverse effect on views from high ground and on sense of openness, both for public and private viewpoints. This is mentioned in section 5.12 but not assessed. Example locations of relevance would be Green Farm itself, Shorne Hill, properties on Pear Tree Lane, and viewpoints in Shorne Woods Country Park. These locations also overlook traffic movements on Lower Higham Road, and experience the overall light pollution during hours of darkness.</p> <p>3. Transport issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Use of Lower Higham Road to the East: 40% of site traffic has been shown to be using this route in contradiction to what was agreed when the site was permitted. This seems a high level of use if merely “for access” and rather appears to be reflecting routine use of the route. The greatest use is also occurring in the afternoons when there is likely to be greatest conflict with school traffic.</li> <li>o Queens Farm Road: The Transport Assessment states on page 5 that Queens Farm Road is “a narrow rural road” and on page 30 that it is “narrow in places”. Photo 2, shows that at one point it is “around 5.5m wide”, with encroachment onto the verges. Photo 3 and accompanying text states that the southern end is narrow with passing places, that shown being a created encroachment onto the adjacent field. Photograph 1 (and 5 for Lower Higham Road) of the Landscape and Visual Assessment also show how poor and narrow the road is. On page 13, the Transport Assessment refers to Queens Farm Road as having “good forward visibility” however this is not true for its whole length, particularly not at the narrow bends just before approaching the Apex Business Park itself. The section discusses conflict with cyclists however it should be noted that this conflict has now increased again with the recent re-opening of Shornemead Crossing giving access to the National Cycle Route. We note that KCC also commented about Queens Farm Road “some sections of which are particularly narrow” and furthermore suggested the need for a “ring through” arrangement to prevent two HGV’s needing to pass, which supports local opinion that the access route is too narrow and that hazards are arising.</li> <li>o Access roads and routes: Although the RS Skips commissioned Transport Assessment implies that there are no problems using the local roads,</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>during the various consultations there have been numerous submissions from local residents expressing dissatisfaction. We note also that KCC asked for a “framework Route Management Plan”, which does not seem to have been undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Accident data: Accident data of the type presented only considers accidents resulting in personal injury and not e.g. just damaging vehicles. Only the official access route from Lion Roundabout has been considered and not also e.g. Lower Higham Road to the East. Much of data shown is not directly relevant although it confirms the particular hazards in passing the college. The data presented is only for 2010-2014, however a longer timeframe on the Crashmap website (<a href="http://www.crashmap.co.uk/">http://www.crashmap.co.uk/</a>) shows three accidents at the Queens Farm Road/Lower Higham Road junction in 2006, 2006 and 2007. While we readily accept that this predates RS Skips taking over the site, it does highlight that the junction is hazardous. The excessive speeds recorded for some of the traffic on the Lower Higham Road also accords with local reports and flags up increased risk there. Overall, the accident data suggests that for the traffic levels on the Lower Higham Road there are actually a high number of incidents, further underlining fundamental issues about the road and the land topography.</li> <li>o Congestion Reference Flow data: The formula actually relates to new roads, built to modern design and safety standards, which would be as straight as possible, of uniform width and with assured sightlines. That is not the case for Lower Higham Road and Queens Farm Road so the calculations and conclusions are not valid.</li> </ul> <p>4. Various points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Dust control: Netting will not control dust from tipping out waste, particularly when done outside the building.</li> <li>o Amenity impact: We disagree with the statement in the documents that the site “has no material adverse impact” on amenity of those living and working in the area.</li> <li>o Listed buildings: The fact that Queens Farm is not currently Listed does not mean that it should not be preserved from impacts of traffic. In this area there has not been a particularly strategy to List buildings but the Farm is anyway central to its associated Conservation Area.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Future plans: We remain concerned that there might be future applications to further increase the utilisation of the site, which would further increase the waste throughput and vehicle movements.</li><li>o Request for Conditions to be imposed that limit operational volume etc: We note the statement that RS Skips "intend" to operate within 55,000 tonnes per annum. We hereby request that, if permission is to be granted, that the permitted waste volume to be processed should be formally specified as being limited to 55,000 tonnes per annum, with clear details of the associated vehicle numbers and types, and the agreed access route(s). Thank you very much for considering our submissions. Should there be any hearing/inquiry into this application then we would be very grateful to be invited to attend as deemed appropriate.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--