

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

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

PRESENT Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)
Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chairman)
Mr R Theobald
Mr R Lane
Miss P Clifton

APOLOGIES for absence were received from Mr M Redfern,
Mr R Cooper, Mr D Hart and Mr G Dent

ALSO IN Mr D Parmenter
ATTENDANCE

62 Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 October 2015

The minutes were AGREED as a true record.

63 Matters Arising from the Minutes

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

PLANNING MATTERS

64 Planning Applications

The Borough Council had given notice of one pending application for planning permission affecting the Parish and it was resolved that the following observations and representations be made:-

GR/2015/1257 Ms S Mitchell	Crown Cottage, Gravesend Road, Shorne, Kent DA12 3JL	Construction of a dormer extension in the northern side roof slope, two pitched dormer windows to the southern side roof slope and alterations to the roof from hip to gable end, with conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms. The Parish Council has <u>NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE</u> to the planning application.
-------------------------------	--	---

		<p>We have a query about the proposed flat roofed dormer on the side elevation: on the side elevation drawing it appears to impinge on the tiled valley where it joins the adjacent gable ended roof but on the roof plan it appears to fully clear it - this needs clarifying and the latter implemented. Also, the flat dormer roof is shown as dead flat whereas it needs to slope towards its front in order to drain properly and possibly reduce the visual impact. Otherwise, the other design features fit well with local building styles and are approved.</p>
--	--	--

65 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

See Report at end of minutes.

66 Decisions of the Borough Council

There were no Decisions received. It was discussed that the Parish Council did not appear to now be receiving letters about decisions. The Chairman was endeavouring to check on the website for decisions and these were being included in the Table of applications dealt with (see Appendix).

In that context, she had been surprised to find that the application for Ringland is shown as having been permitted even though nothing had been received by the Parish Council, and she undertook to investigate further.

67 Notices of Appeal

No Notices of Appeal.

68 Parish/Neighbourhood Plan

This was discussed at the last full Council meeting when Mr Theobald reported that as a Borough Councillor he had attended a Conference in Birmingham on 28th November 2015 organised by the Royal Town Planning Institute. He had made a point of attending the workshop on Neighbourhood Planning. This had been led by a representative from the Planning Advisory Service.

Meopham Parish Council arranged a meeting to discuss Neighbourhood Planning and Parish Plans on 7 December 2015 at the Cricket Pavilion, which he and Mrs Lindley had attended. The meeting was addressed by Jillian Barr, a planner from CPRE, Jim Boot, a planning consultant dealing with Neighbourhood Plans and Wendy Lane from GBC.

A Neighbourhood Plan, after passing through all its stages, is a planning document and can influence the location of development. It is apparent however, from these discussions, that decisions on the Green Belt would be made at district strategic level. A Neighbourhood Plan

can influence where but not if development takes place. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot be used to defend the Green Belt.

At Meopham the discussion broadened to include Parish Plans introduced by Kathy Bugden from Action in Rural Kent. Parish Plans are not planning documents but essentially management tools to assist in planning in the parish. Mr Theobald undertook to circulate the information from the Meopham meeting.

Mr Lane reminded the Council that they had agreed to set up a working party to look at these issues but it was pointed out in response that there is no actual timescale or deadline for Neighbourhood Plans as this is not a statutory requirement. It had been clear at the Meopham meeting that the overwhelming majority of Parish Councillors and Parish Councils are of the view that the appropriate approach was to first undertake a Parish Plan.

69 Lower Thames Crossing (43)

Mr Theobald reported that Meridian TV had contacted him. They were considering using drones to get an aerial view. He had also attempted to locate interested groups in Thurrock but without success. At present we remain awaiting developments.

70 Local Government Boundary Commission Review (44)

It was reported that this is supposed to be finalised on 26 January 2016.

71 National Consultation on Planning Policy for the Built Environment (46)

The Parish Council has responded to this.

72 National Infrastructure Commission

This appears to be a high level consultation but needs to be investigated.

73 Developments outside the Parish but with impact on Shorne (47)

(a) Ebbsfleet Housing and Paramount Developments (47c)

A number of housing developments have received final appraisal, the Paramount Resort application has been deferred.

(b) Medway LDF

Noted, consultation until 29th February.

74 Chalk Crematorium

It was reported that a large area of topsoil had been stripped. Mr Theobald will investigate this with the Borough Council.

75 Longacre, Pear Tree Lane

It was reported that no enforcement action had yet been taken but information is being sought.

HIGHWAY MATTERS**76 Accident Reports (48)**

No accidents reported.

There had been some e-mail discussion among Committee members previously concerning the Crash Map website which records accident information on an ordnance basis from police data. Current data goes up to the end of 2014. Mrs Lindley had undertaken previously to check again in January 2016, which she had done and had ascertained that the site updates at the end of June each year with the previous calendar year of data being added then.

77 Traffic Monitoring & Speedwatch (49)

Miss Clifton had sent the Parish Council the very interesting recent data (See Appendix) which shows a high proportion of speeding over 35mph at the See Ho Public House (up to 20% of vehicles) and at both the top (up to 28%) and the bottom (up to 24% with 12 vehicle owners sent Police letters due to mid-range speeding and 1 for high-range) of Tanyard Hill going north.

Miss Clifton had also sent the formal assessments of each approved Speedwatch monitoring location and there was discussion about further possible locations such as outside the Country Park, Woodlands Lane, and perhaps further along Peartree Lane.

There had been a request from another Parish Council about borrowing our equipment but it was considered that this was not something that could be supported as there is shared, GBC purchased equipment available.

Mr Parmenter drew attention to the traffic speeds in Woodlands Lane approaching the built area from the Country Park end as traffic tends to speed right up to the 30mph sign. The Chairman agreed that there is a problem and considered that the 30mph zone should start well before where it does currently and this is something that it is hoped will be looked into along with the question of other traffic calming measures.

78 KCC - Consultation about Street Lighting (51)

Mr Theobald reported that the Transport Advisory Committee has been advised that the Parish Council requested to have the lights back on.

Condition of Roads in the Parish (52)**(a) Potholes (54)**

Mrs Lindley had requested information and a photograph from Mr Cooper as to the exact locations of the potholes in Shorne Ifield Road, where there are very bad ruts as well.

The condition of the footway in Tanyard Hill had been raised previously and Mrs Lindley had contacted KCC for an update. Apparently properly repairing the footway is on KCC's list of desired works but meanwhile they undertake regular inspections at which they white-mark areas that need earlier attention via patch repairs which they also undertake.

(b) Drainage (53)

Mr Theobald reported that a gully in Tanyard Hill, opposite Denmark House is completely buried by debris. It was considered that the drainage in the parish is generally appalling and could become dangerous. Mr Theobald will provide pictures to assist taking this forward with KCC.

80 Ridgeway House Frontage

Mrs Lindley was asked to attend a meeting with the Borough Council. She asked for the hedge to be moved back to between the lights and for the brick wall to be slightly lower. However the hedge was relaid about one metre from the edge of the road and the brick wall was rebuilt with unchanged height. Highways said that they were satisfied with what had been done. There was further discussion about taking forward the proposal to create a formal footway and it was agreed that a questionnaire should be sent to the residents in the vicinity for their views.

81 Lorries Parking Beside the A2 (56)

It was reported that the lorries are now parking on the hard shoulder. The problems continue and the police have been taking some action. There had been some adverse encounters reported relating to toilet facilities and other inappropriate behaviours.

82 Park Pale Access Road Misuse

Mr Lane had circulated a report to members. He reported that it has been quieter in the last week or so. The vandalism continues and it was reported that the corner at Cob Drive has been badly damaged.

83 Parking problems (59)

There is still concern about parking in The Street and surrounding areas. Mrs Lindley tabled a document on "A Proposal to Increase Parking Restrictions" for discussion and invited comments. She had also recently written to the School.

There was discussion about the Village Hall advertising as an event venue but without saying that parking is actually restricted, Mr Bugg undertook to discuss this with the management committee. The village hall have problems with people parking there regularly so that spaces are then unavailable for events.

A request to re-paint the existing yellow lines in the Village has been submitted.

84 Highway Modifications (60)(a) Racefield Close - Kerb Alignment (60a)

Mr Theobald will take up the matter up with the Housing Dept at the Borough Council.

(b) Footway at Shorne Ridgeway

This has been dealt with under Minute 80.

(c) Waiting Restrictions (Yellow Lines (60b))

Mr Theobald will check with Highways about the speed restrictions in Pear Tree Lane and Forge Lane.

White lines have now been added at the entrance to the Country Park.

85 Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board (61)

Mr Theobald reported that the last meeting dealt with the lighting issue.

86 KCC Parish Highways Survey

The Survey has been completed and submitted. Attention was drawn to a couple of locations in the village where cars, which are longer than the area where they are being parked, are parking with part of the car jutting out into the roadway or overhanging the pavement. In both situations they cause other cars/pedestrians to have to deviate in order to avoid them, and there is concern that an accident might result.

87 Matters Raised by Members(a) Shorne Village Hall

Mr Bugg reported that an order has been placed to repair the Village Hall roof, replace the flashing and the glazing. An order has also gone out for the heating problem.

(b) Miss Clifton reported that the replacement road salt delivery had not in fact been made at the Recreation Ground.

(c) Mr Lane reported that serious damage has been carried out by KCC on one of the trees at Chestnut Green.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.20pm.

Shorne Speedwatch Summary Data (Item 77)

Date	Location	Start Time	Finish Time	No of cars over 35mph	Total No of cars	%	No of letters generated for Mid-Range Speeding	No of letters generated for High-End Speeding
30/07/2015	See Ho (W)	08:10	08:55	7				
04/08/2015	See Ho (W)	08:10	09:05	7				
07/08/2015	See Ho (E)	16:15	17:10	3			2	4
14/08/2015	The Ridgeway (E)	15:30	16:30	8			0	0
25/08/2015	Pear Tree Lane (W)	08:15	09:15	2				
27/08/2015	See Ho (W)	08:15	09:10	10				
01/09/2015	See Ho (W)	08:10	08:50	12				
04/09/2015	The Ridgeway (E)	16:00	16:55	7			4	2
19/10/2015	See Ho (W)	08:15	09:10	7				
20/10/2015	See Ho (W)	12:40	13:10	3				
27/10/2015	See Ho (W)	08:10	08:50	7			4	1
12/11/2015	Top Tanyard Hill (S)	08:30	08:55	6				
17/11/2015	Top Tanyard Hill (S)	08:20	09:15	9				
20/11/2015	Top Tanyard Hill (S)	11:35	12:25	8	29	28%	2	0
26/11/2015	Top Tanyard Hill (S)	08:10	08:50	7	46	15%		
03/12/2015	See Ho (W)	08:10	09:05	13	74	18%		
11/12/2015	See Ho (E)	14:15	15:05	3	49	6%		
17/12/2015	See Ho (W)	08:10	09:00	8	75	11%		
19/12/2015	Bott Tanyard Hill (N)	10:20	11:15	11	46	24%	12	1
08/01/2016	See Ho (W)	08:10	08:45	3	23	13%		
14/01/2016	See Ho (W)	08:15	08:45	7	35	20%	3	0

(Page left blank intentionally)

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
GR/2015/0989 Mr K Gozzett (Discussed 20/10 and 30/10 Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Warren Farm Swillers Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent	Temporary stationing of caravan on the land.	The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to the application as follows: 1) The application refers to a caravan but the proposal is for a substantial prefabricated building. To meet the definition of a caravan, the assembled structure must be on wheels and capable of being moved or towed on its own wheels as a single entity, and it is not believed that will be the case. 2) The size of the proposed prefabricated structure exceeds minimum requirements for both the proposed purposes. The Parish Council is sympathetic to these however considers that a much smaller, more conventional caravan, stationed in front of the current Apple Store would appear to be sufficient. 3) The prefabricated building would seem to require the prior creation of suitable foundations or a stationing platform, and connection to mains water, mains electricity and sewerage supplies in a location where these do not currently exist and would not be needed long-term. 4) The prefabricated building is proposed to be located outside the defined curtilage of the converted Apple Store, to its rear. The Parish Council is concerned that temporarily permitting such a prefabricated building in such a location should not give rise to residential rights. 5) The length of time suggested for the conversion works, and therefore permission for the prefabricated structure to be in place, is excessive. The Parish Council considers that 6 months would be adequate. If permission is to be granted, the Parish Council requests that CONDITIONS SHOULD BE IMPOSED concerning the maximum duration of stationing of the building (6 months preferred), that it (and all associated wires, pipes, drainage, foundations etc) must be removed as soon as the converted Apple Store is fit to be occupied residentially, and that all longer-term or permanent residential (and any other relevant) rights are removed.	Granted Temporary Permission
GR/2015/1005 Mr and Mrs J Rana (Discussed 20/10 and 30/10 Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Ringland Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a single storey side extension, a two storey 3 metre rear addition (beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling only) and the erection of a single storey building to enclose swimming pool in rear garden.	NOT YET RECEIVED by 21/1/2016	
GR/2015/1012 Mr T Wade (Discussed 20/10 and 30/10 Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Mirrabooka Gravesend Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JJ	Erection of two storey side extension to form garage and utility room at ground floor level with bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. Construction of a dormer window on the front roof slope.	The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to the application as follows: 1) The proposed extension goes right to the border of the site whereas normally a one metre gap should be left to allow access from front to rear gardens, for building the extension and for maintaining the new side wall. This could be varied if the neighbouring landowner gives formal written consent for access during the construction and subsequently for maintenance however it should also not be the case that gutters etc overhang the neighbouring land. 2) The Parish Council considers that the proposed rooflines are out of keeping with the local rural area and especially with the neighbouring part of the semi-detached property. The design of the roof of the proposed new window dormer, being a continuation of the angled side roof, is particularly poor. The Parish Council would like to see instead a more balanced design that replicates the roof and gable end (with barn hip), and the window dormer, design of the original properties.	Permitted
GR/2015/1031 (e-mailed, Discussed 30/10 Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Venesta, Woodlands Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3HH	Application for approval of the reserved matters attached to outline planning permission reference number 20140419 for erection of a detached replacement dwelling relating to design details, materials, layout, access, parking and landscaping.	The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to the planning application. The Parish Council would first ask that the following be noted: During consideration of this current planning application, the Parish Council became aware of the land ownership position for part of the land involved. Other issues arising have become apparent. The Parish Council should have been informed of the application in accordance with Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order but has only been made aware of this infringement as a result of being consulted by the Borough Council on the planning application. It should be noted that the Parish Council's adjacent land is registered as a Village Green, and that the applicant presently has no right of access over the Council's land.	Permitted with conditions

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
			<p>The Parish Council would request that the position regarding the application be regularised before it is processed further. Recent changes in ownership, and the current planning application, provide the opportunity to resolve mutual issues. However, the Parish Council believes that the grounds for objection are sufficient that the current planning application should be withdrawn or suspended meanwhile. The Council is currently seeking professional advice and would welcome a meeting with the applicant as soon as is practical.</p> <p><u>The grounds for objection are listed first and then explained below:</u> Please also see the attachment. The information stated below is correct to best knowledge at the time of writing and is “without prejudice” to any future discussions.</p> <p><u>Summary of Grounds for OBJECTION:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The curtilage of the property is shown incorrectly on the plan accompanying the application 2) A previous owner may have annexed part of Shorne Common Rough, which is a Registered Village Green 3) Proposed buildings may be incorrectly located in relationship to the true residential curtilage. 4) The property is currently accessed by driving across parts of Shorne Common Rough including Footpath NS162, which is inappropriate and poses safety hazards for pedestrians 5) The access route needs clarification, possibly revision and if still necessary a formal agreement 6) The access rights need clarification, and an agreement including over repair and maintenance 7) Comments concerning the design of the proposed new house <p><u>Explanation of Grounds for OBJECTION (please see attachment):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The curtilage of the property is shown incorrectly on the plan accompanying the application: The Land Registry plans, which dovetail together, have been checked for the three relevant plots of land: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Venesta house curtilage (Ref K373799, 1972), this is in the ownership of the applicant b) Land adjacent to Venesta (Ref K836900, 2015), this is in the ownership of the applicant but administratively appears to be part of the Common, is not part of the residential curtilage of Venesta house, and may not presently have its own residential rights. The plan is differently based to those either side. The registration document carries a restriction that the plot is "Subject to all existing common rights and all existing rights of way." c) Shorne Common Rough (Ref K554568, 1972), this is in the ownership of Shorne Parish Council and is a registered Village Green. It has been recommended for designation as a Conservation Area. Footpath NS162 runs along its northern boundary before curving further north to cross the Land adjacent to Venesta and to meet Woodlands Lane. The width and curve of the footpath, particularly as it meets Woodlands Lane, reflects its probable history as a cart track serving the sand/gravel quarry formerly located on the Common. A yellow-topped, concrete footpath marker can be seen in the Google photograph, located between the two large trees. <p>It is believed that the route taken by pedestrians on the Footpath may have deviated over time, so is now further south, due to using the Venesta access route. It is unknown overall how the access route to the Venesta house/garage may have changed over time.</p> <p>The plan submitted with the application is incorrect as the red border is not in the correct place for the true curtilage of the Venesta house plot. Part of the adjacent plot has been included without a separating line and as if it is also residential curtilage. The area shown coloured in blue is not in accordance with the Land Registry plans, is not recognisable on the ground or from the adjacent Land Registry plans, and includes/extends onto the Parish Council owned land.</p> <p>The submitted plan needs to be replaced with one that shows the actual land ownership position, the area subject to restrictions as part of Shorne Common Rough, the true route of the Footpath and the actual route of access to the property.</p> 2) A previous owner may have annexed part of Shorne Common Rough, which is a Registered Village Green The Land Registry plans show that the correct southern boundary of the Venesta house curtilage plot is not parallel to the Venesta house but angles northwards towards the house as it runs along its length from east to west. The garage is not shown on the Venesta house plan but it, and a more southerly fence line, appears on the differently based plan for the Land adjacent to 	

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
			<p>Venesta, straddling the Land Registry boundaries. The Google derived photograph shows a wide driveway with almost parallel sides, and more equal width along its length to the garage, which is fully inside a straight fence.</p> <p>It is believed from this information that, at some time in the past, the fence line may have been moved south thus annexing part of the Common. Legal/enforcement action could possibly be taken to restore the southern boundary of the Venesta curtilage to its legally correct position.</p> <p>3) Proposed new buildings may be incorrectly located in relationship to the true residential curtilage.</p> <p>The current residential curtilage of the Venesta house plot needs to be clarified, because that could result in a need for both the proposed new garage and possibly the proposed new house to be relocated on the plot.</p> <p>4) The property is currently accessed by driving across parts of Shorne Common Rough including Footpath NS162, which is inappropriate and poses safety hazards for pedestrians</p> <p>And</p> <p>5) The access route needs clarification, possibly revision and if still necessary a formal agreement</p> <p>The present vehicular access crosses Shorne Common Rough (a Registered Village Green) including Public Footpath NS162, to reach the Venesta house plot. In doing so it creates increased and inappropriate risk to pedestrians and cyclists using the footpath.</p> <p>This layout does not appear to be strictly necessary if the driveway access could be safely redesigned at this time (subject to advice from Kent Highways), preferably to fall wholly within the true residential curtilage of the house. One possibility would be to relocate the garage/poolhouse, and driveway, to the northern side of the house, closer to the pool.</p> <p>The Parish Council also notes that over time the Footpath may have deviated from its original line to instead use the Venesta access route.</p> <p>6) The access rights need clarification, and an agreement including over repair and maintenance</p> <p>Continuing on from the above two points, and to ensure public safety, there needs to be an agreement over access rights (there being none presently), and the repair and maintenance of the parts of the Common and the footpath that are being crossed by vehicles accessing Venesta.</p> <p>The Parish Council is also concerned that damage is likely to be caused to the Common and the Footpath during the projected construction works and requires that the Footpath must be kept open and in good condition, and its route protected, throughout that period of time. It must also be repaired and restored to at least its previous state after all works are completed.</p> <p>7) Comments concerning the design of the proposed new house and garage/pool building</p> <p>a) Mass and visual impact of the new building: The existing building on the site (currently being demolished) is a long, single storey wooden hut which is slightly raised above the ground level and has a standard pitched roof. The Council notes that the proposed new building is in effect rotated by 90 degrees on the site, has much the same floor area but is two-storey (above ground), is approximately square in floor layout plus has a pitched roof of greater floor to ceiling height than previously due to the dimensions of the proposed new building. The mass is therefore much greater as will be the visual impact on both Woodlands Lane and Shorne Common Rough.</p> <p>The Council considers that the proposed new building would be visually intrusive in its location adjacent to Shorne Common Rough, which is a designated Village Green (and may also become classified as a Conservation Area following the current Conservation Areas Consultation).</p> <p>b) Garage/Pool building: The Council requests that the proposed garage and pool building should have CONDITIONS IMPOSED such that it can only be used ancillary to the house and cannot be used as a separate dwelling. See (5) above, the garage/pool house could possibly be relocated to the northern side of the house which would beneficially reduce its visual impact to the Common.</p> <p>c) Basement and lightwells: The Parish Council notes their inclusion, without objection.</p> <p>[Enc: Attachment – Land Registry plans x3 and photograph]</p>	
GR/2015/0719 (revised plans)	Brackenside, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne,	Demolition of existing two-storey dwelling and garage buildings	The Council wishes to make the following representations: The Council wishes to OBJECT to the planning application (revised plans).	Permitted

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
(Discussed 30/10 Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Gravesend, Kent DA12 3JX.	and erection of a detached two-storey dwelling, together with widening of the vehicular access onto a classified road.	<p>In the revised plans the proposed roofline has been altered in the opposite direction to our previous representations, to an even more brutally modernistic and visually intrusive design. No drainage systems or downpipes are shown associated with the flat roofs. We would like some assurance about screening trees and vegetation. Apart from removing the previous yellow sandstone areas, for which we are grateful, we do not feel that our representations have yet been adequately taken into account. We therefore repeat unchanged our previously submitted grounds for objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design proposed is out of keeping with the overall area where successful house designs are generally more traditional in character. The Council would like to see a traditional pitched main roof design, in tile or slate, which it considers would also have advantages in terms of providing storage space and future flexibility of use for the new building. 2. The building as presently proposed would be very visually intrusive from the roadway. The Council considers that it should be possible to design a building that is modern on the inside while employing more traditional materials and being much less visually intrusive externally. 3. There are too many different exterior facing treatments unnecessarily proposed. They do not harmonise with each other, introduce alien materials and do not reflect those that are commonly used locally and historically in this part of Kent. Suitable alternative materials could include red brick, Kentish ragstone, flints, oak front door and oak or painted (black or white) slatted boards. 4. The Council does not see the need for removal of the entire roadside hedge and screening trees (5 on the boundary to the road, one on the new side wall line) and requests that the minimum actual removal requirements for establishing the sightlines should be clarified and then adopted, with as much as possible of the existing hedge line being retained or otherwise replanted. Planting should also be installed to soften the appearance of the new side wall. <p>The Council also notes the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The proposal for the new property to be set further back from the road is approved. (b) The mechanical heat pump plant has been located away from the neighbouring property but consideration should be given to the need for additional noise screening. 	
GR/2015/1115 (Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	26 The Street, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3EA	Erection of a single storey rear extension to form enlarged kitchen, shower room/w.c., study and entrance lobby.	<p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to the planning application.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes however to note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) At 7m in depth, this is a very deep extension but the plot is itself long and narrow. The neighbouring properties (Nos 1 and 2 Church cottages) have in effect established a rear building line, No 1 being set back anyway and the solid roofed extension to No. 2 extends only to the same line. This extension if permitted should continue this principle and not extend any further than that line. 2) Although not apparently listed, the property is in a conservation area and backs onto the Churchyard, and is historically important. The new windows/doors should be of a style compatible with the house and not intrusively modern in appearance. 	Permitted
GR/2015/1125 (Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Danver Lodge Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Erection of single storey extensions to the east and west elevations, conversion of garage to habitable room and erection of a detached replacement garage	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the planning application.</p> <p>The Parish Council requests that conditions should be applied such that the building can only be used as a garage, ancillary to the given location address.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that the proposed garage is a long distance from the house rather than nearby and grouped with it as would usually be expected. The proposed garage is very far forward on the site, partly in front of the building line created by adjacent properties, so it is requested that the garage should, if it is to be permitted in the proposed general location, be relocated a little further north on the site. The proposed location is presently wooded however sufficient screening trees/shrubs etc should remain after construction.</p>	TBA
GR/2015/1143	Chestnuts, Tanyard Hill,	Erection of a two storey side	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to the planning application.	Permitted

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
(Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3EN	extension, new pitched roof on existing single storey side element, entrance canopy on front elevation and external alterations	The Parish Council wishes however to note the following: 1) The property is within the village envelope and set well back from the road. 2) The remodelled and extended property is considerably larger in floor area than previously and of greater mass than adjoining properties. 3) The remodelled and extended property will be almost the full width of the plot (and also extended backwards), the remaining front-to-rear access points will be narrow. 4) An existing small garage is being demolished and no garage is being reprovided however there should be adequate on-site, open air parking provision at the front of the house.	
GR/2015/1148 (Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Badgers Rake, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3JS	Erection of single storey extension at the rear of the property.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to the planning application.	Permitted
GR/2015/1192 - Alternative Reference KCC/GR/0387/2015 (Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	RS Skips, Unit 4, Apex Business Park, Queens Farm Road, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent	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.	The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to the application for the following reasons: 1. Intensification and possible change of proportions of material types processed Despite assurances given verbally on two previous occasions, the application proposes to increase processed volumes and vehicle sizes and movements. There is much confusion between the various documents about what is currently permitted. Figures used in the various different planning applications have varied but it appears that the site currently has permission for 55,000tpa to be processed and is applying for a 36% increase to 75,000tpa. Clarification is needed over the proposed proportions of different types of source materials to be processed: construction, demolition and excavation materials and commercial and industrial waste. 2. Justification for and size of new building Information previously provided verbally was around only Health and Safety issues for staff and neighbouring businesses plus efficiency increases however the main reasoning from the application appears to be in order to undertake increased processing quantity. The previous buildings on the site were together a little longer than currently proposed but were a maximum of 10.7m wide and only 5.6m high. The proposed new building is 20.0m wide with eaves height of 9.8m and ridge height of 11.5m so would be almost twice as wide and over twice as high, i.e more than four times greater area in cross section. 3. Increase in size/type of trucks and number of movements At present, authorised vehicles used on a daily basis are supposed to be standard skip trucks (14 trips = 28 movements) however it is admitted in the various supporting documents that the planning permission figures are being contravened. Considerably more journeys per day are in fact taking place (74 movements estimated and also independently recorded by Higham Parish Council, who are hereby thanked for the data) and larger vehicles including tipper trucks are currently being used. The drawing titled "Trommel and picking station details" continues to cause confusion as it shows a tipper truck releasing its load under the future roof of the new building but we understand that is not to be the case. The proposal references using larger vehicles: 2.5m wide by 12.0m long rigid trucks on the layout plan. The Transport Assessment however refers to skip loader trips (40 per day = 80 journeys), roll-on/roll-off vehicles (7 trips = 14 journeys per day) and tipper vehicles (5 trips = 10 journeys) plus an average of two articulated HGV collection trips per week. It would be helpful to	TBA

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
			<p>also know the dimensions of all these different vehicles.</p> <p>At present, daily journeys being undertaken are over three times greater than currently permitted and are wanted to rise a further 41% on top of that. The increase in vehicle sizes and journeys that has occurred apparently without seeking planning permission does merit concern about the ability of the operators to self-regulate in the future.</p> <p>If there is to be a limit on type and number of vehicle movements imposed then that must be the daily type/total for the site irrespective of the company delivering, as trucks from other companies do also seem to be accessing the site.</p> <p>In the Planning Supporting Statement it states that the current proposal will not cause a noticeable effect from increased vehicle movements because these have already been increased significantly (without permission). The Parish Council rejects this statement and requests that the proposed increase should be assessed instead against what is actually permitted at this time, as the proposal constitutes a more than fourfold increase numerically and includes within that an increase in larger, heavier and noisier vehicles.</p> <p>4. Unsuitability of location/site</p> <p>The site is in the Green Belt, at the mid-point of the very narrow width of Green Belt in this area (the narrowest part of all the London Green Belt). It is not considered that overwhelming justification (“very special circumstances”) has been made for this development to occur here. The site and vehicle access route are rural and adjacent to land with protection/conservation designations which will be adversely affected in various ways. Since the site first came into use for recycling (including prior to 2010) there have been changes in land usage leading to increased protection status.</p> <p>The land north of the railway line has ecological conservation and recreational use, with National Cycle Route1 running along the northern towpath of the former canal. The amenity of these are all adversely impacted by the recycling operation being adjacent. Queens Farm Road is the principal public access point to that land (the crossing point is imminently being re-opened) so there will shortly once again be resumed use of Queens Farm Road for recreational walking, cycling and public car access, with cars parking at the northern end. There may therefore be conflicting use of the road.</p> <p>In proposing to increase utilisation of the site it could be regarded that the operation may have outgrown this location and could better be relocated to somewhere more suitable in both environmental terms and with better transport access.</p> <p>5. Unsuitability of official access route, use of other routes, road safety issues</p> <p>The Transport assessment includes a few selected photographs however “Google Streetview” can better be used instead to take a virtual journey along the access route. This shows that the route from Lion Roundabout passes North West Kent College then along a significant length of narrow residential roads with parked cars, sometimes on both sides, before merging into open countryside. On page 4 of the Transport assessment, it states that the “... majority of site related traffic” uses the designated route, which is an admission that some does not, and this malpractice must be addressed. In reference to vehicles not choosing to travel via Higham (but see Note 8g Below) it says “It is unlikely that site-related HGV’s would utilise this route to travel through the village as this would involve travelling along residential streets with on-street parking and other features not amenable to regular HGV traffic” yet that exact same description can be applied also to the Lower Higham Road.</p> <p>There are several historic buildings at various locations on the route that immediately abut the roadway. The road after leaving Chalk has no pavements, has high banks in places preventing pedestrians and cyclists (who have reported feeling unsafe) being able to escape danger on the road. There is a warning sign about pedestrians, and a lot of cyclists also use the road. Google shows that the road is narrow (single track in places) and unlit, in part encroached by vegetation, bends about and has blind</p>	

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
			<p>corners, undulates with dips and crowns reducing sightlines while at the same time having a 50mph speed limit. There is a particularly bad single track blind bend just as one approaches the Apex Business Park itself.</p> <p>It is noted that on page 10 of the Planning Supporting Statement it refers to the site being "... also accessible via weight restricted routes along Green Farm Lane which connects to the A226.". The weight restriction was introduced with the aim of preventing skip lorries from accessing the site in this manner, which they should not do. It is also noted on page 13 that it is stated that Green Farm Lane will not be used, only the Lion Roundabout and Lower Higham Road route. This condition should be included in any planning approval and must apply to all waste vehicles accessing the facilities, not just those owned by RS Skips.</p> <p>On page 23 of the Planning Support Statement it states that "...the local road network has adequately supported the movement of HGV's associated with the existing WTS for several years", local disagreement with this statement is evidenced by the large number of objections that have been submitted by local residents.</p> <p>The proposal will also increase the number of vehicles which will need to turn into/out of Queens Farm Road and will be pulling across the road and moving at slow speed while doing so. The visibility of the junction for cars travelling from Higham, which may be moving at up to 50mph, is actually poor and it is considered that there is significant risk of an accident at this junction.</p> <p>With the recent residential development at Queens Farm, the potential for conflict with pedestrians (there is no footway or refuge) has been increased, as is also the case for parked cars and vehicles emerging from driveways as the sightlines are poor.</p> <p>6. Overall effects on neighbouring and local residential and business locations and environment (Noise and vibration, Dust and odours/emissions, Visual impact and Light pollution)</p> <p>a) <u>Properties and businesses affected:</u> The Planning support Statement does not include mention that there are several businesses on the Apex Business Park which have offices and other staff on site and also members of the public attending eg. the gymnasium, hence the number of persons routinely being adversely affected is greater than might be inferred. The number of residential dwellings close by has also been understated as there will shortly be 8-9 dwellings located 300m from the site and there are a further 3 dwellings to the east on Lower Higham Road within approximately 1000m. The documents demonstrate that there is noise and vibration impact on the Queens Farm residential complex from HGV's, which will be increased in frequency of occurrence and levels due to larger vehicles.</p> <p>b) <u>Noise and vibration, dust and odours/emissions:</u> More volume of processing will cause greater noise and vibration from the increased traffic movements and increased size of vehicles. The proposal is for waste to be tipped first outside the building then pushed inside by JCB, these will cause nuisance both intermittently and for prolonged periods, and varying in sound intensity. Noise to residential dwellings also occurs from staff using various routes prior to 07.00 in order to travel to work. Peak traffic movements on Queens Farm Road were recorded by 07.00, this type of noise can be more intrusive due to low background noise level. Noise can travel surprising distances in this area, perhaps amplified by the bowl-like and rising land configuration and weather conditions, and it is considered that noise from tipping and vehicle movement at the site will be heard over a wide distance at times, as are trains, train horns and foghorns which are further away. The Noise Assessment assumed that the present situation is the baseline but that does not have planning permission, and uses larger (hence noisier) vehicles than authorised. It did not include nearby residential receptors on Lower Higham Road to the east of Queens Farm Road or consider noise travelling uphill to Lower Shorne and Shorne Village. It did not include the increased intermittent activities likely to cause most noise awareness/annoyance, i.e. tipping large containers loads onto the floor in the open, pushing/lifting materials into the trommel and vehicle reversing beeps/warnings. Non-industrial facilities/offices in the Business Park were not evaluated for impact. Specific noise information for each vehicle type would have been useful rather than resorting to predictions about increased traffic noise impact. For dust, the change in types of materials being processed may increase adverse effects greater than suggested in the various assessments. Although it is stated that the types of materials being tipped outside will not be dusty it is doubtful if that will always be the case as until tipped the contents of the skip etc are unknown and manual dust control</p>	

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
			<p>measures might not therefore be implemented in time. The provided Dust Assessment is very difficult to understand and appears to be a desk-top exercise which does not seem to consider the impact of the highest potentially dust-generating activities, which are tipping skip contents onto the floor in the open and pushing/lifting the material to the trommel, and underestimates the receptors and their sensitivities, and the effect of ambient wind conditions. Overall we are dubious of the Dust Assessment's validity.</p> <p>c) <u>Visual impact</u>: At 11.5m high the new building is over twice as high as the previous ones so will be visible from the marshes to the north. Although the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is dismissive of more distant visual impact, that is not the opinion of local residents, and our previous request to provide mechanisms of visual screening (also for the whole Business Park) is reiterated.</p> <p>d) <u>Light Pollution</u>: Parishioners have complained about light pollution at night from the Apex site but it requires further investigation to determine exactly which areas are causing the problem. Lighting levels must be reduced at night.</p> <p>e) <u>Litter</u>: Parish Litter collection volunteers have identified and removed large amounts of waste material from local roads and verges. It is difficult to specifically identify how this may have arisen, however in general open waste vehicles are often implicated in this occurring.</p> <p>7. Potential for further intensification</p> <p>The Parish Council is concerned that, having invested significantly in the buildings and processing plant on this site (page 12 of the Planning Supporting Statement states that ("Longevity of the Site is important..."), there could be future applications to further increase tonnage and vehicle size/movements thereby exacerbating all the above concerns. Given the factual situation to date, we also lack confidence that the operational use of the site will in any case remain within authorised levels.</p> <p>8. The Parish Council also notes that:</p> <p>a) Due to the multiple planning applications in the past year, some of the relevant responses/documents have been attached to different application numbers: GR/2014/0431, GR/2014/1221 and now GR/2015/1192, these should all be reviewed and comments amalgamated.</p> <p>b) Similarly, and also due to the various closing dates and the consultation being held across the Christmas/New Year holiday season adversely affecting awareness of the latest application, representations particularly from the public may be attached to the previous application references and all of these should be considered.</p> <p>c) The current application is in part retrospective (installation of trommel, picking station and wall), as is in fact the major increase in vehicular movements and size that has taken place to date in contravention of the previous planning permission.</p> <p>d) The various applications and documents often use different figures so we have had difficulty confirming the exact details of the current permissions for processing volume and vehicle types and numbers of movements. Certainly, the types of vehicles being used and the number of vehicle movements currently being undertaken are both significantly larger than was permitted under planning application GR/2010/0412, the only one we believe to be valid.</p> <p>e) The information previously provided to the Parish Council about operator intentions regarding necessity for a replacement building and proposed number of vehicle movements was incorrect (or possibly superseded).</p> <p>f) There is disagreement with the content and conclusions of several of the supporting documents. The evaluation of other potential sites as unsuitable does not actually render the existing site any less unsuitable itself. It is also noted that the impacts of e.g. noise and dust depend on operational factors being always implemented (e.g. sprinklers/damping down for dust) in practice and not just when Inspectors are visiting. It is requested that there should be some un-notified inspection visits undertaken to provide operational assurance.</p> <p>g) We would draw attention also to the submission from Higham Parish Council concerning vehicular traffic to the site using a route through Higham Village to access the site. It is noted that on page 4 of the Transport Assessment it states this is "unlikely" however it does appear to be occurring and we request that conditions should be imposed to prevent this continuing.</p> <p>h) In summary, the Parish Council does not see this application as "improvement and enhancement" of the local</p>	

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission	Decision
			environment and amenity. i) We request that any planning approval should clearly specify the limits of the site processing capacity and associated vehicle types and movements, as well as detailing the mechanisms for monitoring and triggers for any resulting need for enforcement action.	
GR/2015/1216 (Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	Sakho Farmhouse 43 Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Demolition of existing single garage and erection of a detached double garage.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the planning application. The Parish Council requests however that conditions should be applied such that the building can only be used as a garage, ancillary to the given location address. The Parish Council notes that the proposed garage is to the north of "Greenacre", a historic barn that was altered without planning permission, to become substantial ancillary accommodation. This application if permitted will further increase the residential development on the site.	
GR/2015/1254 (Standing orders, minuted 21/01/16)	5 Michael Gardens Gravesend Kent DA12 4QA	Erection of part two storey and part single storey side and rear extensions to form kitchen, dining room, utility room, w.c. and garage at ground floor level and bedroom, shower room and dressing room at first floor level.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the planning application. The Parish Council notes however that the property is at the end of a terrace of 3 houses. The extension is designed with a flat fronted continuing elevation and a barn hipped roof, which latter is out of character with other properties in the immediate area. These, including the similarly extended property opposite, all have standard gable ends, which would be a preferable design.	