

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee
Meeting held on 19 January 2017 in Shorne Village Hall**

PRESENT Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)
Mr R Bugg
Miss P Clifton
Mr R Cooper
Mr R Lane
Mr M Redfern

APOLOGIES for absence were received from Mr R Hardy, Mr C Rea,
Mr R Theobald and Theresa Martin

55 Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 October 2016

The draft minutes were reviewed and a couple of small corrections will be made with the final version to be accepted at the next meeting (Thursday 2 March 2017).

56 Matters Arising from the Minutes not Otherwise on the Agenda:

38 - Correspondence: Mrs Lindley had not yet responded to a parishioner letter about the previous proposal for a footway at Shorne Ridgeway but will do so.

39(e) - See Ho Public House: There had been discussion at a Council meeting about the exterior lighting being excessive. Mr Redfern has agreed to make an informal approach to the management. It was noted also (see also 48(f) below) that the See Ho had put up an unauthorised sign opposite the exit from the Country Park but this swiftly disappeared again. A similar sign however remains at the bottom of Pear Tree Lane.

49(b) - Ascertaining what KCC Highways did to the drains on Tanyard Hill: Mrs Lindley has not received a response to her query.

52(c) - Waiting restrictions/Parking problems - Mrs Lindley had been aiming to get this on the Agenda for the Joint Transportation meeting in December 2016 but had been unable to do so as she had not been circulated about the agenda or the meeting. She now plans to request this for the next meeting which she has found to be on 15 March 2017 and has an agenda deadline of 7 March 2017.

52(d) - Mrs Lindley had attended the Parish Highways Seminar on 27 October 2016. As previously reported at other meetings, the seminar had been very interesting. She will circulate the presentations once published. She had discovered that the costings for

among others e.g. a single unlit road sign (including pole) is £334 and a new speed limit area (signing only) costs £5,700-£10,000.

57 Correspondence

A letter has been received from a parishioner about excessive and poor parking of buses in Vigilant Way. She had also complained to the bus company (Arriva). Mrs Lindley has looked at the area and it seems that the bus stop bay has been reduced in size at some time in the past. Mrs Lindley will make contact to ascertain if the complaint has led to any improvement and if not will also take the problem up with the bus company.

Buses turning at Chestnut Green was discussed as this recurrent problem has surfaced again, Mr Theobald has dealt with the topic.

PLANNING MATTERS

58 Planning Applications/Issues Pending

- (a) Nuralite (British Uralite) Land Clearance: Nothing further to report. Mrs Lindley regularly checks the KCC site about this.
- (b) Proposed Telephone Transmitter in Parish Church Tower: Nothing further to report. Mrs Lindley had seen a newspaper article reporting that there is to be a national blanket agreement concerning installing transmitters in Church spires/towers to improve rural mobile telephone signals and this may be why the individual application has not progressed further.
- (c) Apex Site: Planning Application for Waste Transfers Modification: As reported at other meetings, the site visit had been held on 14 September 2016 and the follow-up KCC planning meeting was held on 16 November 2016 attended by Mr Theobald and Mrs Lindley. Cllr Sweetland also attended. The application was approved by KCC but several conditions were imposed including monitoring of travel routes and a requirement to have regular liaison meetings with affected local Parish Councils.
- (d) See Ho Public House: See matters arising 52(c) above. Mrs Lindley had responded to a letter from a parishioner, who had replied so Mrs Lindley will respond again.
- (e) Telephone Kiosk at Post Office Green: A notice from BT had been found in the kiosk in November 2016 suggesting that, due to low usage, the phone (and possibly the box itself) might be removed. The notice invited comments to be sent to Gravesham Borough Council. The correct processes had not been followed in that SPC should have been notified directly. Mrs Lindley had written to GBC sending wide-ranging objections to the proposal and a response is still awaited so an update will be requested.
- (f) Unauthorised Advertising Signs for Businesses:
 - See also 39(e) above regarding the See Ho.
 - “The Nook” had put up a sign advertising pet food sales in addition to two signs indicating the business. It had been felt that the third sign was inappropriate. Mr

Theobald had spoken to the business informally and the sign had immediately been removed.

- On Pear Tree Lane signs had appeared on the roadside for two businesses but the Parish Council was not aware that there been any planning applications for business use at the location which is Green Belt. It had been drawn to the attention of the GBC Planning Department but no response yet received. Mrs Lindley will send a reminder.
- Updated national guidance has been circulated to all members:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/outdoor-advertisements-and-signs-a-guide-for-advertisers>

- (g) Food Preparation/Sales: It had been noted that two locations in the Parish are now advertising sales of raw meat products, one also a catering service. Environmental Health have been asked to confirm that they are aware of these and that premises and practices have been inspected for compliance with food safety and hygiene regulations but again no response had been received yet. Mrs Lindley will send a reminder.

59 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 Table at end of minutes.

60 Decisions of the Borough Council

No specific decisions to report.

It was noted that paper copies of planning applications were generally still being received however for prudence the GBC website is checked regularly by Mrs Lindley to ensure nothing gets missed.

61 Notices of Appeal

None received.

62 Parish/Neighbourhood Plan (43)

Nothing further to report except it had been noted that there has been national disquiet over housing developments being imposed despite there being an agreed neighbourhood plan, which is why many Parishes have had reservations.

63 Major Plans Affecting the Parish (44)

Lower Thames Crossing: There had been two debates in Parliament late last year, one instigated by Mr Adam Holloway and one by the MP for Dartford. Mr Theobald had written to Mr Martin Potts at Highways England expressing concern at the “Planning Blight” being experienced by the Parish and the untoward delay in publishing an outcome to the consultation, it now being almost a year since the consultation was

launched. A response received had come from a different person as Mr Potts is now working on another project.

Mrs Lindley will ask again for the results of the traffic monitoring in October/November 2016 to be provided.

64 Developments Outside the Parish but with Impact on Shorne (reported for information)(45)

Nothing specific/new to report.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

65 Accident Reports

- (a) On the steep part of Pear Tree Lane, a car was damaged by a van reversing rapidly to make way for a vehicle coming up.
- (b) The “keep left” sign pole near the yew tree traffic island, as looking towards Tanyard Hill had been knocked down. Mrs Lindley had reported it to KCC Highways (the sign had previously been reported as missing) and both the pole and sign were attended to very rapidly.

66 Traffic Monitoring & Speedwatch (47)

Miss Clifton had sent out the latest speed watch figures to members (please see top of next page).

The Speedwatch volunteers were thanked for their hard work. Mrs Lindley reported that a parishioner had asked whether data could be collected in Woodlands Lane but the Speedwatch team considered that excessive vehicle speed was not an issue there.

Mr Lane reported on Lorry Watch. This can in fact be undertaken at the same time as Speedwatch.

Mrs Lindley requested that a call for more volunteers should be put in the next Parish Magazine with a view to increasing the number of volunteers. Training is now initially conducted on-line.

67 Street Lighting (48)

Nothing to report presently.

Table: SPEEDWATCH DATA SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING

Date	Location	Start Time	Finish Time	No of vehicles over 35mph	Total No of vehicles	%	No of letters generated for Mid-Range Speeding	No of letters generated for High-End Speeding	Notes
07/10/2016	See Ho (W)	07:55	08:40	5	68	7%			Cars parked in road
07/10/2016	The Ridgeway (E)	16:10	17:10	5	90	6%	2	1	
14/10/2016	Top of Tanyard Hill (S)	08:00	08:55	7	51	14%	0	1	
28/10/2016	The Ridgeway (E)	16:05	17:00	4	112	4%	0	0	Cars parked on opposite side of road
03/11/2016	Top of Tanyard Hill (S)	08:00	08:55	10	62	16%	0	2	
10/11/2016	See Ho (W)	08:25	09:25	15	93	16%	0	0	
17/11/2016	See Ho (W)	07:55	09:00	12	91	13%	3	1	

68 Condition of Roads in the Parish (49)

- (a) The problem with surface water on The Street by the green railings and on the verge at Tanyard Hill remain. Mrs Lindley will report them to KCC Highways.
- (b) The drains in Mill Hill Lane have been cleaned again.
- (c) Salt containers: The one at the recreation ground is a builder's bag, located inside and to the left of the gate. Mrs Lindley would like to map the salt store locations for the emergency plan. It was mentioned that there is a container in Davy's Place.

69 Hazards

- (a) Mr Lane reported that foreign HGV's often parked overnight on Park Pale.
- (b) Park Pale nuisances: Mr Lane did not think motorbikes had been a problem there recently although others commented about having heard bikes somewhere locally.

70 Parking/Traffic Problems (51)

See above in other sections

71 Highway Modifications (52)

Nothing additional to report.

72 **Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board (53)**

Mr Theobald had attended but was not present to report back, will carry forward to next meeting. (See also 52(c) under point 56 above).

73 **Open consultations**

- (a) A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junction improvements, closes 1 March 2017
<https://highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/he/a2-bean-and-ebbsfleet-junction-improvements/>
- (b) KCC Freight action plan for Kent, closes 12 March 2017
<http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti/freightactionplan/consultationHome>

74 **Matters Raised by Members**

- (a) Yew Tree: A new yew tree has been planted in the historical location on the traffic island at the bottom of Tanyard Hill, donated by Mr and Mrs Grace.
- (b) Telephone Lines out of order: There had been a widespread and longlasting telephone outage affecting dozens of parishioners including two Parish Councillors. It had taken many days for the connections to be restored. OpenReach vehicles are seen in the village at worrying frequency repairing/fixing lines.
- (c) Michael Gardens Landscaping Strip: A resident had expressed concern that one of the houses was occupying and had largely cleared part of the strip reducing the amenity of nearby properties. It is unclear whether this is one that had been issued with a licence by GBC. Mrs Lindley will raise the problem with GBC Planning Department.
- (d) Kent Fire and Rescue Fire Hydrants initiative: Information had been circulated which implied a desire to devolve responsibility for hydrants. This causes concern about already inadequate PC resources.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.25pm (the meeting had started late at 8.00pm due to problems accessing the meeting room).

<u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</u>	SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING	6th October 2016		
GR/2016/0930	The Old Parsonage, Butchers Hill, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3EB	Re-application: Demolition of existing detached double garage and erection of a detached triple garage.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the above application. This application is the latest version of several applications that previously received approval. Following those applications, the access route was to have been changed and the garage had been enlarged in bulk.</p> <p>In this latest application, the access route and gate remains in approximately its current position on Butchers Hill, and a short drive curves round to the enlarged garage, which is now located side-on and close to the boundary fence to the junction of Butchers Hill with Mill Hill Lane/Shorne-Ifield Road.</p> <p>We request that, as the proposed new location is within a Conservation Area and more visually apparent, plantings should be made to visually screen the side of the garage from the roadways.</p> <p>Sent 31/10/16</p>	Permitted
GR/2016/0725	2 Cheney's Cottages, Thong Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 4AA	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of single storey rear extension.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this application but requests, as the property lies within a Conservation Area, that all materials, windows etc should be in keeping with the materials and style of the original building.</p> <p>Sent 31/10/16</p>	Pending
GR/2016/0952	22 The Street, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3EA	Replacement windows on the front elevation.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this application.</p> <p>It is noted that the property is a modern building within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Sent 31/10/16</p>	Permitted
GR/2016/0911	The See Ho, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3JX	Application for the approval of condition 4 attached to planning permission reference no. 20160499 relating to the landscaping scheme.	<p>The Parish Council has noted this application on the Gravesham Borough Council website and wishes to make the following comments:</p> <p>In application GR/2016/0499, in the Design and Access statement, the applicants stated that "Vehicular and pedestrian access is gained via the existing entrance off of Pear Tree Lane into the large visitor and staff car park. The car park offers parking for 50+ vehicles and is large enough to accommodate extra trade and staffing levels generated by the proposals."</p> <p>In the Parish Council's representations we commented: "..... 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</p>	Pending

			<p>could also be parking on nearby roads.”</p> <p>To our surprise, the previous application was permitted without that information first being supplied. Work is nearing completion.</p> <p>The layout plan now submitted shows only 19 parking place at best (if everyone parks in the car park when they can, and all cars park optimally), i.e. less than 40% of what was stated previously. The layout could be improved slightly but the on-site parking provision would only increase marginally.</p> <p>We must express serious concern that permission has been given for the development yet the on-site parking has already been proved to be numerically inadequate. There will inevitably be adverse impact on local residents and road safety in this part of Pear Tree Lane/Shorne Ridgeway.</p> <p>Sent 31/10/16</p>	
GR/2016/0934	Brackenside, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3JX	Application for a non-material amendment to planning application reference 20150719 to allow the planned footprint of the development to be relocated 2m away from woodland.	<p>This application now proposes moving the entire new building footprint two metres to the west, away from woodland but towards the adjacent house (“Red Tiles”) although this still lies a reasonable distance away.</p> <p>The Parish Council therefore has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the above application.</p> <p>Sent 31/10/16</p>	Approval of Non-material amendment
GR/2016/1026	Crown Cottage, Gravesend Road, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3JL	Construction of a dormer extension in the southern roof slope and alterations to the roof from hip to gable end, with conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this application.</p> <p>We note that since the previous application, to which we also had no objection in principle, the flat roof dormer has been halved in size and a barn end roof feature has been introduced.</p> <p>Sent 29/11/16</p>	Amended Plans Jan 2017
(Telephone Kiosk Post Office Green)			<p>Re: Public Telephone Kiosk, Post Office Green, Shorne – BT proposal for removal</p> <p>I understand from my colleague, Councillor Bob Lane, that you are the planning department officer at Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) who is dealing with a recent application by British Telecom regarding the above phone box.</p>	

			<p>I have taken over dealing with the matter on behalf of Shorne Parish Council, now that we know that it is a Planning issue.</p> <p>Please note that the Parish Council wishes to formally register that we object strongly to the proposal, as detailed below. We have accessed the relevant Ofcom guidance (e.g. "Guidance on procedures for the removal of public call boxes" as referenced below) so we also wish to raise that there have been deficiencies in the processes followed to date.</p> <p>Process deficiency issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The notice that was posted at the telephone box by BT dated 15th October 2016 appears to be a standard format notice to members of the public that has not been individualised for the phone box in question. It does not include discussion of the effect of the proposal. 2. At the same time, BT should have given written notice to GBC – please can you confirm the date that notice was received, and provide us with a copy of the notice and all accompanying information, which should also have included detailed evidence of the alleged low usage. 3. GBC should have in turn immediately notified Shorne Parish Council but that did not happen. (See guidance page 3, section 6, paragraphs 6.1-6.3). The purpose of such notification is to enable us to raise awareness among local residents so that they can respond to the notice as well as permitting their opinions to inform the Parish Council's official response. 4. As you know, we therefore only became aware of the BT notice by chance in mid-November. Since then parishioners have been informed as rapidly as we are able via the Parish Council website and Facebook feeds, and also by information in the December issue of the Parish Magazine, which was only published a few days ago. 5. It is not at all clear to us why GBC have not registered the notice by BT on the GBC planning website or then notified us in the usual manner. By not notifying us by any method the application has in effect been hidden from the Parish Council. 6. You stated in your response to Mr Lane that "The way the consultation process works is that the 42 day consultation period is essentially for you report to me any of your concerns...". While that might be true if processes had been followed correctly, it is not actually the situation in this case as the Parish Council 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>have still not to date been officially informed of the BT notice, which was anyway only intended to inform the public in general.</p> <p>In summary, the Parish Council were not officially informed as they should have been so the putative start date of 15th October 2016 for public consultation has become void due to failure to notify the Parish Council. We suggest that a revised start date of 19th November and end date of 31st December 2016, for this and for general public representations, might appropriately be substituted and that no draft decision should be made or published until after that end date. However, we still await receipt from GBC of the formal notice and supporting evidence.</p> <p>Shorne Parish Council grounds for objection to the proposal: Communication aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Post Office Green phone box is in the centre of the village. It is the only public phone available for a considerable number of dwellings close by and also stretching a considerable distance north of the village centre. 2. The nearest and only other call box is about a kilometre away uphill to the south, and would be over two kilometres away uphill for the residents of Lower Shorne, 3. There are elderly and disabled residents living close by, some in social housing, who are less likely to have/use mobile phones and some do not have home phones. 4. Mobile phone reception in the village is poor and variable. 5. The village is subject to power cuts during which home phones may not work and mobile phones cannot be charged. 6. The phone box is situated on a busy road through the village, which has a lot of visiting/passing traffic, and also serves for emergency use relating to the A226. 7. Availability for emergency use is considered vital, and the importance of the reassurance to residents provided by the existence of the functioning phone box should not be underestimated. 8. The Parish Council has not yet been provided with any evidence proving low call usage of the phone box however we do not anyway consider low usage to be sufficient justification for losing the phone facility. 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Visual amenity/heritage aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Post Office Green phone box is located in a Conservation Area. 2. As a heritage K6 model box it is an important historic landscape feature of the village and the Parish Council considers that the box must therefore remain in place. <p>In summary, please note that Shorne Parish Council objects strongly to the proposal to remove the phone box at Post Office Green.</p> <p>The further process to be followed seems to be that it is in fact Gravesham Borough Council as the “Relevant Public Body” that decides whether or not a phone box should be removed.</p> <p>We hope that you will agree that Shorne Parish Council has submitted sufficient grounds for rejection of the BT proposal, and to require retention of the functioning phone box.</p> <p>We will be pleased to discuss this submission further as required.</p>	
GR/2016/1057	Shornebury, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3JX	<p>Erection of outbuilding for use as gym/hot tub, conservatory at the rear and a triple garage and storage area.</p> <p>(Also phone call from owner regarding proposals, advised to substitute plan showing the conservatory, discussed likely conditions on outbuildings)</p>	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this application but please see specific points raised below.</p> <p>The house is set back on a large plot. The original 3-bedroom house has previously been extended at each end so that the house is now wide but of narrow depth.</p> <p>The proposal has three sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservatory at rear with glass roof lantern: Although large this seems reasonable for the house and plot sizes – the Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to the rear conservatory. 2. Gym at rear: This is a large, single-storey, pitched roofed building located far back on the site, some distance from the house, and where it could have visual impact for neighbouring properties. It will presumably require electricity and water supplies, and drainage. We would like clarification of the internal layout especially as to whether there will be bathroom or kitchen facilities. We request that, if permitted, this building should be subject to planning conditions: that it is only ancillary to the main house; is not to be used for residential accommodation; and cannot become a separate dwelling. 3. Replacement garage at front: The property currently has a newly built double garage with a high-pitched roof, located at an angle to the side of the house. The replacement building is effectively a triple garage, located forward of 	Pending

			<p>the house and along and near to the eastern side boundary. The proposal is for a substantial two-storey building with roof lights and dormer with window to the front. We would like clarification of the internal layout especially as to whether there will be bathroom or kitchen facilities, and also as to the work that will be undertaken in the workshop which also has roller shutter garage doors, as this might have noise impact on neighbouring properties. We request that, if permitted, this building should be subject to planning conditions: that it is only ancillary to the main house; is not to be used for residential accommodation; and cannot become a separate dwelling.</p> <p>Sent 7/12/16</p>	
GR/2016/1081	20 Fairfields Gravesend Kent DA12 4QG	Construction of a rear dormer extension by raising the roof line to form 2 bedrooms and shower room and erection of a first floor front extension to form dressing room.	<p>The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>The property is located centrally in a modern estate of similar houses, effectively encircled by neighbouring properties such that alterations will have high visual impact. It is set at the front of a small plot, forward of adjacent houses, and has previously had the addition of a rear conservatory extension. On-site parking is presently adequate for the current 3-bedroom house. It is proposed that the house will become 5-bedroom by the addition of a habitable second floor. The application proposes a small 1st floor front extension and a complete new roof which would be nearly 50% higher than at present, with increased mass, and would have a full-width rear box dormer with three window openings as well as side windows on that level.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that these proposals would be out of character and compatibility with nearby houses and would have detrimental effect on the street-scene and the visual amenity of neighbouring properties. Although obscured glass is suggested for the 2nd floor windows, neighbours might still feel overlooked.</p> <p>Sent 7/12/16</p>	Refused
GR/2016/1094	2 Genesta Glade Gravesend Kent DA12 4PR	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed construction of a dormer extension in the side roof slope and conversion of roof space into habitable rooms.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the proposal.</p> <p>Generally it is preferred that dormer extensions should be of lower height than the main ridge of the property however for this property that would cause design/structural difficulties, plus local precedent has already been established at nearby properties.</p> <p>Sent 31/12/2016</p>	Certificate Granted

GR/2016/1109	3 Gazelle Glade, Gravesend, Kent DA12 4PU	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to the existing garage to form home office/gym.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this application.</p> <p>The proposal is to replace the existing single storey, semi-detached garage at the side of the house with a wider and much longer single storey and flat-roofed, partially semi-detached building comprising a garage area, office area and gymnasium.</p> <p>The new building will be over 17 metres long and will extend up to the rear boundary of the site, it will have a stepped southern wall so leaving a slender triangle of land inaccessible.</p> <p>We would like information about services to be provided to the building and whether it contains any kitchen/bathroom facilities.</p> <p>We request that, if it is to be permitted, then this building should be subject to planning conditions: that it is only ancillary to the main house; is not to be used for residential accommodation; and cannot become a separate dwelling.</p> <p>We understand that some building work is already taking place on the site.</p> <p>Sent 7/12/16</p>	Pending
GR/2016/1117	Cartref, Bowesden Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3LA	Erection of a single storey front extension to form a porch and changes to the external wall surfaces at first floor level.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this application.</p> <p>Sent 29/11/16</p>	Permitted
GR/2016/1126	Barretts Folly, Gravesend Road, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3JJ	Application for determination as to whether prior approval is required for the proposed conversion of an agricultural building to a three bedroom two storey dwellinghouse (Class Q(b)).	<p>The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that due to the size, location and visual prominence of the building the proposal should be subject to a full standard planning application.</p> <p>The proposal involves creation of a new dwelling and a large associated residential curtilage in the Green Belt where new dwellings are not normally permitted.</p> <p>The proposal appears to have a greater roof height than the existing building but the proposed new dimensions are not clearly set out on the drawings that have so far been submitted.</p> <p>Sent 31/12/2016</p>	Pending

GR/2016/1214	Hartshill Bungalow Thong Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Single storey rear extension with a depth of 8 metres, maximum height of 3.35 metres and eaves height of 2.4 metres.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this application provided that the property remains a single and single-storey dwelling with the same roof height as at present, and the design in accordance with the drawings presently submitted. Sent 10/01/2017	Pending
--------------	--	---	---	---------