

**SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee  
Meeting held on 13 April 2017 in Shorne Village Hall**

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

**ALSO IN** Mr J Aughterlony – Rochester & Cobham Golf Club  
**ATTENDANCE** Mr R Gagg- Harlex  
Mr J Wood  
Mr D Parmenter

**APOLOGIES** for absence were received from Mr R Hardy  
and Mr C Rea

The Chairman suspended Standing Orders in order to first address parishioner concerns.

**94 Matters Raised by Parishioners**

Mr Gagg, from Harlex, drew attention to the hazardous problem of numerous cars, estimated between 30 and 70, parking in Park Pale the previous Saturday and Sunday in connection with the Country Park. This included parking on existing double-yellow line areas. He has been in touch with GBC about this because of risks experienced to his drivers and vehicles from the parking and consequent careless pedestrians.

Mr Aughterlony, from the Golf Club, stated that he would like there to be double yellow lines all the way down Park Pale. It was indicated by Mr Gagg and Mr Aughterlony that they were willing to pay for this.

Mrs Lindley pointed out that while the funding in that area would be very welcome, as there is no official funding for what are regarded as voluntary projects, the problem is that such a proposal first has to be officially sanctioned. She has been trying over the past year to get the overall problems with parking in the village, including on the pavements outside the Country Park, onto the agenda of the GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board. Two meetings had been cancelled including the most recent. The Parish Council must get the need officially recognised so that we can access expert advice to draw up a detailed and implementable scheme proposal. The proposal needs

to be taken to the Joint Committee by the relevant GBC member as the Parish Council representative is only “in attendance” at the meetings. The next meeting will be in June.

Mr Aughterlony commented further that there are some restrictions already in place but these needed to be enforced. Mrs Lindley commented that enforcement was indeed another problem area as e.g. the double yellow lines in the centre of the village are regularly ignored. There was general discussion about requesting random attendance by enforcement officers (Carly Deacon was mentioned) but otherwise informing police when there was a problem.

Mr Gagg reported also that there had been incidents of people sleeping in vehicles (cars as well as lorries) at Park Pale and then depositing hazardous rubbish. He suggested that “No Parking Overnight” signs are needed all the way down Park Pale.

Mr Lane suggested that the parishioners could write to Matthew Balfour, the Kent Cabinet Member for Transport about this. Mrs Lindley said that she would also try to have further direct discussions with Lisa Gillham, the Kent Highways Manager. Mrs Lindley suggested that a petition could be useful supporting evidence. It was noted that there had apparently been few problems from motorbikes recently.

The meeting then returned to the Agenda.

**95 Minutes of the Meeting held on 2 March 2017**

The minutes were AGREED as a true record.

**96 Matters Arising from the Minutes not Otherwise on the Agenda:**

None.

**97 Correspondence**

- (a) Mrs Lindley had implemented the paper previously agreed on “Protocol on Management of Vegetation encroaching on and Overhanging Highways (including road signs and streetlights) and Footways”. Accordingly, request letters had been delivered to three properties. Two then dealt with the overhanging vegetation (one after initial resistance), but one remained a problem as the owners responded refusing to take action. As per the protocol, that property had consequently been reported to KCC as it is primarily their responsibility, the additional Parish Council letters having been intended only as a polite preliminary step.
- (b) Michael Gardens Landscaping Strip. Mrs Lindley had given GBC more information on this as kindly investigated by Mr Rea. GBC went to the site and had reported back but slightly missed the point about excessive vegetation clearance. Mrs Lindley will contact them again.
- (c) Problems at Park Pale. Dealt with above under Minute 94.

- (d) The See Ho. Mr Redfern will take up the matter of the excessive lighting with the manager. Regarding the on-road parking problems, it was reported that the parking facilities at the See Ho were inadequate for the number of customers with the result that they were parking on the main road and causing problems with sightlines. GBC had given Planning Permission regardless however the landscaping plan approval is still pending.

### **PLANNING MATTERS**

#### **98 Planning Applications/Issues Pending**

- (a) Apex Site - Planning Application for Waste Transfer Station Modification: Mrs Lindley reported that KCC have discharged most of the remaining conditions taking account of our input.
- (b) Nuralite (British Uralite) - Mr Theobald reported that there have been complaints from Higham residents about increased lorry movements through the village. It is believed that the company is importing hardcore for which they have no planning consent. Mr Theobald reported that GBC are awaiting a planning application from Nuralite. He has also spoken to Cllr Sweetland about this. The matter has been referred to KCC for enforcement action.
- (c) Barratts Folly - Mr Theobald reported that he had reported the dumped hardcore to the GBC enforcement officer. The matter is being investigated.

#### **99 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.

#### **100 Decisions of the Borough Council**

- (a) The Red House kennels - This has been referred to the Regulatory Board.
- (b) Electronic Plans - An e-mail had been sent by from Kevin Burbidge in response to the concerns expressed at the meeting of Parish Council Chairman. The availability of tuition for Councillors was confirmed with the aim of undertaking this during April. With that in mind, he has instructed staff to continue providing paper copies of documents during April at no cost to the parishes. It is his intention to cease the provision of free paper copies of plans, other than in the exceptional circumstances previously mentioned, from 1 May 2017. Alternatively, if the Parish Council wishes to continue receiving paper copies, there will be a charge.

#### **101 Notices of Appeal**

No Notices of Appeal.

**102 Parish/Neighbourhood Plan (82)**

As requested at the Council meeting, Mrs Lindley will draw up a report formally explaining the decision not to proceed with a Neighbourhood Plan because it requires the identification of land for development. The outcome of the Vigo plan (refused permission to proceed) in that respect had been noted.

**103 Major Plans Affecting the Parish (83)**

Lower Thames Crossing - The Parish Council had been advised by Highways England that the Secretary of State for Transport had announced the preferred route for the Lower Thames Crossing. The decision had been announced on the previous day to this meeting, Wednesday 12 April 2017.

The preferred route consists of: a new bored tunnel under the River Thames east of Gravesend and Tilbury (referred to in the consultation as Location C); a new road north of the river linking the tunnel to the M25 between junctions 29 and 30 (Route 3), and a new road south of the river linking the tunnel to the A2 east of Gravesend (the Western Southern Link) - which represents a key change from their preferred scheme in the 2016 consultation.

Following a brief discussion, it was agreed to hold an extra meeting the following Thursday evening 20th April 2017 to allow enough time prior for everyone to look at all the documents, think and then discuss what to do about the LTC decision and the next steps the Parish Council should take. It was considered that there should also be another public meeting held and possibly a letter circulated to update parishioners on the position following the announcement.

**104 Developments Outside the Parish but with Impact on Shorne (reported for information) (84)**

- (a) Port of London Authority - A meeting was held at the Port of London Authority on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2017 concerning Port developments and associated infrastructure, including the Lower Thames Crossing. There were apparently representatives from GBC and KCC attending. From following internet links, Mrs Lindley had discovered that in 2015 the Port of London Authority had carried out a consultation "Thames Vision" regarding the tidal Thames. The report refers to involvement of key stakeholders however Mrs Lindley and other Councillors had not become aware of this through official routes or other local amenity organisations. It seemed that none of the Parishes or other community groups on the Hoo Peninsula had been made aware either, so a consultation supposedly about the tidal Thames had not included communities adjacent. She will investigate further and send an enquiry letter.
- (b) It had also been reported in the press that there was to be an extension proposed to the Tilbury Docks.

## **HIGHWAY MATTERS**

### **105 Accident Reports**

An accident occurred at Shorne Crossroads on 2 April 2017, involving three cars, with two people injured.

### **106 Traffic Monitoring & Speedwatch (86)**

Nothing further to report.

### **107 Street Lighting (87)**

Nothing further to report.

### **108 Condition of Roads in the Parish (88)**

- (a) Mr Theobald reported that he had shown the depression in the road at the junction of Manor Field and The Street, to workmen who had attended to fix nearby potholes. Trial holes will be dug to ascertain the problem.
- (b) Mr Theobald reported that the pavement in Forge Lane has been dealt with. Mrs Lindley noted that another section of pavement on Tanyard Hill had also been repaired. Recent reporting had generally proved successful.
- (c) Mr Theobald reported that the road surface at the top of Tanyard Hill towards Chestnut Green has been marked up for repair.

### **109 Hazards**

Lorries Parking Beside the A2 – Mr Parmenter reported that lorries parking beside the A2 was particularly bad that night.

### **110 Parking/Traffic Problems (89)**

Mr Theobald will draw Cllr Sweetland's attention to the parking problems in the village and to ask for this to be placed on the agenda of the Joint Transportation Board meeting.

### **111 Highway Modifications (90)**

Nothing further to report.

### **112 Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board (91)**

Nothing further to report, the last meeting due on 15<sup>th</sup> March was cancelled due to physical problems at the Civic Centre.

**113 Open consultations (92)**

- White Paper “Fixing our broken housing market” – closes 2<sup>nd</sup> May  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-announces-ambitious-plan-to-build-the-homes-britain-needs>

**114 Any Other Business**

- (a) Mr Parmenter has reported the fly-tipping debris in Shorne Ifield Road to GBC.
- (b) Mr Parmenter reported that a lorry broke a tree in Woodlands Lane, the Country Park staff had been very helpful.
- (c) It was noted that funeral corteges were going through the village on the way to the crematorium at Chalk. It was agreed to write to the superintendent at the crematorium, asking them to advise funeral directors to use the Wainscott by Pass

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.25pm.

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS SINCE PREVIOUS MEETING ON 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2017**

GR/2017/0239 (Standing Orders, minuted 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2017)	15 Michael Gardens Gravesend Kent DA12 4QA	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed enlargement of the existing garage.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the planning application but wishes to comment that, being an odd shape, the way that the roof is constructed and will connect with the neighbouring adjoined garage roof is difficult to follow.	Certificate Refused
GR/2017/0310 (Standing Orders, minuted 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2017)	Dreams Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Demolition of an existing storage building and erection of new garage and store.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the planning application but wishes to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plans show a cross-hatched appearance on the south-facing roof slope of the replacement building, please can it be clarified about the nature of these, i.e. whether rooflights or solar panels.</li> <li>• The plans show a steel gate opening at the western end of the site. From Google Earth there appear to be materials and vehicles in the adjacent field. We are unclear whether this use is by the applicant or others, and whether it has planning permission and is intended to continue so we would be grateful for that to be clarified.</li> <li>• The new building should have conditions imposed that is cannot be used for residential purposes.</li> </ul>	Pending
GR/2017/0319 (Standing Orders, minuted 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2017)	Shornebury Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JX	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a detached outbuilding at the rear as a gym and an indoor hot tub.	<p>The Parish Council had previously commented on multi-part application GR/2016/1057 as follows (please carry forward to this present application):</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>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</p>	Pending

			<p>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.”</p> <p>In addition to the previous comments we would like to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is noted that the orientation of the proposed building has been changed to align it more with the side fence line.</li> <li>• The proposed building is still some distance from the main house so its stated use as a Gym ancillary to the main house might be compromised in poor weather.</li> </ul>	
GR/2017/0322 (Standing Orders, minuted 13th April 2017)	Perry Dene Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed two storey side extension, single storey side extension, conversion of the garage into a habitable room, construction of a dormer extension in the rear roof slope and conversion of roof space into a habitable room, installation of velux roof lights in the roof front roof slope and erection of a detached garage.	<p>The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the application but wishes to make the following comments:</p> <p>The property is a large house on a large sloping curtilage, set at an angle to the road. It does not appear to have previously been extended.</p> <p>The application is for a lawful development certificate, and we therefore presume that the total dimensions of the proposed extensions do comply with those regulations, however in general we prefer such large modifications to be submitted as a standard planning application.</p> <p>The appearance of the house from Pear Tree Lane will be relatively unchanged. At the garden aspect it will become a 4-storey property and the roof dormer could result in some visual impact to Crutches Lane, Higham.</p> <p>The rear dormer is shown as being of the same height as the existing roof ridge but it would be preferable for there to be subsidiarity of the dormer and for it to be at least two lines of roof tiles lower than the ridge.</p>	Pending