

**SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee  
Meeting held on 4 October 2018 in Shorne Village Hall**

**PRESENT** Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)  
Mr J Bugg  
Mr R Theobald  
Mr R Hardy  
Miss P Clifton

**APOLOGIES** for absence were received from Mr R Lane  
Mr R Cooper, Mr C Rea and Mrs L McCluskey

**36 Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 July 2018**

The Minutes were AGREED as a true record.

**37 Matters Arising from the Minutes not Otherwise on the Agenda**

None.

**PLANNING MATTERS**

**38 Planning Applications/Issues pending:**

- a) Venesta – The owner had been written to as requested about the driveway crossing the footpath, together with a reminder about removing the storage containers, with no response. However it was thought that the Containers may have been removed earlier in the day.
- b) Burdett Avenue – The fence that had been installed across the roadway was removed on 12<sup>th</sup> September, the delay was reported to have been caused by the contractor being unwell. The previous boundary fencing and chicane was revealed as being still in place and unchanged. We had written to the householder about their CCTV and subsequently they had relocated the security camera that had been attached to the roadside tree onto their own property and put up the required warning notices (although one was attached to the same roadside tree). No response had been received from the field landowner about voluntary dedication of a link to footpath NS156.
- c) Sakho Farmhouse – The owner had paved the roadside verge and erected high fencing and gates. Mr Theobald had raised this with Gravesham Planning Enforcement but who had decided that no action should be taken.
- d) See Ho – Clarification is still needed over the classification of the highway frontage as Highways or Parish land. The See Ho's land ends with their front wall according to the Land Registry plans and all the historic plans. We had been corresponding with KCC

Highways over this but the matter is not yet resolved. There should not be any problem about the See Ho occupying the land with their tables and chairs but that would require permission. Parking problems continue but we are aware that means of improvement are under discussion.

- e) Daymer (Green Farm Lane) – Planning Applications submitted so far have been refused permission. The site is in a poor state, Gravesham Planning Enforcement are aware and had already helped in getting some improvement.
- f) 31 The Street – A vehicle crossover is needed. We wrote to the owners on two occasions without a reply. We therefore asked KCC for advice but they contacted the owners direct and it is understood that action will be taken.
- g) Thong Lane – The agricultural buildings had been sold and are now being used for some sort of storage. Mr Theobald had raised the matter with Gravesham Planning Enforcement and a change of use application is expected.
- h) Springhill, Pear Tree Lane – Concerns were raised over tree felling on the site and Mr Theobald had raised this with Gravesham Planning Enforcement. Planning permission had been obtained for a side extension but the entire frontage had also been cleared. The trees were part of the residential curtilage and not protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Many residents are unhappy about the amount of trees which new owners in Pear Tree Lane are cutting down.

### **39 Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii), Schedule of Planning Applications (26) dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members**

Please see the Table after the end of the Minutes.

### **40 Notices of Appeal:**

- a) 20171362 3 Longtens Cottages, Green Farm Lane – We had not objected to these plans
- b) 20180461 Hartshill Bungalow, Thong Lane – This is difficult as the extensions were built without planning permission and infringe planning guidance
- c) 20170717 High Ridge, Pear Tree Lane – The Appeal reported previously was dismissed
- d) 20170813 Springhill, Pear Tree Lane – The Appeal reported previously was dismissed

### **41 Major Plans etc affecting the Parish**

- a) Lower Thames Crossing – no further meetings or new information since the previous meeting but Highways England has just published the statutory notices. The Consultation period is to be from 10 October to 20 December 2018. When the formal announcement is made the information will be publicised on the Parish Council website and through other social media sites. There will be formal consultation events at various locations and also a mobile exhibition (both will visit the Village Hall) and a video fly-through will be available on-line.

### **42 Outside Parish but with impact:**

- a) London Resort Company (Northfleet peninsula) – the application has been delayed again.

- b) A2 Bean and Ebbsfleet junctions – Highways England had consulted on these changes previously and propose to re-consult in the Autumn.

### **HIGHWAYS MATTERS**

#### **43 Accident Reports:**

None reported to the Parish Council since the previous meeting.

#### **44 Traffic monitoring, Speedwatch, Lorrywatch**

- a) There had been some reports of inappropriate lorries but none included sufficient identifying information that could lead to intervention.
- b) On 30<sup>th</sup> July a large lorry had travelled down Bowesden Lane and then been unable to turn around, the problem was resolved with the kind assistance of a resident. There was discussion about whether “Unsuitable for HGV’s” signs would help and where they would best be located.
- c) Harlex had helpfully informed us in advance that they would be working at a property towards the Higham end of Pear Tree Lane, i.e. large vehicles would be using the route for official reasons.
- d) Miss Clifton had circulated the latest Speedwatch figures, the volunteers were thanked for their valuable assistance. Several offending vehicles had been sent official letters by the Police. Speeds of up to 46mph had been recorded at The Ridgeway (30mph zone).
- e) The Traffic speed and volume measuring strips kindly funded by Mr Bryan Sweetland have been installed this week in three locations: the Higham end of Pear Tree Lane, outside Merrivale in Pear Tree Lane and in Brewers Road, near the junction with Woodlands Lane.

#### **45 Road condition/highways issues and Hazards**

- a) Pavement outside Village Hall – No further information.
- b) Drains on Mill Hill Lane and potholes, also surface of Crown lane – KCC Highways assure us these requests have not been forgotten.
- c) Cob Drive – The road repair and resurfacing undertaken was very good and the school warning lines had been reinstated very promptly. Mrs Lindley had sent thanks to KCC.
- d) Pothole on corner of Forge Lane following heavy rain earlier in the year – This had been “temporarily” repaired but not then had a permanent repair leaving concerns that it would break down further as the weather deteriorates. It will be reported again.
- e) Malthouse Lane – The poor condition of the green areas following the drainage roadworks last January-March has been upsetting local residents. KCC have been chased about this and assured us that the verges will be re-seeded by the original contractor as part of the job. With the very dry weather over the summer this had not been possible.
- f) Verge condition outside Silverdene, Tanyard Hill – Thanks to persistence by a resident, KCC eventually dug up the area to investigate the cause of the water seepage there. Mrs Lindley chased KCC for the findings which were that spring water flows along the BT ducting (something that was known previously to be a problem locally), it is unclear where it gets in but it was then escaping through a joint causing the verge to become saturated. This has been stopped from happening. They also discovered that the spring

appears to have been actively diverted on land further up the hill which is why it also now flows onto the roadway there. The Enforcement team are to contact the relevant landowner.

- g) Verge at Crutches Lane – This is in Higham but affects access to Crabbles Bottom. Southern Water want to install bollards to prevent fly-tipping over their fence.
- h) Road sign appeared on Chestnut Green – A new sign indicating Pear Tree Lane had appeared on Chestnut Green, not in a very useful position as there is usually a vehicle parked in front of it. There had been concern that the sign was in the wrong place. Mrs Lindley investigated postal addresses and historic planning applications and found that the sign appears to be correct. The Ridgeway road changes to Pear Tree Lane from “Threeways”, the driveway of which is immediately opposite the location of the sign. This does not alter “The Ridgeway” being the descriptive name for the area.
- i) Mr Hardy reported that there was also a new sign indicating Davy’s Place/Marling Way so it seems that signs are being installed widely where roads change names during their length.
- j) See Ho advertising sign – it was noted that a brown sign indicating the location of the See Ho as a local restaurant had been installed at the Halfpence Lane roundabout.
- k) Parking on pavement – Court Lodge. A large vehicle is almost permanently parked fully blocking the pavement at the corner of Court Lodge. It was agreed that the problem should be taken up with Gravesham Parking enforcement.
- l) A2 eastbound off-slip give way sign – Incorrect information had been provided to Mr Lane, who had repeatedly raised the matter with Highways England and been told it had been investigated, An FOI request revealed that in fact nothing had been done about it, but supposedly action will now be taken. There are also no visible white lines.

#### **46 Parking/traffic problems, Waiting restrictions and Highway modifications:**

- a) See Ho – parking for beer festival, wakes etc, use of other land - The current owner of the land adjacent to the See Ho (the land having originally been owned by the See Ho as amenity land but sold off a long time ago) had raised whether the land could be used for overflow parking. We had no objection in principle but informed that they needed to discuss the proposal with GBC Planning as the use may need planning permission.

#### **47 Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board**

- a) 12<sup>th</sup> September 2018 – There are personnel changes at KCC Highways again. Earl Bourner is being replaced by Kevin Gore.

#### **48 Open Consultations:**

None new to report

#### **49 Closed consultations/for information:**

- a) Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – published on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2018  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

**50 Matters raised by Members**

- a) Mrs Lindley reported that the possibility of having a “concealed entrance” sign had been raised by the new owner at Perrydene in Pear Tree Lane. This had been investigated and it seems that such signs are not included in the Highway code for individual properties. The problem is similar for all the properties in that part of the road. Miss Clifton also reported that the picket fence has now gone and that the grass has self-seeded.
- b) “Benny” the Beluga whale is inhabiting in the Thames including in Shorne Parish waters near Shornemead Fort.
- c) Mr Bugg reported that he has treated weeds in The Street with weedkiller.
- d) Mr Bugg reported that the contractors will be starting the work on the roof at the School at half-term.

**51 Matters from other Committees being discussed for convenience:**

- a) Chancel repair liability query – there had been a query from a new resident about this matter flagged up during conveyancing but no-one else living locally was aware of any problem.
- b) Possible crime in Woodlands Lane on 13th September 2018 – CCTV images had been requested.
- c) Annual Report and distribution – the photograph had to be changed at the last minute due to copyright problems and the new photo had come out a little darker than had been hoped. The paper used is slightly thinner than previously which reduces the weight. Extra copies have been provided but please give any left over ones back.
- d) Drop-in session – Village Hall small hall, Saturday 13th October session 10-12am

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.20pm.

**Planning Applications since previous meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2018:**

|                       |  |   |  |           |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|-----------|
| 20180421<br>(revised) | Shorne Woods Country<br>Park Brewers Road<br>Shorne Gravesend Kent<br>DA12 3HX | Retention of a 4m high<br>column with automatic<br>number plate<br>recognition (ANPR).  | <i>No comments submitted: Revised application, previously implied new installation but already exists</i>  |           |
| 20180422              | Shorne Woods Country<br>Park Brewers Road<br>Shorne Gravesend Kent<br>DA12 3HX | Continued display of 28<br>non-illuminated signs<br>around the car park.  | <i>No comments submitted: Already installed</i>  |           |
| 20180618              | Seatonhurst Gravesend<br>Road Higham Rochester<br>Kent ME3 7DX                 | Erection of a single<br>storey rear and side<br>extension with<br>alterations to the roof<br>from hip to gable and<br>construction of a<br>dormer extension in<br>the rear roof slope and<br>conversion of the roof<br>space into habitable<br>rooms. | The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to the proposed alterations but has the following comments:<br>1. We believe that land immediately south-west and to the south-east of the application area shown may also be in the ownership of the applicant but this is not presently shown on the plans.<br>2. The proposed rear extension will have some impact on the neighbouring semi-detached property and the rear dormer could increase overlooking.<br>3. The proposed side extension may (the actual measurements are not shown on the plans) be being built right up to the eastern boundary (not shown on the plans) of the residential plot leaving no means of external access from the front to the rear of the property.<br>4. A side door is shown on the ground floor which may lead to outside of the residential curtilage.<br>(Sent 26/7/18) | Permitted |
| 20180668              | 141 Astra Drive<br>Gravesend Kent DA12<br>4QF                                  | Erection of a first floor<br>side extension, single<br>storey rear extension<br>and construction of a<br>dormer extension in<br>the rear roof slope and<br>conversion of the roof<br>space into habitable<br>rooms.                                   | The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this application, subject to their not being any significant objections from neighbours, but also has the following comments:<br>The roof dormer should preferably be subsidiary to the flank gable of the house, i.e. stepped in a little from the side. Ideally, it's roof height should be one or two tiles below that of the ridge of the house, to also improve appearance.<br>The balcony on the rear dormer may increase overlooking of the neighbouring properties.<br>(Sent 17/8/18)  | Refused   |

|          |   |  |   |                                    |
|----------|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| 20180792 | 2 Davys Place<br>Gravesend Kent DA12<br>4DL               | Application for a non-material amendment to planning permission reference no. 20180371 to allow the enlargement of the roof lantern. | (Not consulted, no comments made)   | Approval of Non-material amendment |
| 20180714 | Brackenside Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JX | Engineering works to alter site by raising ground levels across the development site.  | <p>The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This application is retrospective as the engineering works have already been done. We would have expected a developer to know clearly what they can and can't do without having the relevant permissions in place.</li> <li>2. This property is in a rural location in the Green Belt, where natural appearance landscape considerations are important.</li> <li>3. The residential curtilage is again shown incorrectly with a red line around the adjacent woodland as well as the residential area. Condition 10 of Decision Notice 20150719 states: "Within one month of the date of this decision notice, a plan of the residential curtilage of the main dwelling known as Brackenside shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their written approval. In the event that the first submission is not approved by the Local Planning Authority, a revised plan shall be submitted within a timeframe to be approved in writing between the applicant/owner and the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order that there is no doubt as to the extent of the curtilage of the property to be defined for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), or any subsequent amendments or re-enactments to that Order." This was done under 20160049 but the applicant has somehow reverted to an incorrect version.</li> <li>4. The applicant refers to Sunridge (the property to the south) as being a disused agricultural building however it is actually a house following residential conversion, hence its privacy is important even if it may currently be vacant. Any concerns about the condition of their fence should be raised with the owner.</li> <li>5. Previous ground levels on the site are shown numerically on the original site plan and there is a photograph in the design and access statement which shows a large area of gentle slope and then a bank possibly half-way down the garden. There was 2m difference between the front of the house and the far end of the garden.</li> <li>6. The amount of earth deposited, and the topsoil covering, both seem different from and greater than would be expected to arise from excavation of the foundations.</li> </ol> | Pending                            |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>It appears that a significant volume of additional material may have been imported into the site.</p> <p>7. We do not agree that there was any problem with the previous site elevations and do not accept that banking up and levelling the whole of a very large site in this way is appropriate or necessary. What has been created is a sterile, urban appearance which lacks any character and is denuded of all vegetation. To have such steep banks at the boundaries is a very unusual and un-neighbourly structure. We would suggest that levelling half of the length of the garden would be more than adequate for the intended use stated and that the rest should be restored to previous levels. i.e. with a bank or equivalent to change levels halfway within the site and then the rest merging at the same level with the adjacent grounds of neighbouring properties at their boundaries.</p> <p>8. The works have resulted in considerable loss of amenity and privacy, and created overlooking of both adjacent properties. While hedges may be intended, they are not an instant solution. Whatever permission is granted, the planting of permanent hedges should be a condition and advice given and taken regarding required essential interim measures to ensure privacy of neighbours.</p> <p>9. We note that the applicant's recent photographs do not show the condition of the entire residential site and adjacent woodland.</p> <p>10. We would be grateful if the applicant/future owner could be reminded that the woodland is not part of the residential garden and cannot be incorporated into it, requires a management plan and cannot be cleared of trees and groundcover vegetation. A check should be made concerning whether trees etc have already been removed and TPO's applied if necessary to those remaining, as there appears to now be a clear area and piles of cut timber on the site.</p> <p>11. The original approved planning application 20150719 includes Condition 5 in the Decision Notice, referring to landscaping advance planning issues, which states: "Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme detailing the proposed soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the type and species of planting to be carried out, to include their quantity and size as well as arrangements for aftercare and shall also include a woodland management plan. Thereafter the approved soft landscaping scheme shall be carried out in full during the first available planting season following first occupation of the dwelling. Any trees or plants that die, are damaged, removed or become diseased within five years from the date that the development is</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|          |   |                         |  |           |
|----------|---|-------------------------|--|-----------|
|          |   |                         | <p>first brought into use shall be replaced with a species of a similar size and species during the next available planting season. For the avoidance of doubt the landscaping scheme shall seek to retain as much of the front boundary treatment as possible.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the landscaping is maintained in the long term in the interests of the visual amenity of the development, in accordance with adopted Local Plan Core Strategy Policy CS19.” The Condition clearly expected that such works would not be undertaken until the proposed landscaping scheme and woodland management plans had been submitted and approved.</p> <p>12. We note that there is also a Planning application 20170524 submitted regarding tree works in the woodland area and which has not yet been determined (see separate comments).</p> <p>(Sent 11/8/18)</p>   |           |
| 20180524 | Brackenside Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JX | Works to various trees. | <p>While reviewing previous applications for this property in connection with application 20180714, the Parish Council became aware of this application (not yet determined) regarding tree works on the site.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to express concern/comment as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The trees referenced are all in the woodland area, which requires a formal tree management plan as part of application 20150719 (see Condition 5 of the Decision Notice), rather than being within the residential curtilage of the property.</li> <li>2. The accompanying notes refer three times to “the garden” and also “We are keen to..... merge the woodland effect into the garden plan”.</li> <li>3. We would be grateful if the applicant/future owner could be reminded that the woodland is not part of the residential garden and cannot be incorporated into it, requires a management plan and cannot be cleared of trees and groundcover vegetation. A check should be made concerning whether trees etc have already been removed and TPO’s applied to those remaining if considered necessary, as photographs show piles of cut timber on the site.</li> <li>4. Photographs included with application 20180714 appear to show that trees previously present in the true residential garden, and that were shown on the site plan submitted with application 20150719, have in fact been removed.</li> <li>5. Minimal works required for genuine safety reasons are naturally supported in principle.</li> </ol> <p>(Sent 11/8/18)</p> | Withdrawn |

|          |   |   |   |         |
|----------|---|---|---|---------|
| 20180713 | 15 The Street, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3EA                     | Retention of the replacement timber double glazed windows on the front elevation.                                     | The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this retrospective planning application.   | Pending |
| 20180802 | Nuralite Industrial Estate Canal Road Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7JA | Request for a scoping opinion under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. | <p>We are grateful to Gravesham Borough Council for asking for our comments on this application. The Nuralite Industrial Estate lies mainly within the Parish of Shorne, the Parish Boundary with Higham (to the east) running north-south through the easternmost part of the site.</p> <p><b>General Points:</b><br/>The Parish Council firstly notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This application is for an Environmental Impact Assessment scoping opinion however it includes information about the proposed planning application, on which we also comment expressing a variety of concerns throughout this response.</li> <li>- Regrettably, significant adverse alterations to the site have already been made without there being planning permissions in place. These are principally that all trees and vegetation habitat was cleared from the bulk of the site (which activity will have disturbed Asbestos containing ground), a large area of hardstanding has been laid out and a large scaffolding structure was erected, which was taken down after Planning Enforcement intervention.</li> <li>- We consider that any EIA should be based on the site being in its previous, unaltered state.</li> <li>- We consider that due to the close proximity to the Ramsar Site and Special Protection Areas, the EIA should be very comprehensive and with no aspects scoped out.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transport and access issues:</b><br/><b>Error concerning road layout in Lower Higham:</b> On pages 35 and 36, the connection of Canal Road to Lower Rochester Road is not correctly described – The road markings show clearly that Canal Road forms a T-junction with Church Street, which then itself forms a T-junction with Lower Rochester Road/Chequers Street, which is the main through route.<br/><b>Increase in traffic:</b> The much greater number of work units and changes of use will lead to greater traffic on Canal Road and through Lower Higham/Chequers Street. The document itself describes road widths as being too narrow in many places to allow two HGV's or even vans to pass. On page 51 a significant increase in AADT is predicted (526</p> | Pending |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | <p>LDV plus 26 HGV) however page 61 refers to 570-600 additional jobs being created, so the predicted AADT rise may have been underestimated. All consequences of potential traffic increase should therefore be included in the EIA.</p> <p><b>Unsuitability of access routes and road safety concerns:</b> The road junctions and layouts in Lower Higham/Chequers Street are presently quite hazardous. The junction of Gore Green Road to Lower Rochester Road is “blind” and Chequers Street often has parked cars causing traffic to be on the wrong side of the road when vehicles coming from Lower Rochester Road cannot see around the corner. To have increased traffic, particularly including industrial traffic, will increase risk, particularly turning into and out of Church Street to access Canal Road. We note also the restricted height of the nearby railway bridge and the fact that the road beneath it is damaged (as evidenced by the large puddle) and needs repair which will further reduce the clearance.</p> <p><b>Safety adverse effects:</b> The area is used for recreation by walkers and particularly cyclists – Sustrans Route 1 passes the entrance and then goes along Canal Road and Lower Rochester Road, and route 179 turns off at Gore Green Road. The proposal increases traffic and therefore increases risk to cyclists and other recreational users. Footpath NS156 connects with NS140 by walkers having to cross Canal Road by passing under the railway bridge where there is restricted width and visibility.</p> <p><b>Access Routes:</b> The routes described on page 7 and in “Study Area” on page 40 are not all allowable/suitable for increased traffic and certainly not for industrial traffic.</p> <p><b>Public parking outside the entrance:</b> For very many years, public have parked on unused ground by the entrance to the site in order to take walks, consideration should be given to this function being able to continue/be re-provided.</p> <p><b>Parking and cycling:</b> Parking areas are assumed in front of the units but facilities for cycles to be tethered/locked up need to also be provided.</p> <p><b>Pollution and other Environmental issues:</b></p> <p><b>Increased pollution risk:</b> This site is immediately adjacent to and actually partly within (error on page 1, discrepancy with page 24) a Ramsar site where pollution should not be occurring. Noise and fumes will increase at the site, along Canal Road and in Lower Higham, which is a Conservation Area, particularly related to the road junctions where vehicles will have to pause. Noise and vibration will reduce the tranquility of the area and have an adverse effect on local residents. All these aspects should be included in the EIA and not be scoped out.</p> <p><b>Light Pollution:</b> It is likely that the proposed site will have higher lighting levels than at present, for safety of access and security, this is a concern in a rural and protected</p> |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>area.</p> <p><b>Direct damage to protected land:</b> The proposal will increase recreational use of, and potential damage to, the Ramsar site by staff and visitors - the document notes that workers are unlikely to leave the site area at lunchtime.</p> <p><b>Noise pollution:</b> In open, flat landscapes noise travels a considerable distance.</p> <p><b>Visual intrusion and urban appearance:</b> The proposal creates a visually intrusive cleared site and installs modern buildings close to the footpath and cycle route, and the Ramsar site. It reduces the visual amenity of important recreational routes. It creates an urban appearance where presently rural. There will be visual impact over a wide area due to impact on long distance views from higher ground. If landfill is permitted the surface should be landscaped and planted subsequently.</p> <p><b>Construction and operation pollution:</b> Further information is needed concerning a number of aspects: how widespread environmental Asbestos pollution will be prevented during any renovation/demolition, including excavations for drains and removal of previously dumped material from the canal bed; how water run-off will be prevented from contaminating canal water and ditches communicating with the protected sites; restrictions are needed over operational use of the site to prevent dust and rubbish etc contaminating the local environment. Users of the footpath and cycle route are additional potential receptors who need to be considered.</p> <p><b>Loss of habitat:</b> The proposal seeks to permanently fill in part of the Canal course at the eastern edge of the site however the reasons or need for this are unclear. It is noted that the proposal also involves loss of the easternmost pond although this is designated as a local wildlife site.</p> <p><b><u>Other General/Planning aspects:</u></b></p> <p><b>Historical assets:</b> The area is known to have had Roman occupation. Celtic, Roman and Saxon remains/items were found very close by. A watching brief for historical assets should be undertaken during all works on the site.</p> <p><b>Location of the site:</b> While the site is already in existence, having been first built there in the early 1900's, if this were a new application it would be vociferously opposed as the location would nowadays be considered inappropriate.</p> <p><b>Increase in built area:</b> The layout plan on page 11 shows an approximately 50% increase in built area over the existing industrial footprint, this should not occur. The number of individual units is increased. There are variable size units and because of the sensitive location, the proposed range of uses for these needs to be clarified and if necessary restricted.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|

|          |  |  |  |         |
|----------|--|--|--|---------|
|          |  |  | <p><b>Raising the land levels:</b> The proposal to raise land levels by 2.0 metres seems excessive. If permitted this should be landscaped with gently sloping edges and not be a steep edged platform. Site levels in some parts appear to have already been raised.</p> <p><b>Sustainability:</b> Having such an industrial estate in a remote rural area is not a sustainable form of development. There is no housing close nearby and no public transport, therefore the development will encourage increased vehicle use for access by workers and visitors.</p> <p><b>Control of access to the site:</b> The present site has a controlled entrance. The Canteen building is mentioned as being for site security but no gates or fences are shown on the plans, the nature and location of these requires clarification.</p> <p><b>Hours of operation:</b> This will affect the traffic noise etc in Lower Higham and other areas that traffic will pass through, the hours and days of operation need to be defined.</p> <p><b>Usage of the Canteen facility:</b> The canteen facility is shown located at the entrance of the site, with 22 associated parking places. The proposed usage of this facility requires clarification. One question arising is whether the site intends this facility to be open to visitors to the site, both to the industrial estate itself and from passing walkers and cyclists. If that is the intention, then the various responsible authorities and interested parties need to consider whether this is a desirable development as it might attract even more traffic and visitors to the area.</p> <p><b>Layout at the entrance:</b> All the local paths and tracks need to be shown and accommodated clearly, including the access to the track north of Beckley Hill (commonly used as a continuation of NS317 instead of footpath NS140).</p> <p><b>Restoration of the Thames and Medway Canal:</b> Although no longer used for its original purpose, the Canal course is considered locally to be an important Community Asset. Rather than any additional areas being filled in, the canal bed (including where previous dumping has taken place) should be enhanced by being completely cleared, restored and retained as a significant environmental asset (land classified as Ramsar and SSSI) with historic and wildlife importance. Ideally, we would prefer to see a bridged entrance to the site which allows water (and low profile boats/kayaks to pass underneath).</p> <p>(Sent 12/9/18)</p> |         |
| 20180827 | 77 Astra Drive<br>Gravesend Kent DA12<br>4PZ | Erection of a two storey front extension and construction of a dormer extension in | The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this application, subject to their not being any significant objections from neighbours, but also has the following comments:<br>The overall effect of the three recent applications for this property will be to greatly  | Refused |

|          |   |  |  |   |
|----------|---|--|--|---|
|          |   | the rear roof slope and conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms.   | increase its bulk, and more than double the original internal floor area. A stepped appearance will be created at the rear with increased overlooking to neighbouring properties, which could be detrimental to their amenity.<br>(Sent 17/8/18)   |   |
| 20180844 | 1 Swillers Lane Shorne<br>Gravesend Kent DA12<br>3ED          | Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed single storey rear extension, erection of new porch and conversion of the loft space into habitable rooms. | The Parish Council has no objection to the principle of this bungalow, located in an area characterised by low-rise dwellings, being altered but OBJECTS to aspects of the proposed design as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two side dormers merge with the existing front roof slope and have an extended ridge line rather than being subsidiary as would be preferred. They extend too far to the sides of the property and so create a greatly increased bulk as viewed from the roadway.</li> <li>The blind ended side dormers have small windows on their sides facing forward and backwards, a non-usual and visually intrusive design.</li> <li>The rear dormer has a balcony feature which could give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>Overall the proposals would be detrimental to the street scene and would reduce the amenity of neighbouring properties.</li> </ul> We note that a similar design, with only two bedrooms upstairs, was approved as lawful development close nearby in 2009 (see 20090856).<br>We suggest that the side dormers in this application should be less deep and have windows at the ends (sides of the property) as more usual, with obscured glazing. The implemented design should be near identical with that of the above quoted nearby property, the reason being to create harmony in the street scene where properties are small, low rise and close together.<br>(Sent 27/8/18) | Certificate Granted<br>(plans slightly amended) |
| 20180857 | Land Between 29 And<br>31 The Street Shorne<br>Gravesend Kent | Demolition of the existing garage and erection of a detached no. 3 bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and landscaping.  | The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to this application, with the following comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a very difficult and narrow site within the Shorne Village Conservation area, constrained by an ancient wall on the right (eastern) border. The land drops away from west to east.</li> <li>We note that the site has been the subject of several previous planning applications, all of which were refused.</li> <li>We understand that the site contains sewer drains serving the neighbouring properties and an access manhole, consideration will need to be given to these structurally within the design and build. A large soakaway is noted shown at the end of the garden.</li> </ol>  | Pending   |

|          |   |  |   |           |
|----------|---|--|---|-----------|
|          |   |  | <p>4. We also observe that aerial wires to another property cross the site.</p> <p>5. We OBJECT to the proposed design, considering it to provide cramped accommodation and to be too large for the site, possibly constituting overdevelopment, and therefore detrimental to the street scene and the amenity of neighbouring properties. No 31 is particularly affected by the much higher roof ridge height.</p> <p>6. A much more compact overall design with a shallower roof pitch and which averages out in roof ridge height between the two neighbouring properties would be preferable, meaning approximately the height of the ridges of the front dormers that are presently shown (although roof lights might usefully be substituted). A rear dormer could be considered instead.</p> <p>7. We OBJECT to the proposed two-storey rear projection as it severely affects the amenity of the neighbouring properties - a single storey rear projection (which could be across the full width), would be acceptable. If possible, conditions should be imposed preventing subsequent further extensions of the property.</p> <p>8. On the east elevation, we OBJECT to the proposed windows: the top window does not add anything to the design and should be removed, the 1st floor bathroom window might be smaller and the ground floor window should be deleted as it would cause overlooking to the neighbouring property due to the difference in ground levels. The proposed two front dormers might be better reworked as rooflights to reduce the dominant appearance of the design.</p> <p>9. The proposed bin and cycle shed is impractically distant from the house and affects the amenity of the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>10. If permitted, materials to be used should harmonise with existing properties nearby in the area.<br/>(Sent 27/8/18)</p> |           |
| 20180816 | 27 Marling Way<br>Gravesend Kent DA12<br>4DW                | Construction of dormer extensions in the rear and front roof slopes and conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms. | The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this planning application.<br>(Sent 27/8/18)   | Permitted |
| 20180870 | Ponswood Bowesden<br>Lane Shorne Gravesend<br>Kent DA12 3LA | Erection of log cabin in the rear garden.  | The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application, However, detail is lacking as to what this large cabin will be used for and what services will be provided to it.   | Withdrawn |

|          |   |   |   |           |
|----------|---|---|---|-----------|
|          |   |   | <p>The Site plan submitted with the application seems to be an old drawing, and the present day aerial view appears to show a structure already in the garden at/near the proposed location.</p> <p>We request that, if permitted, conditions should be imposed that the cabin is ancillary to the main house and cannot be used as residential accommodation.</p> <p>(Sent 27/8/18)</p>  |           |
| 20180931 | Ridgeway House The Ridgeway Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LW      | Conversion of the existing attached garage/workshop to an annexe ancillary to the main dwelling.          | <p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application provided that the appearance of the building from the street is relatively unchanged as the building is a prominent feature in the Chestnut Green Conservation area. A slight increase in roof height (but pitch unchanged and still subsidiary to the main house) and an additional rooflight are noted. All materials used must match the existing building and be subject to the approval of the Borough Conservation Officer.</p> <p>There is a theoretical loss of parking however there is enough capacity on the site. We would be grateful for conditions to be imposed confirming that the Coach House annexe accommodation is only ancillary to the main house and cannot be used as a separate residential dwelling.</p> <p>(Sent 3/10/18)</p> | Pending   |
| 20180936 | 1 Cheneys Cottages Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AA    | Erection of single storey side extension and alterations to the roof of the single storey rear extension. | <p>The Parish Council has no objection to this application subject to the approval of the Borough Conservation Officer, as the property lies in the Thong Village Conservation Area.</p> <p>Materials used must match the existing row of houses.</p> <p>(Sent 3/10/18)</p>   | Permitted |
| 20180956 | 1 Homewood Cottages The Ridgeway Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LG | To perform Doff/Joff cleaning, brick and crack repairs, and 2 coats of a lime render.                     | <p>The Parish Council has no objection to this application subject to the approval of the Borough Conservation Officer, as the property lies in the Chestnut Green Conservation Area.</p> <p>(Sent 3/10/18)</p>   | Pending   |