

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee
Meeting held on 19th September 2019 in Shorne Village Hall**

PRESENT

Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)
Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chairman)
Miss P Clifton
Mr R Theobald
Mr C Rea
Mr B Lane
Mr R Hardy
Mrs L McCluskey

APOLOGIES

Mr S White

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 11th July 2019

The minutes were agreed by the Committee as a true record and signed off by the Chairman.

2. Matters arising from the Minutes not otherwise on the Agenda.

There were no additional matters arising.

Planning:

3. Planning Applications/Issues pending:

a) GBC/KCC enforcement actions update:

- Ringland (see also below), and Apex Business Park - Nothing additional to report.
- 1 Ifield Cottages - the fence height has been reduced. The verge enclosure issue has been reported by GBC to KCC, nothing further heard. Bryan Sweetland has also been informed.
- Woodvale, The Ridgeway - GBC have written twice to the owner and son but have not heard anything from them. The Enforcement Team will now talk to the GBC Legal Team.
- “To Let” sign in Thong – GBC contacted the agent and this has been removed.
- Sakho Farmhouse – The highways verge aspect has been reported to KCC regarding the installed concrete and stones. Bryan Sweetland has also been informed.
- Pear Tree Lane TPO’s – No action taken yet by GBC.

- b) Cobham Lodge, Valley Drive – for Regulatory Board but wasn't on the Agenda of 4th September, assumed will wait until the next meeting. The applicant has submitted revised proposals omitting the social housing contribution.
 - c) Nuralite – for Regulatory Board (as reported by Councillor for Higham). There was a meeting in Higham on 4th September which Mrs Lindley attended but it was largely to encourage Higham residents to submit objections. Incorrect information about Shorne was presented by some Higham residents.
 - d) Brackenside, Pear Tree Lane – landscaping and woodland. A planning application has been submitted that includes a sunken garden on part of the previously raised area, it also changes the previously agreed entrance gates to metal sliding ones. The property highlights the problem where residents buy a piece of woodland and then treat it as garden however the seller can also be considered responsible.
 - e) 28 Coutts Avenue – an application has been submitted for 4 houses in a mini-estate format, in place of one bungalow.
 - f) Courtlands, Gravesend Road – an application for very large (4 horses and tack-room) brick-built stables and a hay barn has been submitted, future residential conversion would be a concern. The plot is relatively small at 2.2 acres and in part constrained by woodland. The proposed location of the building on the plot is unusual for a stable and wasteful of useable space.
 - g) Cumloden, Pear Tree Lane – an application for a 6-bedroom house has been submitted
 - h) Ringland, Pear Tree Lane – application for a lawful development certificate has been refused, permitted development rights had been withdrawn in the last previous full planning application. They will need to apply for planning permission.
 - i) The Clockhouse, The Ridgeway – metal fencing with electric sliding gates has been proposed to replace the wooden fence, along with removal of the hedge which the neighbour has supported as it improved sightlines leaving their property. The metal fencing will be set further back than the current fence but the metal is considered out of character in the Conservation Area. The Conservation Architect was consulted but his advice was not taken.
 - j) 1 Bunny Hill, Tanyard Hill – an infill house is proposed, the potential effect on neighbouring properties was discussed.
 - k) Inn on the Lake – an application for an additional 30m mast has been submitted, this is near the current 35m mast.
- 4. Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii), Schedule of Planning Applications (26) dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members (circulated)**

No specific comments made.

5. Notices of Appeal:

- a) 20181068 – Thong House, Thong Lane – Appeal dismissed, and the more recent identical application has been withdrawn.
- b) 20180713 – 15 The Street, replacement windows – Appeal dismissed. There was discussion that the householder might reapply, based on recent GBC decisions with relevance that allowed uPVC windows in Conservation Areas.

6. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish:

- a) Lower Thames Crossing:
 - Ground Investigations Works - A meeting with Highways England representatives took place on 5th August, with Mr Lane and Mrs Lindley present, to discuss the works being undertaken, the locations being used and concerns over footpath use conflicts.
 - Executive Summary of Consultation Feedback – this was published on 22nd July but not the base document which should exist and to which it should relate. The official line from HE is that they are still analysing the 28,000 responses to the consultation and that the report itself will not be published until the DCO application (now expected summer 2020)
 - Mobile information unit displays took place at Bluewater and in Gravesend town centre. After complaints an additional venue was arranged at Cascades on 9th September. Mrs Lindley and Mrs McCluskey attended but found that the display was small and there was no new information provided.
 - The local Traffic Data from the recent HE surveys had been requested by Mrs Lindley, this has been received and will be circulated.
 - Archaeological Walkover Survey at Crabbles Bottom – HE had requested access, which was granted. There was discussion as to why Crabbles Bottom land was included in this. Mrs Lindley had requested that we should be provided with a copy of the report.
 - HE Parish Council Meetings – these had taken place recently with Cobham and Luddesdown PC's in connection with increasing their understanding of potential traffic problems. Shorne have also been offered such a meeting which was appreciated but pending more information about the proposed content it was considered it might be better scheduled when there was some new information.
- b) Thames Estuary Commission meeting 16th July – Mr Lane had been unable to attend due to a conflict of meetings.

7. Outside Parish but with impact:

Nothing identified.

Highways:

8. Accident reports:

- a) 20th August 2019 – Mr Theobald reported regarding Forge Lane where there had been the previous temporary repair. After further heavy rain, more of the tarmac had washed away causing a large hole (see also 10c below). It appeared that an accident had been caused by someone swerving to avoid the pothole.
- b) 4th September 2019 but not confirmed – There was discussion on Social Media which said “Looks like there has been an accident Tanyard Hill/Racefield Close junction. Police and ambulance in attendance.” Mr Lane asked relevant officials for more information but nothing has in fact been reported.

9. Traffic monitoring, Speed watch, Lorry watch:

- a) Speed watch – The equipment is awaiting repair, therefore nothing to report.
- b) Lorry watch - Nothing specific to report

10. Road condition/highways issues and Hazards:

- a) Verge outside Silverdene, Tanyard Hill stream – KCC have repeatedly said that they are going to investigate the problem and also to put in an extra drain but nothing has happened yet. They are going to clear the drains again meanwhile. The stream has been running strongly recently and a new feature of concern is that water is now also emerging from a manhole cover on the west side of the road. This has been reported to KCC.
- b) Mill Hill Lane – this has been repaired to a very satisfactory level although there is also here an area where water was emerging from the road prior and therefore again since the repairs.
- c) Forge Lane pothole – now repaired to a satisfactory surface. It was noted that the manhole cover located there has been removed, assumed redundant after the previous drainage works.
- d) Brewers Road and Pear Tree Lane speed limit reduction – Mrs Lindley has completed the Highways Improvement Plan that was requested by KCC (as reported in the previous minutes), this was circulated earlier and tabled with a request for any comments by Monday 23rd September after which it will be sent in to KCC.
- e) White and yellow lines including refreshing – It was noted that some lines had been refreshed, probably thanks to the Highways Steward inspecting but also GBC Parking Enforcement to ensure any ticketing would be valid. The faded lines on the Shorne side of the Country Park crossing had not been refreshed, this will be reported. The Chestnut Green and Bowesden Lane corner double yellow lines installation will take place on 27th September, we had previously been given a date prior to the Pear Tree Lane repair work but had pointed out this would cover over the newly painted lines.

- f) Park Pale parking meeting – this took place on 31st July largely to discuss the nuisance vehicles and bikers. Mrs Lindley apologised that she had not attended due to having been copied an e-mail from KCC Highways saying it would not take place but had not then realised that it was still going ahead but just with Police involvement. It had previously been reported the same KCC e-mail that KCC are considering putting double yellow lines the entire length of Park Pale. There are concerns over possible consequences of displaced parking.
- g) Pear Tree Lane resurfacing – This had started today, information received from a resident (via Facebook discussion) just prior to this meeting is that works will continue late tonight so that they can be completed today. It is unclear whether the previously marked up area of Tanyard Hill is also being repaired now, which was supposed to happen prior to the yellow lines being installed at Chestnut Green.
- h) Crown Lane near Village Surgery entrance - this had been reported previously with the verbal response from KCC that it wasn't very bad plus only a very few people lived there. It was explained that it is the road that leads to the Village Surgery and therefore actually very busy and important, and we had hoped/expected it might be repaired at the same time as Mill Hill Lane given that all the heavy equipment was being brought to the area. It was reported again with the response this time that of course they intended to repair it but at a weekend when the Surgery is closed.

11. Parking/traffic problems, Waiting restrictions and Highway modifications:

Park Pale and the Country Park area still have on going issues with parking, see sections above and below.

12. Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board:

There was a meeting on 11th September 2019 – Mr Lane and Mrs Lindley attended and Mr Lane presented to the agenda items that Mrs Lindley had previously submitted:

- a) Redroute buses – Redroute had been invited to attend but did not do so. Mr Lane wrote to them the next day and received a reply which he will circulate. Mrs Lindley had written previously on 21st February without receiving a reply.
- b) Park Pale and the Country Park area parking, and enforcement time allocation – we could not get an answer about how much enforcement time we should expect to receive or had been receiving. We were informed that enforcement team members had visited but had not found anyone parked on double yellow lines at those times. Details of the dates they had visited were requested. The main problem however is lack of enforcement of the TRO, which is a Police matter, but it is apparently extremely rare for this to be undertaken. It was also apparent that the yellow lines needed to be repainted before any tickets could be issued, which explained why that had recently happened.
- c) Yellow lines on corners near Cob Drive – The discussion at the meeting was not particularly helpful but previously Mrs Lindley had shown the area to Ben Platt (KCC Highways Steward) who had subsequently measured up for internal discussion of costs.

- d) We also requested to know when the Chestnut Green and Bowesden Lane yellow lines were to be installed. This turned out to be planned for prior to the Pear Tree Lane resurfacing so we advised that it should preferably be postponed until after the Pear Tree Lane resurfacing although the officer involved said that it didn't matter as pre-existing lines would be repainted.

13. Open Consultations:

None considered relevant

14. Closed consultations/for information:

None considered relevant

15. Matters raised by Members and attending Parishioners

- a) Mr Lane reported that a gully has collapsed on Woodlands Lane and will be repaired on the 20th September.
- b) A parishioner has reported that 2 Park Cottages still has overgrown hedges affecting the highway, they had been trimmed back a little but not enough. The Clerk will write a letter asking them to cut the hedge back fully. Mrs Lindley mentioned the previous template and protocol she had written (and will send to Mrs Poole) although she also pointed out that while SPC's involvement was good practice it can cause an extra four weeks delay to enforcement action when needed.
- c) Mrs Clifton commented about the dumped sofa and chair in the front garden at 5 Ridgeway Bungalows as reported at the Council meeting on 5th September and was asked to draft a letter.

16. Matters from other Committees being discussed for convenience

- a) Mr Lane reported that the SID consultation has closed and the report has gone to KCC. Our approach to the consultation had been commended.
- b) Mr Lane asked Mrs Lindley to expedite responding to KCC's enquiry about the previous overfunding for the highways speed survey and Mrs Lindley undertook to do so once the comments had been received on the Highways Improvement Plan, (see also 10d above) which is the presently required step in progressing alternative use of the overfunding.
- c) Mr Lane reminded that he had sent out draft meeting dates for next year for everyone to approve.
- d) Mr Lane reminded that the next litter picking sessions are: Shorne on the 28th September and Shorne West on the 20th October.

Meeting finished: 20.47

Signed by Mrs Lindley

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SINCE 19th September 2019:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20190929	1 Cheney's Cottages Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AA	Removal of part of existing hedgerow to the frontage and formation of vehicular access with new gate and formation of vehicle hardstanding.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal provided that all materials used are compatible with the location within a Conservation area. We would welcome the input of the GBC Conservation consultant about the suitability of the proposals and particularly the proposed Holly hedging, we had previously suggested that the hedging should preferably be mixed native species (which could include Holly). (Sent 14/10/19)
20190938	135 Astra Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 4QF	Erection of a single storey rear extension with a pitched roof, and erection of first floor side and front extensions.	The Parish Council notes that the application title refers to a single storey rear extension with pitched roof, as per previous application 20190390 which was refused permission, however this is not shown on the section plans and side elevations. The existing and proposed roof plans are also confusing. Assuming that this present application is in fact only for the front and side two-storey extensions, the Parish Council has no objection in principle to that proposal, provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours. (Sent 14/10/19)
20190974	18 Burdett Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HP	Erection of a single storey rear extension.	The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours. The proposal is for an 8m deep and 7.3m wide extension but it is single storey, screened from the eastern side by an existing outbuilding and for the western side is approximately the same depth as the existing house there. Therefore it should have only minimal impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. (Sent 14/10/19)
20191000	Northleigh Gravesend Road Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7DX	Application for the removal of condition 5 of planning permission reference number 20080509 for the change of use of garage/boathouse into two bed and breakfast units involving construction of new pitched roofs on proposed units, existing garage and open car port: to allow use for a hobby room and storage.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposed change of use provided that there are no objections from neighbours, however we OBJECT to the proposal to remove condition 5. The reason for our objection is that condition 5 includes a statement preventing use as permanent self-contained residential accommodation, and this clause should remain in place. (Sent 14/10/19)

20191003	Hartshill Bungalow Thong Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of an outbuilding.	<p>The Parish Council has to again OBJECT to the proposal, with the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This proposal is broadly similar to Application Ref GR/2019/0269 which was refused, and we fully support that Gravesham Borough Council decision.2. New dimensions and design: We note the slightly reduced dimensions, from approximately 21.25m wide by 8.6m deep to 17.4m by 6.6m, however this remains a very large and solid building which will impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The design of the building creates an unattractive view for occupants of the bungalow.3. Additional built area: From the plans submitted, the built area of the original bungalow was 100 sqm, to which another 100 sqm has already been added, doubling the original ground floor land take. This totals 200 sqm not the 166 sqm stated in the accompanying letter. In addition, although plans showing it have not ever been submitted, and the access stairs have only been shown on one ground floor plan (20180461), the first floor has seemingly also been converted to residential use, type of use and floor area unknown. This present proposal is to add a further 115 sqm of ancillary building (not 100 sqm as stated in the accompanying letter) plus a considerable amount of associated driveway/hardstanding, the area of which should also be taken into account as it will be lost from the useable garden.4. Residential use versus agricultural use: The proposed outbuilding is within the residential curtilage of Hartshill Bungalow and has to be evaluated solely on that basis, i.e as ancillary to a residential dwelling. However some of the proposed uses are not domestic, or of the scale usually associated with domestic use, that could reasonably be regarded as incidental or related to the enjoyment of the dwelling itself.5. Practicality of proposed location: The proposed location is at the far end of the garden, impractically distanced from the house and the main road, and the building is overall larger and more extensive in nature than would normally be considered necessary or appropriate for a residential property.6. Impact on amenity: The Google aerial view (date approximately May 2018) shows that the proposed building and associated driveway/hardstanding will impact considerably and detrimentally on the amenity of the extended bungalow and that very little garden will remain.
----------	---	---	---



Google aerial view, approximately May 2018

7. Garage and driveway: A triple garage is proposed which exceeds normal residential garage requirements (two parking spaces would be considered sufficient for a three-bedroom property) and dimensions. The location involves creating a new driveway the full length of the site for access, plus hardstanding area, both considerably encroaching on the grassed garden area and being detrimental to its amenity. We suggest that it would be much better for the amenity of the bungalow and site as a whole for the residential elements to be located much nearer to the bungalow and the road, perhaps immediately to its west or associated with the permitted parking and turning area (see 20120409) at the front of the property although this does not presently seem to be in use for that purpose.

8. Services: No services to the proposed building, or exterior lighting, are defined. There are no windows or rooflights supplying any natural light.

9. Equipment store: The size and nature of the equipment described exceeds normal requirements for the management of a residential curtilage and the design and access statement makes it clear that this equipment is for maintenance of the adjacent agricultural land. The correct location for a building to store this equipment is therefore on the agricultural land itself. Also, from the description in the accompanying letter, the need for the equipment store area is stated as temporary, which leads to a question about what that part of the building will be used for subsequently.

10. Wood store/Clothes drying/Sheltered storage: This area is 6m by 2m internally, which exceeds normal domestic provision. What is proposed is excessive in size and nature for a residential property

			<p>and poorly located as impractically far away from the bungalow it is supposed to serve.</p> <p>11. Impact on Green Belt: The proposal would create a large new permanent type of building in the Green Belt where none presently exists, and where none would normally be permitted. It would be visually intrusive with impact on the landscape and on openness.</p> <p>12. Lack of special circumstances and Lower Thames Crossing aspects: No conventional special circumstances have been put forward to justify the proposal. The accompanying letter mentions the imagined impact of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing but the plans for that are not finalised and the application for a Development Consent Order will not take place until next summer (based on presently available information). Therefore this proposal is premature as it is presently impossible to predict whether or not there will be any impact on the property or what that might be, and consequently conjecture about possible impact cannot be taken into account and used to justify the proposal. Should the LTC plans proceed, we would expect that as part of the LTC project all appropriate and necessary mitigation (e.g. regarding noise and dust control, and increased security) would be put in place prior to construction, also with relevant financial provisions or compensation. Awaiting that phase and negotiating with Highways England could be of financial advantage to the applicant and there would be adequate time once the plans have been finalised for any required planning permissions and necessary building works to be undertaken ahead of construction work beginning in the area. We also note that Highways England anyway need to be consulted about this application as the property lies within their Red Line Boundary.</p> <p>13. References to case law and other Appeal Decisions in the accompanying letter: a) Reference is made to the case law of <i>Emin vs SSE</i> (1989) but arguments on that basis have failed in other easily found Appeal decisions, e.g. APP/U2235/X/12/2177741 and APP/G3110/X/10/2143003. b) Reference is made to an Appeal decision (Ref APP/R5510/X/16/3143072 and 074) in Ruislip but examination of the original application and the Ruislip Council officers comments, plus the several subsequent applications for the same property reveal many differences: Although classed as Green Belt that property is surrounded by urban development including extensive hardstanding carparks and a large pub/restaurant; the applicant was not asking for a use relating to another piece of land; two separate buildings were being applied for (children’s playroom and domestic store) when one would have sufficed; and most importantly, examination of the present Google aerial view shows that the structures permitted on Appeal do not appear to have been built – instead the applicant has gone on to apply for extensions to the existing house. The Decision notice also states in Paragraph 6 that “...each case should be considered on the basis of the particular facts and circumstances.” Hence discussion about what happened in other, different cases and different circumstances in a different area of the country may anyway not be pertinent.</p> <p>14. Conditions if permitted: If this proposal should be permitted, we request that strong</p>
--	--	--	--

Meeting 3

			conditions should be imposed including that the building is only ancillary to Hartshill Bungalow, does not have any residential rights and cannot be used for any residential purposes or as a separate dwelling. In view of the statement concerning temporary use of the machinery store, any permission might also be temporary or personal to the applicant with a requirement to seek new permission prior to any future change of use. (Sent 17/10/19)
20191026	31 The Street Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EA	Minor alteration to the position of an existing access point to the drive to move this opening over to the west.	The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal. (Sent 14/10/19)
20191038	Landfall Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA	Enlargement to the existing dormer extension in the eastern roof slope.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal, provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours, as it should not create any additional overlooking. However, as a comment on the proposed design, we consider it would be preferable if the proposed extensions to the dormer did not extend right up to the side wall of the house but instead were a little inset (symmetrically) so as to give more of an appearance of subsidiarity to the main roof. (Sent 14/10/19)
20191071	The Lodge Watling Street Gravesend Kent DA12 5UD	Erection of a two storey rear and side extension.	Thank you for asking our opinion on this application, the site lies partly within the Parish boundary. The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours. The building is screened from wider view by woodland and there is enough on-site parking for the size of the house. (Sent 17/10/19)
Planning Inspectorate Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W /19/3235909 Gravesham Borough Council Ref: GR/2018/085 7, Appeal Ref: 2019/00057	Land between 29 and 31 The Street, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent	Demolition of the existing garage and erection of a detached no.3 bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and landscaping.	Thank you for notifying us (via Gravesham Borough Council) about this appeal. Shorne Parish Council wishes to make the following representations: 1. Shorne Parish Council and Parish: Shorne Parish Council is a Local Authority constituted under the Local Government Acts. The Parish lies to the east of Gravesend, in the Borough of Gravesham in the north-west of the county of Kent. Shorne Parish (including ancient settlements of Shorne Village, Lower Shorne, Thong/Riverview, Shorne Ridgeway and Pear Tree Lane) is located in the Green Belt. It is bounded by Chalk and the urban border of Gravesend to its west, and Higham Parish and the Medway Towns to the east. It extends from the A2 in the south to the middle of the Thames in the north. 2. Our previous representations: Our previous representations of 27th August 2018 are reproduced at Appendix A, and we request that

/REF			<p>these should also be considered as part of this Appeal response.</p> <p>We note that the application was submitted on 14th August 2018 but a “Supporting Statement” was subsequently submitted three months later on 12th November 2018, after our representations had been submitted.</p> <p>3. Additional comments in relation to this Appeal: In responding to this Appeal we would add the following comments: Planning history: The site has been the subject of several planning applications for building a house since 2006. All applications were withdrawn/refused because the designs were considered inappropriate/too large for this narrow plot in a visually sensitive location: 20061089 (withdrawn), 20070976 and 20090640 (both refused) Site condition: The present owners purchased the site in 2013, since when it has been left undeveloped and generally untended and overgrown, so occasioning adverse comments from residents (please see photographs of examples of site condition in Appendix B). Site width: There has been concern expressed regarding the true western boundary of the site at the pavement border, and this may affect the achievable site layout. We note that the neighbours have placed a wooden post at the left side of the site to show what they believe to be the correct front boundary position. Parking arrangements: We note and support the comments from the Gravesham Borough Council Highways Development Officer expressing concerns about the parking provision. The building needs to be set back further, to at least 6m, in order to prevent parked vehicles overhanging the footway. As the site is narrower at its road frontage, there will be barely enough width for two parked vehicles and these will occupy the entire frontage leaving little space to access the front door of the building or the narrow side gate. The proposed open frontage for parking is a layout not otherwise seen in the area, and there is no boundary wall or plantings to screen the vehicles from view. Additional habitable rooms/bedrooms: Although the application is for a three-bedroom dwelling, we note that there is a room on the first floor labelled “study” which appears to be 2m by 2.7m, i.e. large enough to be a fourth bedroom, whereas a similar size and perhaps more suitable area on the ground floor is shown accommodating a second dining table. There is also a space on the attic level which appears to be 2m by 2m and could also accommodate a bed. Both of these lead to concern that the actual number of bedrooms in occupation and therefore the number of occupants could be greater than expected for the stated three-bedroomed house applied for. If so this would have further negative consequences in the area as on-street parking locally is difficult and competitive.</p> <p>4. Summary and Concluding comments: We support the comments made by Gravesham Borough Council in refusing planning permission based on the plans that were submitted.</p>
------	--	--	--

Meeting 3

			<p>Our expectation had been that revised plans would subsequently have been submitted that took into account the concerns expressed and the comments about the design (which had been intended to help the applicant) that we had made in our representation to Gravesham Borough Council of 27th August 2018.</p> <p>While we would like to see the circumstances of the site resolved, we have concerns about the present application and consider that the unmodified design is unsuitable for a variety of reasons (as also stated in our previous representations, see Appendix A). We therefore request that the Appeal should be dismissed.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering our representations and comments on this application/appeal.</p>
--	--	--	--