

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee
Meeting held on 12th March 2020 in Shorne Village Hall**

PRESENT:

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

APOLOGIES:

Mr C Rea
Mr S White

Parishioners:

None in attendance

19. Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd January 2020. The minutes were **AGREED** as a true record.
20. Matters arising from the Minutes not otherwise on the Agenda. - There were no other matters arising from the minutes.

Planning:

21. Planning Applications/Issues:

- a) Park Cottages verge – Mrs Lindley had checked maps and confirmed that there is no highways verge at that location. Residents should properly maintain hedges etc from encroaching on the highway. The Clerk undertook to monitor the situation and will write to residents as needed.
- b) Apex Business Park – Mrs Lindley has raised this again with GBC enforcement by e-mail on 5th March 2020 asking for an update on the various situations. She also expressed concern about night-time light pollution as this had been raised by a parishioner.
- c) Courtlands (stable block) – Mrs Lindley reported that this had been on the agenda for the Regulatory Board on 5th February. She had attended to speak and was grateful for Mr Theobald’s support. Councillors were generally sympathetic. The applicant submitted a revised plan showing the woodland being retained. The Committee requested that strong Conditions should be attached to the approval.
- d) Courtlands (ancillary buildings) – There had been a Lawful Development Certificate application which was refused. These unfortunately have no official size limits on what can be built, which is a conflict with Green Belt designation and other local planning regulations.

GBC review the rules and check compatibility. Although they could have objected to the size and let the application go to Appeal, the only grounds for refusal that they identified were that the proposed buildings were slightly too high and within 2 meters of the boundary. The applicants immediately submitted an identical new application but with the heights and distance labelled as being compliant. There was discussion about whether or not GBC can include conditions or make it clearer about what is permitted (and therefore not permitted). Mrs Lindley wishes for application to be referred to the Regulatory Board as she considers that Councillors need to be explicitly aware as to what buildings and size are being permitted via the LDC process as these are damaging to the Green Belt.

- e) 1 Ifield Cottages – Mr Lane reported that KCC has confirmed that they own the frontage verge, they are now dealing with this.
 - f) Telephone Mast proposal in Shorne West – Mrs McCluskey reported that she had raised this with a Highways England representative (Sarah) at the recent Consultation Event at Cascades. She was told that as the area is mitigation land, any application for its use would have to be considered by the relevant HE committee but it was thought to be highly unlikely that permission would be given for a mast there. Mrs Lindley had responded to the preliminary proposal on the 10th February 2020 and received an acknowledgement but nothing since then.
 - g) Verge at Landfall, Bowesden Lane – Concerns had been raised after the new owner had suggested he would like to build a parking area on the verge opposite his house and next to Furzy Lea. That land appears to be part of his land but on the other side of the Private Road. Mrs Lindley was asked to further check this by looking at the Land Registry documents. As this is engineering works, a full planning application would be needed. Mrs Lindley had e-mailed Kevin Gore (KCC Highways Manager) on 2nd March 2020 and copied in GBC Planning, asking whether the area concerned is designated highways verge as it is coloured green on the highways maps.
 - h) Hartshill Bungalow – The third application for a large garage has been permitted, but without the equipment store for maintenance of adjacent land. The owners had also submitted another Appeal (see below). The previous enforcement notice that requires demolition of the corner of the illegal extension has not yet been actioned. The latest HE Red Line Boundary now includes the property as being scheduled for demolition.
 - i) Windsong, Pear Tree Lane – Concerns had been raised that another single-storey, flat-roofed extension is being proposed, this time at the side of the front of the building. A porch has been built but this may be permitted development. The property is already very deep and extending the full width of quite a large plot. Mrs Lindley e-mailed GBC on the 12th March 2020 asking their advice. An enforcement officer responded proposing to visit the property.
22. Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii), Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members (Previously circulated, see table below)
23. Notices of Appeal:
- a) Hartshill Bungalow, Thong Lane/Shorne Ifield Road - Appeal APP/K2230/C/19/3220892 against enforcement notice relating to previous dismissed appeal (bungalow extension) – Appeal dismissed.

- b) 1 Cheneys Cottages, Thong Lane – Householder Appeal APP/K2230/D/20/3244216 against GBC refusal of application 20190929. This was to cut a hole in the hedge and create a parking area behind it. As it is a householder appeal we are unable to submit comments but previous comments are automatically included. We had not objected as such to the proposal just about the intended hedge composition, which was we considered should instead be mixed native species.
24. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish – Lower Thames Crossing:
- a) A meeting with HE was held on 20th February 2020 attended by Mr Lane, Mr Theobald, Mrs McCluskey and Mrs Lindley but there was not really any more information provided than had already been published.
- b) There was a Consultation Event at Cascades on 27th February which most councillors were able to attend, and which did provide some useful information and clarification.
- c) Mr Lane met with KCC as GBC councillor on 3rd March. He spoke about the environmental impact on the woodland, junctions on/with the A2, the amount of land take each side of the A2, Ashenbank Woods etc. These will be included in the KCC report.
- d) Mr Lane reported that Cobham Parish Council has started doing traffic surveys for Cobham and surrounding villages that side of the A2 as they feel that HE's data is insufficient, £2,000 has been set aside for this. Mrs Lindley commented that important information that has not yet been published is the results of the ANPR surveys as they would tell us what drivers intentions are e.g. once they cross over Brewers Bridge. There was also meant to be data from mobile phone movements.
- e) Mrs Lindley reported the utility trial trenching works notification which has been sent out is very vague with regards to quantity and timings of works. They seem to be doing works alongside the A2 which resulted in them closing the footpath.
- f) Various letters have been received from HE that are incorrectly addressed, the last one being sent to the former Clerk. Mr Lane reported that one was sent to a P O Box in Dartford, which he had collected. Mrs Lindley has emailed Eva, asking for HE to make sure that letters etc are correctly addressed. The Clerk had received a letter from Caxtons which appeared to talk about land that they thought we owned which is part of the mitigation area. On checking the Land Registry reference this proved to be Crabbles Bottom which is not (at least presently) affected. Mrs Lindley has also passed this onto Eva, who reported that HE were aware of several incorrect approaches.
- g) Miss Clifton had passed some information over to Mrs Lindley regarding a group called the "Environment and Community Group Forum". Despite its name, it has no community representation and may explain why the environmental mitigation proposals had changed. This needs to be included in our Consultation response.
- h) The mobile information van was at Shorne Country Park last weekend and will be at Shorne Village Hall on the 18th March 2020. There is now less than 2 weeks to go, so Mrs Lindley asked for reminders to be placed on our Facebook page asking residents to respond to the consultation.

- i) Mrs Lindley has asked Mr Theobald to contact the Drainage Board (Priscilla at the North Kent Marshes Internal Drainage Board) concerning the ground preparation tunnel, the proposed injection of Grout and possible interference with the water supply to the Marshes.
25. Outside Parish but with impact: No new information. An update though that Medway housing development proposals are moving on rapidly for Chattenden and Hoo which they are now calling a “small town”. This will cause a further increase in local traffic and has not been factored in to the latest HE proposals.

Highways:

26. Accident reports: None reported.
27. Traffic monitoring, Speedwatch, Lorrywatch:
- a) Speedwatch – Mrs Lindley thanked Miss Clifton and the other volunteers. Five sessions have been undertaken since the last meeting. The highest speed detected was 42mph, and the most speeding cars were detected on 25th February 2020, with an average of 11 out of 96 cars/vans.
 - b) SID – this has been installed, and the first results (Tanyard Hill) have been downloaded. The results are quite complex but useful information is obtained. Vehicle numbers are broadly similar to those obtained previously.
 - c) Lorrywatch:
 - i. Pear Tree Lane, 2nd February 12.50 - a lorry which appeared to be lost travelled the full length of Pear Tree lane then turned right at the traffic lights.
 - ii. Pear Tree Lane, 20th February 16.00 – a lorry damaged trees at the bend at the top of the hill.
 - iii. Crown Lane, 4th March – a lorry caused damage to Post Office green, the pavements and road surface at Crown Lane and the bottom of Mill Hill Lane, and to road signs by Mill Hill. Police were involved. Mr Lane has been in contact with the lorry Company who have offered to pay the costs of repairs. They have asked for quotations, which has been passed to KCC and GBC. Mr Lane has asked for quotes from John Vilday and Colin Lawrence for costings to repair Post Office Green. Mr Lane had a meeting with KCC and Mr Sweetland on 30th January 2020 regarding the statutory signs, which KCC have said are all correct. In our submitted Highways Improvement Plan, we had requested eight additional “Not Suitable for HGV’s” signs. Mrs Lindley has written again to KCC asking for these signs to be installed or to be provided with costings. She will also write about Green Farm Lane, asking for clarification of the correct TRO (i.e. 7.5 tons sign or 6’6 sign, or both) and similar extra signs.
28. Road condition/highways issues and Hazards:
- a) Fallen trees during storms – several trees fell, some taking out power lines. The trees were cleared rapidly by KCC and power lines speedily repaired by Power Network engineers. Mrs Lindley wrote to KCC thanking them as considering the amount of calls they had received our problems were dealt with very quickly.
 - b) Silverdene verge – update. BT have cleared their ducts, and the situation is reported to be improved. Mrs Lindley commented that, due to there having been so much rain recently, several intermittent streams are currently flowing and will continue until dryer weather.

- c) Brewers Road/Pear Tree Lane speed reduction - This is being progressed by KCC. Mr Lane reported that he had met with KCC on 30th January and they had requested more speed monitoring in a different location, between the existing 30mph signs on The Ridgeway and Woodlands Lane, and this is presently in place. Mrs Lindley recapped that we had requested Village Entry signs between Woodlands Lane and the field gate into the Country Park, and were hoping that the 30mph limit could if possible be extended back to there, however the previous speed monitoring suggested that might not be possible as traffic is moving too fast. If the 30mph zone starts elsewhere then we would probably need two sets of entry signs. KCC had said that they would provide details of the proposed entry sign design to Bryan Sweetland but we need to see and approve them too.
- d) Forge Lane corners new yellow lines – Mrs Lindley has got everything ready to start the consultation and Mr Lane has put it on the website which will go live on Friday 13th March 2020 and this will run until the 24th April 2020. Mrs Lindley will forward all the information again to the Councillors to kindly place notices on the relevant noticeboards.
- e) Brewers Road and Pondfield area – Mrs Lindley had reported previously on the poor condition of these yellow lines. She had been in contact with KCC and GBC with a response from Nick May who had suggested that the lines only needed cleaning. He is arranging that, to be followed by reinspection. This needs to be kept under review to check that the actions have been taken.
- f) Forge Lane – walls at Crown Green properties. Mrs Poole wrote to the owners who had responded reporting that the walls are not owned by the houses. This had previously been investigated in 2001 and the walls were subsequently rebuilt by KCC. KCC reported that they had inspected the walls and consider that they are stable and do not need any action, but residents remain concerned. Mrs Lindley has contacted KCC to ask them to check again after the recent heavy rains as new cracks have been reported.
- g) Chestnut Green – road name sign defaced. Mrs Lindley reported that the recently installed sign that says Pear Tree Lane has been defaced. This should be reported and replaced but might happen again.
- h) Chestnut Green yellow lines – inconsiderate parking has been reported with vehicles encroaching on a driveway on the southern side of Pear Tree Lane. This seems to be occasional rather than regular. Overall, the situation there is much better, similar encroachment occurs elsewhere in Shorne at busy times.
- i) Hayes Terrace (Post Office Green) – possible signage improvements. Residents of Hayes Terrace had been in contact concerning poor and inconsiderate behaviour by motorists using the link to access Crown Lane. They reported a recent incident of abusive and threatening behaviour when a vehicle had to wait while an elderly resident got out of a car in order to access their house. There was a wide-ranging discussion of the options. It was reported by Mr Theobald and Mr Bugg that the hatched lines there were installed after a previous discussion with KCC. Mrs Lindley will ask KCC as to what the possibilities are from their viewpoint and will also put the matter on the updated Highway Improvement Plan.
- j) Shorne Village Centre – possible 20mph speed restriction or zone, Mr Lane had raised this with KCC. There was discussion about whether or not traffic is already slow enough for a self-enforcing zone to be implemented and the degree of benefit that is likely to result. There were various suggestions as to how speed and volume data could be obtained but formal

traffic monitoring will be needed. Mrs Lindley will add this on the Highways Improvement Plan update and ask KCC to consider the topic further.

- k) Butchers Hill sewer blockage – This had apparently started on 26th February and residents had been in contact with Southern Water. About two weeks later there was discussion on Facebook asking the Parish Council to assist as the problem was still unresolved. Mrs Lindley contacted Southern Water who said that heavier duty equipment had been needed but this had now arrived and the problems were soon resolved.
- l) Travellers in Park Pale – This problem had arisen on 1st March and there had been concern that people had been seen looking at the locks and height restriction on the Recreation Ground. This needs to be referred to Footpaths & Greens Committee, but a discussion was undertaken about buying a combination padlock this will be discussed in further detail at the relevant meeting.
- m) Parking/traffic problems at Park Pale, Waiting restrictions and Highway modifications: Since issuing the agenda, new enforcement information had been received via the Joint Transport Board. GBC reported that they had taken zero enforcement actions out of 23 visits made however the days of the week of the visits were not when problems were most likely, i.e. the visits were mostly on weekdays usually Tue/Wed. Mrs Lindley will write to GBC advising them when the likely problem days might be.

29. Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board:

- a) No meetings had been held since 23rd January, the next had been 11th March which Mr Lane had attended. He reported that Nick May does not believe there's a problem at Park pale as no tickets have been issued compared with other areas. See also 27(m) above. The Red Route buses representative again did not attend the meeting. Wrotham Road will be closed in phases for several weeks this year for concrete slab paving of the roadway, eight weeks per phase. The first phase will start in April, then in school holidays.
- b) The New KCC Highways Schemes Manager is Claire Venner.

30. Open Consultations:

- a) Lower Thames Crossing supplementary, until 25th March 2020 - <https://highwaysengland.co.uk/lower-thames-crossing-consultation2020>
- b) KCC conservation areas windows and doors, circulated, finishes 13th March 2020, Mrs Lindley will send comments.

31. Closed consultations/for information: None to record.

Any other business:

32. Matters raised by Members.

- a) Covid-19 and meetings - Mrs Lindley queried when are we going to suspend meetings due to Covid-19? A discussion took place and it was decided that all the time we have a quorum and

people are feeling OK we should carry on until officially told that we should suspend meetings.

- b) Astra Drive speeding vehicles - Mrs McCluskey raised about Astra Drive. She had attended the PAT meeting at Cascades on the 11th March 2020, and would like to get a sign post saying "SLOW". Who does she need to contact? Mrs Lindley said it would be KCC via their website.
- c) Post Office Green Telephone Box - Mr Lane asked where we are with the Telephone Box, Mrs Lindley said she had sent in a response as requested to GBC and is awaiting to hear back.
- d) Painting of railings in The Street - Mr Lane reminded that it was discussed before about painting the iron railings through The Street. Mr Bugg is getting a quote for this as we had put a budget in there if KCC are not going to do them, Mrs Lindley will first raise a query with KCC asking if they will paint them.
- e) Sinking drain cover in Michael Gardens - Mr Hardy asked how long it normally takes for Southern Water to repair a sinking drain cover after reporting to KCC. It was suggested that Mr Hardy should follow this up within a fortnight of reporting it.

33. Matters from other Committees being discussed for convenience.

- a) Telephone Mast on Shorne Common - Mr Lane reported that this is on hold at the moment and it is understood that the company are in talks with another land owner.
- b) Village Clock upgrade - Mr Lane reported that the Village Clock upgrade was also put in the budget. Mr Lane will circulate this again for attention.
- c) Padlock and chain, Crabbles Bottom - Mrs McCluskey raised that on the recent visit to Crabbles Bottom with Miss Clifton and Mrs Poole it was found that the padlock and chain for the gate were missing. Mrs McCluskey asked the committee for authorisation to purchase new ones, which was given. It was considered that a motorbike chain and combination padlock would be best.

34. Matters raised by attending Parishioners:

None in attendance

Meeting finished: 21.27

Signed by Mrs Lindley

((THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK DELIBERATELY))

PLANNING APPLICATIONS TABLE for 12th March 2020:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20191015 Permitted	Little St Katherines Forge Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3DR	Retention of single storey rear extension.	The Parish Council notes that this is regrettably a retrospective application but offers no objections. (Sent 22/01/20)
20191296 Certificate Granted	Hartshill Bungalow Thong Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of an outbuilding.	<p>This is the third application for an outbuilding at the far eastern end of the garden. The removal of the equipment store and consequent reduction in size to approximately 12.4m by 6.6m = 82sqm is noted. The Parish Council continues to have concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an application for full Planning Permission: We consider that it would be more appropriate for there to be a full planning permission application submitted for this proposal so that any approval would include the attachment of conditions of use of the proposed building as well as related to any further proposed buildings or extensions on the site. (please also see below). • Impact on Green Belt: The proposal would create a 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. • Lack of special circumstances: No conventional special circumstances have been put forward to justify the proposal, especially in this location on the site. • Inappropriate location: The proposed location remains at the far end of the garden, impractically distanced from the house and the main road. • Loss of garden and amenity space: Having a large garage in this location results in a considerable amount of garden being lost to access route with consequent reduction in amenity. • Hardstanding and composition of driveway: The plans do not show any hardstanding or discuss the composition of the driveway and area in front of the garage and these should be defined in detail. • External Lighting: No external lighting is shown on the plans so it assumed that none will be installed on the outside of the garage or along the driveway, otherwise issues of possible light pollution (in an area presently dark) will be created. • Conditions if permitted: If this proposal should be permitted (as stated, preferably as a full planning application) as a full planning application, we request that strong 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 commercial or residential purposes or as a separate dwelling. In view of the large amount of extension/building that has already occurred on the site, we suggest that it might be appropriate to withdraw permitted development rights. <p>(Sent 22/01/20)</p>

<p>20191304</p> <p>Permitted (with obscured glazing)</p> <p>(SL Declaratio n of interest, sent to Robin and John for review)</p>	<p>Mill View Mill Hill Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HA</p>	<p>Proposed loft extension forming enlarged bedroom, dressing area and bathroom and double storey front kitchen extension</p>	<p>The Parish Council does not object to the overall principle of the proposed modifications, although extensive, but has some concerns about details of the design as presently proposed:</p> <p>1) Rooflines lack of subsidiarity: The proposed two-storey front extension and front and rear dormers show rooflines level with the main roof ridge. Consideration should be given to lowering the heights by two roof tiles so that they show subsidiarity and reduce the bulk of the design, particularly of the west side elevation.</p> <p>2) Overlooking from proposed new first-floor windows: The house is set back on its irregularly shaped plot so stands close to the gardens of three surrounding houses (two on Mill Hill Lane and one on Manor Field). The proposed small windows in the first floor side elevations will overlook the gardens of the two neighbouring Mill Hill Lane properties. Consideration should be given to these windows instead having obscured glazing or being high level windows. The large window in the proposed rear dormer looks at the bedroom window of the rear neighbouring property in Manor Field. We would be grateful if this could be formally assessed for conformity with regulations for inter-building distance and angles of view. Consideration should be given to instead either also having obscured glazing or high level windows or substitution with one (as presently) or more Velux type rooflights.</p> <p>3) Incorrect drawing: The west elevation side view does not show the proposed rear dormer (Sent 21/1/20)</p>
<p>20191312</p> <p>Certificate Refused</p>	<p>Courtlands Gravesend Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JR</p>	<p>Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of 2 no. single storey outbuildings for purposes incidental to the main dwelling</p>	<p>1. The Parish Council has the following comments:</p> <p>a) The application is for a Lawful Development Certificate for the future erection of two very large new buildings within a domestic curtilage, in a Green Belt location where the construction will impact adversely on the Green Belt and its character, amenity and openness.</p> <p>b) No very special circumstances have been put forward in justification.</p> <p>c) The existing property on the site is a good size following previous extension yet the proposed ancillary accommodation greatly exceeds the area of the existing footprint.</p> <p>d) Although intended to be ancillary accommodation, the proposed buildings have been located impractically distant from the main house.</p> <p>e) The size, facilities and layout of the proposed buildings might lend themselves to being subject to commercial use or residential use/conversion.</p> <p>f) The Parish Council considers that the Lawful Development Certificate process is inappropriate for a proposal of this size, nature and location and that a full Planning Application is instead required, which would also allow for the correct conditions on use of buildings and for the overall site to be attached to any resulting permission.</p> <p>2. Regarding the submitted plans and documents we also note:</p>

			<p>a) There are discrepancies between the plans and the descriptions regarding which Outbuilding is which and what the rooms within them are to be used for.</p> <p>b) It is not clear where the pool associated plant would be located.</p> <p>c) The north elevation view of Outbuilding 1 does not appear to have a flat wall throughout.</p> <p>d) Outbuilding 1 appears to be 22m by 5m, a ground area of 110sqm rather than the 92.3sqm that has been stated.</p> <p>e) Outbuilding 2 appears to be 19m by 8m, a ground area of 152sqm rather than the 130sqm that has been stated. Additionally, the external part of the pool has not been included, but which adds a further 38sqm or more to the proposed built area.</p> <p>f) In the supporting document, several unconnected Planning Appeals are referenced and discussed. However, in Appeal Ref APP/R5510/X/16/3143072 the Decision Notice states in Paragraph 6 that “..... as an accepted principle when considering planning applications and appeals, each case should be considered on the basis of the particular facts and circumstances.”. So discussion about what happened in other, different cases and different circumstances in different areas of the country may not be deemed relevant to the present application. (Sent 21/1/20)</p>
20200013 Refused	St Katherines Forge Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3DP	Open outdoor swimming pool with small detached building for plant & services for the pool.	<p>The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal. We suggest though that conditions should be included in any permission requiring that no associated pool enclosure or additional ancillary facilities can be built without full planning permission. (Sent 22/01/20)</p> <p>Additional comment 3/2/20: There is potential for archaeological discoveries during excavations so it might be appropriate for an expert survey to be done prior plus a careful watch then kept during all excavation works. (Sent 3/2/20)</p>
20191180 Certificate Granted	Land Adjacent To 1 Ifield Cottages Shorne Ifield Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HF	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the continued use of land as domestic garden ancillary to the main dwelling.	<p>The Parish Council notes that the land ownership of the field has now been clarified and that it is cut off from the nearby agricultural land by an access track. The Parish Council does not object to the continued ancillary use as domestic garden however we request that any approval should be conditioned so that the land remains separate and different from the residential curtilage and that there should not be any development rights. (Sent 3/2/20)</p>
20200016 Prior Approval Not Required	16 Davys Place Gravesend Kent DA12 4DL	Single storey rear extension with a depth of 5.4 metres, maximum height of 4 metres and eaves height of 2.4 metres.	<i>“Larger Home Extension process” - No consultation letter</i>

20200109 Permitted	The Red House Tanyard Hill Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EN	Single storey rear extension replacing conservatory, single storey side shed extension replacing existing detached shed, replacement of front elevation garage door with window and replacement of rear elevation french casement doors and sidelights with window	The application has four sections and the Parish Council has the following comments: 1) Single storey rear extension replacing conservatory: We have concerns about the proposed design of the extension as the roof height and bulk will be greater than the existing conservatory due to the tall parapet. The design is not in keeping with the rest of the property. We would prefer to see instead either a sloping roof (from house to garden, as for the side elevation of the existing conservatory) perhaps with rooflights, an open sided flat roof with glazed lantern, or one similar to that of the proposed attached shed. 2) Single storey side shed extension replacing existing detached shed: No objection as a gap has been left to the side boundary and the front elevation shows subsidiarity to the main house 3) Replacement of front elevation garage door with window: No objection but we note the loss of two parking spaces. The front garden of the property is presently used for parking but the number of spaces and adequacy needs verification in relation to the number of bedrooms in the house. 4) Replacement of rear elevation french casement doors and sidelights with window: No objection.
20200122 Certificate refused	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Application for Lawful Development Certificate in respect of a proposed side and rear extension and enlargement of roof.	Generally we prefer applications for large extensions and modifications to be via a full planning application. The existing house is of a good size and on a large plot, with a previously permitted eastern extension and detached garage/annexe. It is distant from the neighbouring houses. The proposal has several elements and the Parish Council has the following comments (on the assumption that the proposals are permitted development): 1) 8m deep and 17m wide stepped single-storey extension across rear: No objection. 2) 6.9m deep and 8.4m wide single-storey side extension on west elevation: No objection. 3) Front and rear dormers (with windows) in original roof slope: No objection 4) Rear roof slope to gable conversion: This includes a rear facing window, the appearance is satisfactory. No objection. 5) Side gable end conversion (described as a gablet): This does not appear to be a gablet (a hipped dormer above a sloping roof) but effectively a side dormer (with window) merged with the gable end side elevation to form a small gable end. The appearance is satisfactory and we have no objection.
20200150 Pending	Springhill Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JT	Application for approval of condition 2 attached to planning permission reference no. 20191115 for retention of landscaping of rear garden forming an engineering operation including retaining walls.	The Parish Council has the following comments: The proposed planting scheme comprises six trees and some underplanting, together representing only a small amount of reinstatement in comparison to the amount of mature vegetation that was previously on the site and that the applicant has removed. We would like to see considerably more boundary plantings. The side elevation view shows trees at the rear of the house but these are not included in the plan view. We note that the two structures at the north end of the garden (long L-shaped linear, and rectangular) shown previously in plans have now been joined by an additional larger near-oblong shape. None of these are labelled on the plans and it is probable that they would require planning consent (if given) prior to being built. (Sent 27/2/20)