

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



**Meeting No 1**

## **SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL**

### **Minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2020 on Zoom**

#### **PRESENT**

Mr R Lane (Chairman)  
Mr R Theobald  
Mrs L McCluskey  
Mr R Hardy  
Ms Clifton  
Mr J Bugg  
Mrs S Lindley

#### **APOLOGIES**

Mr C Rea  
Mr S White

Parishioners in attendance: None

It is with great sadness that we note that Theresa Martin died on Saturday 16th May. Theresa was our Parish Clerk for 33 years from 1986 until her retirement last June. Mr Theobald said she was an excellent clerk, she came to us when we needed her, and she gave us very good service both diligent and conscientious. A minute's silence was held in her memory.

#### **1. To receive any declarations of interest for any items on the agenda**

None received.

(The meeting was adjourned at 20.00 to allow Members to clap for carers.)

#### **2. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

Mr R Lane was proposed by Mr R Theobald and seconded by Ms P Clifton for the position of Chairman. All agreed.

Mr R Theobald was proposed by Mr R Lane and seconded by Mrs McCluskey for the position of Vice-Chairman.

As there were no other proposals, Mr Lane was duly elected Chairman and Mr Theobald as Vice-Chairman.

Mr Lane then took the Chair.

#### **3. Appointment of Committees**

##### **(a) Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for Planning and Highways Committee**

Mrs S Lindley was proposed by Mr R Theobald and seconded by Mr R Lane for the position of Chairman.

Mr R Bugg was proposed by Mr R Theobald and seconded by Mr R Lane for the position of Vice-Chairman.

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



As there were no other proposals, Mrs Lindley was duly elected Chairman and Mr Bugg as Vice-Chairman.

## Planning & Highways Committee

Mrs Poole was asked to look into how many people should be committee members.

### (b) Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for Footpaths Properties & Greens

Ms P Clifton was proposed by Mrs L McCluskey and seconded by Mr R Lane for the position of Chairman.

Mrs L McCluskey was proposed by Mr R Theobald and seconded by Mr R Hardy for the position of Vice-Chairman.

As there were no other proposals, Ms Clifton was duly elected Chairman and Mrs McCluskey as Vice-Chairman.

## Footpaths, Properties & Greens Committee

Mrs Poole was asked to look into how many people should be committee members.

### (c) Finance & General Purposes Committee

All Councillors.

### (d) Emergency Planning

Mrs Lindley was asked to review this, as she had previously looked into this matter. The KALC template was not really relevant to Shorne, since it focussed on flooding. We had attempted previously to make a list of volunteers with chainsaws or 4WD for winter towing but had hardly any responses. KCC have produced a template and Mrs Lindley will look into this to see if it is relevant and check again on the KALC website.

## **4. Outside Bodies**

### (a) Shorne Village Hall Management Committee

Mr J Bugg and Mr R Lane were appointed. All agreed.

### (b) Gravesham Rights of Way Committee

Miss P Clifton was appointed. All agreed.

### (c) Shorne Church of England Primary School Board of Governors

Mr R Theobald was appointed. All agreed.

### (d) United Charity Committee

Miss P Clifton and Mr R Hardy were appointed. All agreed.

### (e) John Baynard's Charity

Mr R Cooper was appointed, nominated by Mr R Lane and agreed by all.

### (f) Sir Thomas Smythe's Charity

Mr R Dinnis was appointed, nominated by Mr R Lane and agreed by all.

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



(g) GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board

Mrs S Lindley was appointed, nominated by Mr R Lane and agreed by all.

(h) Rural Parishes Meetings (KALC)

Mrs L McCluskey and Miss P Clifton were appointed, nominated by Mr R Theobald and agreed by all.

(j) Parish Councils' Liaison at GBC

Mr R Lane was appointed, nominated by Mrs L McCluskey and agreed by all.

(k) Parish Report (Editor)

Mrs S Lindley was appointed, nominated by Mr Lane and agreed by all.

(l) Internal Controls (Prior to Audit)

Miss P Clifton was appointed, nominated by Mr R Lane and agreed by all.

**5. Finance – Update on approval of the Finance Figures for the Annual Audit**

Mrs Poole has sent the accounts to the new Internal Auditor Martin Thomas, but has received nothing back yet. There was a delay in sending things to him as Mrs Poole was awaiting signed copies of minutes. These have now been received and we should hear back within the next 2 weeks. Mrs Poole will report back at the next meeting.

**6. Review of the Risk Assessment**

Mr Lane circulated an updated draft Risk Assessment, based on the previously agreed version, on 13<sup>th</sup> May. This is attached below. Mr Lane considered that it is not appropriate to reopen and debate previously agreed items at the AGM unless there has been a material change. Mr Theobald said that items such as the Football Club and the village sign need to be added to the assessment. Mrs Lindley said that strictly speaking, what we have presently is a Risk Register rather than a Risk Assessment, which Mrs Lindley considers needs to be undertaken for each item identified. She suggested that it might be worth asking other local Parishes to share copies of theirs and also that internet searching tends to bring up many examples. It was proposed that a small committee is formed to review the risks and format over the coming year so that this can be agreed prior to the next AGM. Mr Theobald and Mrs L McCluskey agreed to look at this over the next year, consulting other Members as necessary.

**7. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2020**

The draft minutes were circulated for comment on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2020 and again on the 13<sup>th</sup> May including amendments from comments received. The minutes were **AGREED** and signed as a true record.

**8. Matters arising from the minutes not otherwise on the Agenda**

None.

**9. To receive a report from the Planning & Highways Committee**

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



## Planning:

Mrs Lindley submitted a table of applications that have been dealt with since 12<sup>th</sup> March. These included:

- Hartshill Bungalow – Appeal in regards to the original application 20191003
- Merrievale, Pear Tree Lane - There have been six simultaneous applications, one Planning Application and five for Lawful Development Certificates
- Cumloden, Pear Tree Lane – A new application for a garden room, and a revised application to increase the roof height of the house and to add electric gates. There is a possible discrepancy concerning ownership of highway verge.
- Landfall, Bowesden Lane – Engineering works in rear garden were undertaken without planning permission. A retrospective planning application has now been submitted, and the spoil deposited on the land/verge opposite has partly been removed after enforcement intervention, but this could cause a problem on the highways.
- Medway consultation called “Planning for Growth on the Hoo Peninsula” – Mrs Lindley has commented, as there are proposals for around 12,000 additional houses, which would result in double the volume of traffic to and from the Hoo Peninsula, environmental damage, noise, etc. There are also proposals to reintroduce passenger traffic on the Hundred of Hoo line, which could impact the PROW in Shorne.

## Highways:

- Silverdene Verge/Gullies, lower Tanyard Hill – Openreach are supposed to have cleaned out their ducts, and KCC promised that drains would be cleared on 14<sup>th</sup> May, but it is not thought that this has been carried out yet. Mrs Lindley will check with KCC.
- Manor Field, drain repair – scheduled for 26<sup>th</sup> May, which will close the road.
- Bowesden Lane – the no through road sign has been moved, thanks to Mr Lane.
- Park Pale/Brewers Road – Road signs damaged presumably by a HGV turning around.
- The Gravesham Joint Transport Board on 26<sup>th</sup> May has been cancelled.
- The Forge Lane parking consultation ended on the 24<sup>th</sup> April and Mrs Poole has put all the replies together. There were 24 responses, 23 in favour of the proposal and one neutral, with no responses against the proposal. This has now been sent to KCC for their action. Mr Lane suggested that Mrs Lindley sends a copy of the report to Nick May the Parking Manager at GBC.
- Retaining wall in Forge Lane; Mrs Lindley emailed Kevin Gore again on the 30<sup>th</sup> April after a parishioner had reported that the wall had worsened, since the last visit by KCC. Mrs Lindley still has had no response to her chasing email of 13<sup>th</sup> May, and will send a reminder.

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



- Mr Lane reported that at the last meeting Mr White raised the matter of windows fitted to the flank walls of Sirius in Green Farm Lane. This has been checked with GBC and is considered to be permitted development as it is the flank of the existing property, not the new extension.
- Ms Clifton asked about the defaced sign on Chestnut Green, Mrs Lindley will report this.
- Astra Drive Slow Sign. At the last meeting Mrs McCluskey reported that she had requested KCC to install a sign at the top of Astra Drive as the painted sign on the road is too close to the bend to make a difference. A parishioner had advised that her and her neighbour's vehicles had been damaged by vehicles. KCC has responded that they can see no record of personal injury crashes in the last three years and no pattern of collisions recorded, and people should abide by the Highway Code and not park on bends. Mrs McCluskey replied advising that her original report made no mention of crashes, and only vehicle damage to parked cars. Mrs McCluskey was asked to include this in the HIP. Mrs Lindley will add this in as it needs to be reviewed this year.

## 10. Report from the Footpaths, Properties & Greens Committee

### Crabbles Bottom:

Mrs McCluskey has put the new combination padlock and chain on the gate entrance to Crabbles Bottom, and has emailed the new combination to all Members. Mr Gozzett has collected the keys in order to cut the orchard meadow this weekend. Mrs McCluskey suggested that combination padlocks are considered for the other gates as there is less chance of keys getting lost and needing to be replaced.

Mrs McCluskey, Ms Clifton and Mrs Poole met Tom Gozzett to ask him quote to reinstate the vehicle entrance from Bowesden Lane, due to the possibility of losing access via Crutches Lane. This is a considerable sum of money, but may need to be considered if Southern Water succeeded in removing vehicular access via Crutches Lane. At present they do not seem to be pursuing this suggestion. Mr Lane felt this should not be done at present, but at least we have some idea of the costs involved.

Mr Gozzett has also quoted to remove all dead wood and carry out a light pruning of the orchard area, and to remove the broken branches which are on the ground. All wood chip and logs will be moved to designated places for habitat piles. We should get other quotations if we decide to proceed with these works. Mr Lane asked what the purpose was for, Mrs McCluskey said the trees were not in a good way and it would be nice to get some Parishioners working like they have in New Ash Green with the Community Orchard Team. Ms Clifton said it was in the report that was done a few years back when Martin Redfern was on the council that advised light pruning should be undertaken. Ms Clifton will speak to Jerry at the Community Orchard Team.

### Mill Hill Play Area:

Mrs McCluskey reported that GBC had already taped off the play equipment, and Shorne Parish Council affixed COVID-19 signage following the previous meeting. Mrs McCluskey has contacted John Vilday with regards to the annual maintenance at Mill Hill play area. He will be checking on pricing as he has said that some suppliers

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



have increased their prices during the crisis, otherwise he will obtain and spread the bark next week. Mr Lane reported that the paintwork of the play equipment was in a very poor state considering this was only done last year.

Ms Clifton reported that GBC had been to cut the grass verges at the recreation ground, the picnic area at Shorne Common Rough. When they attempted to cut Shorne Common it was found that the gate was locked and only Mr Dore had a key. Mr Lane has been in contact with Mr Dore, who reported that he had changed the padlock as it was damaged, but that he had provided Mr Fish with a key. Mr Dore has agreed to have the key copied for the Parish Council. We will issue a copy to Mr Fish if required.

## Grass verges:

Colin Lawrence has carried out three cuts of the grass verges already this year and another is planned this week.

## Tree Work at Shorne Common Rough:

GBC have now given consent to the tree work in Woodlands Lane. NPC have advised that they now have their own cherry picker so they can start immediately. Mr Lane said that we must only carry out the work to trees on our land. Mrs Poole has sent a letter to the owner of Venesta advising him of the dead trees on his land adjacent to NS162.

## Memory Trees:

Once lockdown measures have been lifted, Mrs McCluskey would like to purchase the tree to plant in memory of our dear friend Nick Lance, and we need to decide where we should put this. Also, in light of recent sad news regarding Theresa Martin, Mrs McCluskey proposed that we also plant one in her memory. Mrs McCluskey suggested somewhere in the village. Mr Lane and Mr Theobald agreed to this. Mr Bugg said we need to make sure we can maintain them after they are planted. Mr Theobald suggested maybe a bench and plaque may be more appropriate. Mrs McCluskey asked for ideas and suggestions to be discussed at the October finance meeting.

## Timber Butts:

Mrs McCluskey reported that we require at least three replacement timber butts; one at Mill Hill play area, and two in Shorne Common Rough adjacent to Woodlands Lane. Once lockdown measures have been lifted, Mrs McCluskey will request Shorne Country Park to provide them and ask John Vilday to install them.

## Shorne Common Rough

Mr Lane and Ms Clifton witnessed a group of men digging holes and constructing BMX ramps in Shorne Common Rough on 12<sup>th</sup> May. Mr Lane told them that they had no right or permission to do this and were requested to stop. Their response was not receptive. The matter was reported to the Police, and PCSOs Hartley and Ferrara attended site on 14<sup>th</sup> May, and took some photographs and wrote a report. A letter has been sent to Dartford Rebores, as their van was being used by some of the offenders. John Vilday has been asked to quote to fill in the recent holes.

Mr Hardy asked why the swings have been removed in Michael Gardens Play Area, Mrs McCluskey confirmed that they are being replaced with new ones.

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



Mr Lane reported that Higham PC has published in their annual report that they have been given funding by GBC, and perhaps we need to think of our play area in Mill Hill Lane to see what we can obtain something similar.

## 11. Finance Report

Date	Description	Amount	VAT	Total	B/F
	Precept Received				£38,127.00
01/04/2020	BACS Open Space	£45.00	£0.00	£45.00	£38,082.00
01/04/2020	BACS All Seasons Garden	£85.00	£0.00	£85.00	£37,997.00
01/04/2020	BACS S Poole March Salary	£776.42	£0.00	£776.42	£37,220.58
01/04/2020	BACS S Poole Expenses, Stamps, Stationery, Refreshments	£175.58	£1.65	£177.23	£37,043.35
01/04/2020	BACS KALC	£851.72	£170.34	£1,022.06	£36,021.29
02/04/2020	DD Vodafone	£36.36	£7.28	£43.64	£35,977.65
06/04/2020	DD Nest Pension Mar	£57.52	£0.00	£57.52	£35,920.13
20/04/2020	DD Eslip	£19.00	£3.80	£22.80	£35,897.33
28/04/2020	BACS Nothing but Padlock	£75.21	£15.04	£90.25	£35,807.08
28/04/2020	BACS Shorne Village Hall Qtr 1	£109.00	£0.00	£109.00	£35,698.08
28/04/2020	BACS Mr B Lane Expenses	£130.99	£11.61	£142.60	£35,555.48
30/04/2020	BACS S Poole April Salary	£785.18	£0.00	£785.18	£34,770.30
		£3,146.98	£209.72	£3,356.70	
05/05/2020	DD Vodafone	£27.64	£5.53	£33.17	£34,737.13
07/05/2020	DD Nest Pension April	£57.52	£0.00	£57.52	£34,679.61

### (a) Annual Audit

It was reported that Mrs Poole had delivered everything over to Martin Thomas our Internal Auditor, after our last meeting when we agreed this was to go to him once signed minutes were received. Some queries have been made but Mrs Poole is dealing with these.

### (b) Precept for 2020/2021 (Paid directly into Lloyds TSB)

Mrs Poole has also reported that she has now started her SLCC course, which has been brought online. Her first session on zoom was held on Tuesday. This will take around 15 months to complete. Once completed this means that Mrs Poole will hold a professional Clerks certificate for local council.

## 12. Update on Annual Report

Mrs Lindley has circulated a draft copy of the Annual Report for comments. As requested at the previous meeting, Mrs Poole sent a final reminder that all reports must be received by the Clerk by 1st May, otherwise they will be omitted from the Annual Report. Mrs Lindley subsequently sent out a further reminder, and we are now only awaiting a report from Shorne Woods Country Park which has been promised for tomorrow (22<sup>nd</sup> May).

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



## 13. Update on Telephone Kiosk at Post Office Green

Mrs Lindley has emailed Mrs Waterman regarding this, and she has responded to say she hasn't heard anything else, but the cut-off date for BT was the 19<sup>th</sup> April.

## 14. To consider approval to replace gate at Shorne Recreation Ground

Mrs McCluskey reported that the gate is in a state of disrepair and needs replacing. AGS-Hoarding has quoted for both a wooden and a metal gate, which has been circulated to Members. AGS offer a 3-year guarantee against the timber gate and posts and a 5-year guarantee against the steel post set. The guarantees excludes misuse, damage, etc. Mrs McCluskey has checked online and the prices appear to be very competitive to other gates available. GBC has confirmed that as we are replacing the existing gate at the Recreation Ground, we do not need planning consent with regards to it being in a conservation area, irrespective of the material chosen. Mr Theobald and Ms Clifton expressed their preference for a timber gate. It was **agreed** that Ms Clifton will proceed with the timber gate option, provided that it is pressure treated.

## 15. To consider approval to proceed with upgrade to clock outside Village Hall

Mr Lane circulated a note on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2020, with a quotation to upgrade the clock on the outside of the Village Hall. The quotation is for a synchronous movement which automatically restarts the clock after a power interruption and automatically resets itself to the correct time. It also automatically adjusts for GMT and British Summer Time. Smith of Derby have confirmed this week that the quote is still valid, and that the existing 5 amp spur circuit is suitable. It was **agreed** to proceed with the proposal.

## 16. To consider Mr Theobald's report on the railings in The Street and agree actions

Mr Theobald circulated a report on the railings in The Street on the 13<sup>th</sup> May, with a draft specification. Mrs Lindley has reported that the railings need repainting to KCC, but has not heard from them. Mr Lane proposed that if KCC is not prepared to take responsibility then the Parish Council should obtain quotes to do this. It was **agreed** that Mr Theobald and Mr Bugg would prepare the specification and obtain quotations for approval by Members, or at the Finance Committee as required.

## 17. To approve a donation to the Kent Rural Pop Up café initiative

At the Finance Meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2019, Members agreed in principle to make a £100 donation to Rural Kent Pop Up Café, rather than pay a subscription and join Rural Kent. It was **agreed** for the Mrs Poole to send the donation of £100. Mr Lane asked Members to consider any other donations that the Parish Council may wish to make.

## 18. To consider options for bus shelters, including possible consultation

Mr Lane circulated a note on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2020, regarding the Parish Council-owned bus shelters. Ms Clifton has obtained an indicative price for a new bus shelter (excluding demolition and site preparation costs) and Mrs Poole has obtained details of KCC's Bus Shelter Grants Scheme. Mr Lane asked members to consider any actions that should be taken. Mr Lane said in view of the significant costs involved, we would need to carry out a consultation before making any firm decision.

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



Mr Theobald expressed concern that we are considering pulling down two perfectly serviceable bus shelters and replacing them with wooden shelters that would not last long. Mr Lane said that the existing shelters are over 60 years old, subject to misuse, and do not appear to be fit for purpose in today's environment. Modern timber shelters have a 50 year life expectancy. In any event, this is on the agenda to consider options, not to make firm decisions. Following further discussions, it was agreed that other options were to be circulated to Members, together with a possible consultation questionnaire, to enable proposals to be considered at the Finance meeting in October.

## 19. Update on the proposed mobile phone masts

Nothing further to report.

## 20. Update on Shornemead level crossing

Nothing further received from Network Rail. Mr Theobald presumes that it is progressing as per our meeting with them. KCC are due to put another notice on the crossing extending the closure, but it needs to be signed by the Secretary of State. Mr Theobald will contact them.

Mr Lane reported that the Police and PSCOs are having to attend the site because motorbikers are using bolt cutters to cut the chain off. Officers then have to stay there until Network Rail arrive to replace the chain. The risk is if this keeps happening then Network Rail will weld the gate shut. Police issued a number of Section 59 and penalty notices to motorbikers in the area last weekend.

## 21. Update on Lower Thames Crossing

Mrs Lindley reported that the Archaeology and Trial Trenches/Boring studies are still in progress. A number of people are upset about the crops being killed off, and there has been considerable speculation on Facebook about this, not always accurate.

The feedback from the legacy workshop attended by Ms Clifton and Mr Theobald has been circulated. Mrs Lindley has queried that the tables included an impractical suggestion for Shorne Mead to be used for recreational watersports and commented that some of the suggestions applied to multiple geographical areas. They intend to hold further workshops and she asked for Shorne to have a place on each one, with decisions about who would attend which to be made later.

Mrs Lindley reported that KCC has provided her with a copy of their submission to the 2020 consultation but this did not adequately address the potential impacts on the marshes water supply issues. Bodies like the Environment Agency have been involved but their input tends to be at high level. She had received a follow-up response from KCC saying that the hydrological impacts would be considered for the Environmental submission for the DCO but she thought that to be very late in the process.

Mrs McCluskey reported that she emailed Eva Simunovic last week due to Highways England vehicles crossing the footpaths again near Claylane Wood at the back of Michael Gardens, without any signage to say they were working. Mrs McCluskey is concerned that with the increase of foot traffic due to the current situation an accident might occur. Eva has responded that she will pass this onto the relevant department.

# Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



## **22. To receive any report from Borough Councillor R Lane**

Mr Lane reported that GBC held its Annual Meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2020 by video, this was limited to Cabinet and Shadow Cabinet members. Cllr John Caller was made Mayor, and Cllr Lyn Milner is Deputy Mayor. This year's programme of committee and Council meetings has resumed by video conferencing. However, the Regulatory Board (now renamed the Planning Committee) on 20<sup>th</sup> May and the Joint Transport Board scheduled for 26<sup>th</sup> May have been cancelled due to lack of business, and the meeting of Parish Council Chairmen scheduled for 27<sup>th</sup> May has also been cancelled.

## **23. To receive any report from County Councillor B Sweetland**

No report received.

## **24. Correspondence requiring action.**

Email sent to Mr Lane from Cobham Parish Council regarding a joint letter to the Secretary of State to assist KCC in obtaining enforcement powers under Section 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and to implement lorry control zones. Mr Lane said that Cobham PC have invested a lot of time and money into traffic concerns. We need to be consider whether any recommendations from this would have an adverse impact on traffic in Shorne.

An email has been received from a resident regarding tree felling in Court Wood. Mrs Lindley is attending to this but it is difficult to work out which house is involved. However the photographs received seemed to show partially coppiced woodland.

## **25. General matters raised by Members for discussion**

- Mr Lane reported a disturbance in the Village Hall car park on 19<sup>th</sup> May caused by a people in a parked car sniffing nitrous oxide. Police have been informed.
- Mr Lane reported that there was considerable motorbike noise disturbance from Park Pale on 20<sup>th</sup> May. This has been reported to the Police.
- Mrs McCluskey reported that a new sign is required for Shorne Recreation Ground. Ms Clifton will agree the wording for this, and Mrs McCluskey will see if this can be obtained from a local contact.

**Date of next meeting.** Mr Lane asked if Members were happy to continue with the combined format for the present, and Members agreed. The next meeting will take place at 19.45 on 25<sup>th</sup> June on Zoom.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.01pm.

Signed Mr Lane:.....

Dated:.....

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



## Shorne Parish Council

### Risk Assessment

Shorne Parish Council has identified risks to areas over which it has total and direct control. Action in place is recorded which includes insurance. Insurance cover is annually renewed by the Council and adjusted according to need. This document will be reviewed annually in May.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b><u>Equipment</u></b>		
Play Equipment on Shorne Common	Wear, Tear and Vandalism Loss Personal injuries by members of the public	Annually inspected by Gravesham Borough Council. Play equipment and surface periodically maintained by Shorne Parish Council. Covered by insurance.
Play Equipment at Shorne West	Wear, Tear and Vandalism Loss Personal injuries by members of the public	Gravesham Borough Council owns the Play Equipment and is responsible for inspection and maintenance. Shorne Parish Council informs Gravesham Borough Council of any issues observed or reported
Notice Boards	Unauthorised or inappropriate use; Wear, Tear, Vandalism, Loss; Personal injuries by members of the public	Periodic inspections carried out; Maintenance and repairs carried out by Shorne Parish Council as and when required.
Automated External Defibrillator (AED)	Loss, damage, or inoperability	Covered by insurance. Weekly and monthly inspections carried out by Village Hall.
Speed Indicator Devices (SID)	Loss, damage, or inoperability	Covered by insurance. Monthly inspections carried out.
Bus Shelters on A226 Shorne Crossroads. At junction of Tanyard Hill and Racefield Close	Wear, Tear and Vandalism Loss Cleanliness Personal injuries by members of the public	Covered by insurance. Shorne Parish Council carries out periodic inspections. Gravesham Borough Council pressure washes bus shelters on request.
Purchase of new and replacement of old Capital Equipment	Equipment and/or services are purchased unnecessarily or at higher cost than necessary	Asset register maintained Financial regulations require that all purchases are approved by Shorne Parish Council, and that 3 quotations are obtained before major expenditure.

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



IT equipment  (Note: Laptop and printer facilities are provided by the Clerk.)	Equipment failure leading to urgent replacement need; IT security issues, failure of storage/back-up.  Departure of the Clerk could result in loss of IT facilities and loss of data.	Urgent equipment replacement if required will be agreed and then recorded at the next meeting. Anti-virus software will be installed and maintained on all relevant devices. Essential that back-up storage drives are used for Parish Council business.
<b><u>Property</u></b>  Village Hall Car Park and surrounding garden border	Wear, tear and vandalism. Drainage and cleanliness. Personal injury by members of the public	Shorne Parish Council carries out periodic inspection and maintenance as required. "No Skateboarding or Ball Games" sign displayed.
Recreation Ground	General upkeep of perimeter fence Personal injury by members of the public. Unauthorised vehicle entry or occupation	Shorne Parish Council carries out periodic inspection and general maintenance. Gates are kept locked with restricted key-holders to prevent unauthorised entry or occupation.
Scout Hut and Surrounding Land	General upkeep Vandalism Personal Injury	The Scout Hut is owned by the Scouts and is their responsibility.
Shorne Common  Mill Hill Car Park	General Maintenance Third Party Injuries Anti-social behaviour Night time misuse	Shorne Parish Council carries out periodic inspection and general maintenance. Chestnut butts and gate locked at night
Shorne Common Rough	General Maintenance Third Party Injuries Unauthorised vehicle entry or occupation	Shorne Parish Council carries out periodic inspection and general maintenance. Chestnut butts at entrances to prevent unauthorised vehicle access to interior
Land South of Lower Crabbles Wood (Crabbles Bottom)	General Maintenance Third Party Injuries Unauthorised vehicle entry or occupation	Shorne Parish Council carries out periodic inspection, general maintenance and treating of ragwort as required. Vehicle gates kept locked and fence repaired as required
Trees on Parish Properties	Risk of damage or injury	Tree Management Plan
<b><u>Footpaths</u></b>	General Maintenance Third Party Injuries	Shorne Parish Council reports defects and advises landowners when appropriate.

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



<p><b><u>Personnel</u></b></p> <p>Parish Clerk</p>	<p>Personal Injury Long Term Sick</p>	<p>Covered by insurance. In the event of the Clerk being indisposed for an extended period, consider a temporary appointment.</p>
<p>Parish Councillors and Co-Opted Personnel</p>	<p>Personal Injury</p>	<p>Covered by Norris &amp; Fisher Insurance</p>
<p><b><u>Financial</u></b></p>	<p>Keeping proper financial records in accordance with statutory requirements Ensuring all business activities are within legal powers applicable to Local Councils Ensuring that all requirements are met under employment law and Inland Revenue regulations Ensuring all requirements are met under Customs &amp; Excise regulations (especially VAT) Ensuring the adequacy of the annual precept within sound budgeting arrangements Ensuring the proper use of funds granted to local community bodies under specific powers or under section 137 Proper, timely and accurate reporting of council business in the minutes Responding to electors wishing to exercise their rights of inspection Meeting the requirements for Quality parish status or other accreditation Proper document control Register of members' interests and gifts and hospitality in place, complete, accurate and up to date</p>	<p>Regular scrutiny of financial records and proper arrangements for the approval of expenditure Recording in the minutes the precise powers under which expenditure is being approved Regular returns to the Inland Revenue; contracts of employment for all staff, annually reviewed by the council, systems of updating records for any changes in relevant legislation Regular returns of VAT; training the responsible officer in matters of VAT and other taxation issues as necessary Regular budget monitoring statements Developing systems of performance measurement Procedures for dealing with and monitoring grants or loans made Minutes properly numbered and paginated with a master copy kept in safekeeping</p>

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



<b><u>Major Disaster</u></b>	Severe loss of amenities/services in the Parish of Shorne	Responsibility lies with statutory agencies/providers. All available Councillors to form Emergency Committee to identify resources and urgent needs, and to assist and liaise as required and possible in the circumstances.
<b><u>Pandemic</u></b>	Risk of infection. Restrictions on public recreation.  Parishioners unable to access essential services.  Parish Council unable to meet to discharge its functions.	Suspend all PC meetings and assemblies. Close off play equipment. Adhere to current government advice and restrictions. Responsibility lies with statutory agencies and providers. Parish Council to ensure known urgent cases are referred to statutory agencies. Meetings to be held by video conference.

Shorne Parish Council reviewed the above Risk Assessment document at the Full Council Annual General Meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2020.

Note: It was agreed to form a small committee to review the content and format of the Risk Appraisal over the next few months. Other potential items that may need to be included are:

- Any risks associated with the lease of the football ground at Shorne Recreation Ground;
- Any risks associated with the village sign.

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



**PLANNING APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH from 12<sup>th</sup> March 2020 to 20<sup>th</sup> May 2020:**

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20200204 <b>Refused</b>	1 Genesta Glade Gravesend Kent DA12 4PR	Erection of a front extension and two side dormer extensions	<p>The Parish Council wishes to make the following comments:</p> <p>The building is situated well forward of the building line of other nearby properties except for that immediately opposite. Building a front extension, at two storeys, could adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties and be detrimental to the street scene by reducing the sense of openness in the area. We could not find examples of two-storey front extensions being permitted previously in the three cul-de-sac roads of bungalows and OBJECT to this aspect of the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal involves building full-width box dormers on both sides of the existing pitched roof. To the best of our knowledge, only one application for such a design has previously been made and permitted in the immediate area (see application ref 20190130) however that property is one that borders the fields on one side so only affects one neighbouring property, from which it has a good separation distance.</p> <p>On both elevations but particularly the northern side, there would be first floor windows of habitable rooms that look directly at the neighbouring properties which are close. This could adversely affect their privacy particularly if they also wanted to install roof dormers at some point so, if the application is going to be permitted, consideration should be given to this aspect of the proposed window designs by requiring that they should be high level windows or have obscured glass.</p> <p>(Sent 18/3/20)</p>
20200176 <b>Pending</b>	The Barn East Court Farm Church Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 2NL	Erection of two storey extension joined by glazed link to existing dwelling for use as home gym with ancillary facilities and with guest bedroom suite over and ensuite bathroom	<p>Thank you for asking the opinion of Shorne Parish Council on this application which lies just outside the Parish Boundary but could have adverse visual and landscape impact on Parish areas, including on openness of the Green Belt. We have the following comments:</p> <p>The proposal refers to an extension but the proposed additional, two-storey building is actually and effectively, or easily capable of being, a separate dwelling. The dimensions appear to be substantial at 6.2m high and 13.5m by 6m in area (81sqm).</p> <p>The Barn has only a very small garden, commensurate with its conversion from agricultural use. This additional building will be detrimental to the size of the garden available and therefore the amenity</p>

# Shorne Parish Council

## Borough of Gravesham



			<p>of the main dwelling, resulting in a cramped and overdeveloped site.</p> <p>The proposed building will be much deeper than the existing barn conversion and located in the Green Belt where new buildings are not normally permitted. It will therefore have visual impact, be generally detrimental and cause a reduction in openness. No special circumstances have been put forward to justify the proposal.</p> <p>Should it however be permitted, there should be very strong conditions imposed that it is only an annexe ancillary to the main house, preventing its use for long-term accommodation or as a separate dwelling, or for any commercial purpose.</p> <p>(Sent 18/3/20)</p>
20200137  <b>Refused</b>	135 Astra Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 4QF	Erection of first floor front and side extensions	<p>The submitted drawings appear unchanged from previous planning application 20190938 which was refused permission, hence all the same grounds for refusal will apply.</p> <p>(Sent 11/03/20)</p>
20200151  <b>Refused</b>	Marlings 409 Valley Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 5UE	Installation of two access gates to the front of the property to give access to the off road parking.	<p>Thank you for asking our opinion on this application, the property lies immediately adjacent to the parish boundary.</p> <p>We note that the height of the gates is not stated.</p> <p>The property lies at the very busy corner of Marling Way, at its junction with Valley Drive. Our only concern is over pedestrian and vehicle safety relating more to the north side gate as vehicles will not be able to pull fully off the roadway and pavement while seeking access or waiting for the gates to be opened.</p> <p>(Sent 11/03/20)</p>
20200235  <b>Certificate Refused</b>	7 Burdett Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HP	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed construction of a dormer extension in the rear roof slope and conversion of the roof	<p>This property has previously had a two-storey rear extension and the previously added double garage converted to habitable use.</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to aspects of the proposed design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is for a loft conversion by means of a full width dormer, which does not show subsidiarity in the horizontal plane.</li> <li>• The dormer/loft extension extends partly over the previous two-storey extension, which has</li> </ul>

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



		space into habitable rooms.	<p>a pitched roof.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A balcony is proposed which could give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties, particularly as the property is already taller than its neighbours and the land fall away to the west and north.</li> <li>The total number of bedrooms appears to be the same but one has been greatly increased in size allowing a greater number of people to potentially reside in the house. The house has only a narrow depth of frontage and the previous garage conversion has halved the number of parking places to two. Burdett Avenue is very narrow and on-street parking (usually half on the pavement) causes problems for both vehicles and pedestrians. The parking arrangements are unlikely to be suitable or sufficient for the further extended house.</li> </ul> <p>(Sent 11/03/20)</p>
20200155  Permitted	Forge Cottage Forge Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3DP	Erection of a two storey side extension.	<p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application, subject to there not being any valid objection from the neighbouring property.</p> <p>We would request though that the amount of glazing on the first floor of the side extension should be reviewed as it will be visible from the roadway. We consider that a more traditional appearance at this level would be more in keeping with the existing property and the Green Belt location.</p> <p>(Sent 11/03/20)</p>
20200298  Pending	15 The Street Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EA	Replacement of double hung timber sash windows.	<p>The Parish Council has no objection providing that the window designs meet the GBC Conservation Area standards and are acceptable to the Borough's Conservation adviser.</p> <p>(Sent 28/3/20)</p>
20200316  Permitted	Mill View Mill Hill Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HA	Application for non material amendment to planning permission reference no. 20191304 to allow change of facing brickwork to hanging tile and render to ground floor	<p>The Parish Council has no objection to the proposed changes which will be visually more in keeping with other properties in the area.</p> <p>We note that the decision notice for application 20191304 required in point 4 that the new windows (on the west and east side elevations and of the rear dormer on the south elevation) should have obscured glazing however this is not indicated as being such on the presently submitted plans. This point should perhaps be reiterated in any permission arising from this present application.</p> <p>(Sent 28/3/20)</p>

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



		brickwork	
20200324  Certificate Refused	7 Burdett Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HP	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed construction of a dormer extension in the rear roof slope and conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms.	<p>This application is a reapplication based on Ref 20200235, which was refused. The Parish Council notes that the only alteration from the previous application appears to be that the previous attic balcony has been pulled back to become instead a Juliette balcony with glass balustrade.</p> <p>Accordingly, our previous comments are repeated:</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to aspects of the proposed design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is for a loft conversion by means of a full width dormer, which does not show subsidiarity in the horizontal plane.</li> <li>• The dormer/loft extension extends partly over the previous two-storey extension, which has a pitched roof.</li> <li>• A Juliette balcony with glass balustrade is proposed which could give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties, particularly as the property is already taller than its neighbours and the land falls away to the west and north.</li> <li>• The total number of bedrooms appears to be the same but one has been greatly increased in size allowing a greater number of people to potentially reside in the house. The house has only a narrow depth of frontage and the previous garage conversion has halved the number of parking places to two. Burdett Avenue is very narrow and on-street parking (usually half on the pavement) causes problems for both vehicles and pedestrians. The parking arrangements are unlikely to be suitable or sufficient for the further extended house.</li> </ul> <p>(Sent 28/03/20)</p>
20200211  No letter  Certificate Granted	Courtlands Gravesend Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JR	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>This is a re-application, identical to application ref 20191312 except that the distance from the boundary and the roof heights have been indicated. The Planning Statement has not been corrected.</p> <p>We wish to again OBJECT to the proposal and therefore re-submit the same comments as made previously – please see second page below.</p> <p>The GBC Officer Delegated Report and subsequent decision of 13th February 2020 on application 20191312 are noted. The grounds given for refusal of the Certificate concerned the distance from the boundary and the roof heights, however we consider that the sizes of the proposed buildings are excessive. The Lawful Development framework does not specify a size limit, which is a deficiency.</p>

Shorne Parish Council  
Borough of Gravesham



			<p>We consider that outbuildings should be proportionate to the ground floor area of the original house and suggest that the “One third rule” should also be applied to such applications in the Green Belt.</p> <p>We therefore request that this application should be refused.</p> <p>Should Officers however be minded to grant permission, we request that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The application should be referred to the Regulatory Board for discussion and confirmation of the decision.</li><li>• A paragraph should be included in any decision notice stating clearly the limits of the scope of the Certificate, i.e. that the Certificate conferred only covers what has been applied for and that the buildings therefore: are only an annexe to the Courtlands house; cannot be used for residential purposes or as a separate dwelling; cannot be joined together; cannot be subject to any change of use or used for any commercial purpose; cannot be repositioned or extended; and the pool cannot be enclosed. Any of the forementioned would require a further planning consent.</li></ul> <p>Comments previously submitted for Application ref 20191312 and hereby re-submitted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Parish Council has the following comments:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li><li>b) No very special circumstances have been put forward in justification.</li><li>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.</li><li>d) Although intended to be ancillary accommodation, the proposed buildings have been located impractically distant from the main house.</li><li>e) The size, facilities and layout of the proposed buildings might lend themselves to being subject to commercial use or residential use/conversion.</li><li>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,</li></ol></li></ol>
--	--	--	--

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



			<p>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.</p> <p>(Sent 1/4/20)</p>
<p>20200307</p> <p>Permitted</p>	<p>The Old Parsonage Butchers Hill Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EB</p>	<p>Construction of a garage and drive from Butchers Hill with demolition of an existing timber store building.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has the following comments:</p> <p>1. The property has a large house on extensive grounds, and there is room for the proposed new building.</p> <p>2. The previous permitted application 20160930 was for a three-car garage instead of an existing two-car garage. This proposal adds 6 spaces (four of which are the less practical two-car tandem arrangements) making a total of eight garage spaces, which is a large number for routine domestic use.</p>

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



			<p>3. The re-orientation of the access to the existing two-car garage and the re-fencing is noted. It appears from the plans that the new access route to the existing garage might be partly obstructed for vehicular use by a corner of the proposed new building.</p> <p>4. With the part-buried design and green roof (conditions about maintenance are required), the visual impact will be low however we request that minimising any visibility from Shorne Ifield Road should also be considered within the proposed planting scheme, as well as from Butchers Hill.</p> <p>5. An archaeological assessment and watching brief might be indicated.</p> <p>6. We note that this part of Butchers Hill is an unmade road and that increased traffic could adversely affect the surface (which is generally already in poor condition) and the safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>7. The width and design of the gates to Butchers Hill should be clarified. The gates (and the driveway) appear to be 4m wide, which seems a little wider than should be necessary, and these could perhaps be reduced.</p> <p>8. The plans do not show any exterior lighting so it is assumed that there will not be any, particularly during hours of darkness, otherwise light pollution could be an issue.</p> <p>9. If the application is to be permitted, we request there should be conditions imposed that the proposed building is only a garage ancillary to the main house, that it cannot be used as living accommodation or as a separate dwelling, or for any commercial purpose.</p> <p>10. We also request a condition to be included that the planning consent granted under reference GR/2016/0930 should not be exercisable in addition to the development applied for under this present application.</p> <p>(Sent 14/04/20)</p>
20200345	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Demolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of a two storey side extension	<p>This is a good sized house with previous large single storey extension and outbuildings, set well back on a large plot.</p> <p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposed extension, which replaces a similarly sized, previously permitted single storey side extension in the same location.</p> <p>We request that the ridge height of the proposed extension should be the same as the equivalent</p>

# Shorne Parish Council

## Borough of Gravesham



			<p>roof ridge of the existing house in order to create symmetry.</p> <p>In view of the multiple applications presently submitted and the overall amount of building proposed on the site, we suggest that permitted development rights should be withdrawn, and that this permission should not be exercisable together with any part of LDC application 20200349.</p> <p>(Sent 24/04/20)</p>
20200348	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Single storey rear extension with a depth of 8.00 metres, maximum height of 4.00 metres and eaves height of 2.85 metres.	<p>This is a good sized house with previous large single storey extension and outbuildings, set well back on a large plot.</p> <p>The application refers to “extension” (i.e. singular) but two are shown on the plans.</p> <p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to these proposed extensions but notes that they would themselves almost double the floor area of the original house, which already has a substantial single storey extension of approximately 50%.</p> <p>(Sent 24/04/20)</p>
20200349	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Application for Lawful Development Certificate in respect of a proposed erection of single storey side extensions to both sides.	<p>This is a good sized house with previous large single storey extension and outbuildings, set well back on a large plot.</p> <p>We note that this application would require demolition of a previously permitted extension on the east side of the house and also conflicts with application 20200345, a separately submitted planning application for a two-storey side extension on the eastern side.</p> <p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to these proposed extensions, however we also have the following comments and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed extensions would double the floor area compared to the existing house.</li> <li>• We would prefer for the proposed front window of the former loggia to match the existing windows</li> <li>• We would prefer for extension “B” to be set slightly back at the front in order to show subsidiarity.</li> </ul> <p>(Sent 24/04/20)</p>
20200350	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne	Application for a Lawful Development	<p>This is a good sized house with previous large single storey extension and outbuildings, set well back on a large plot and separated from the nearest house (Crows Nest, to the east) by a strip of</p>

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



	Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a swimming pool building	woodland. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal but suggests that the swimming pool and gym should be amalgamated into one building, in the interest of conserving openness on the site. (Sent 24/04/20)
20200352	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of an outbuilding for use as a gym and well being suite.	This is a good sized house with previous large single storey extension and outbuildings, set well back on a large plot. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal but suggest that the gym and swimming pool should be amalgamated into one building, in the interest of conserving openness on the site, which could otherwise become cluttered. (Sent 24/04/20)
20200353	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed the alterations to the roof from hip to gable and construction of two dormer windows in the side roof slope, one dormer extension in the rear roof slope with conversion of the roof space into habitable rooms, insertion of a window on the flank elevation and skylights on the front and west roof slopes.	This is a good sized house with previous large single storey extension and outbuildings, set well back on a large plot. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal. The dormer designs show subsidiarity and there is sufficient distance from Danver Lodge that overlooking due to the proposed side dormers should not be a problem. (Sent 24/02/20)
20200356	Cumloden Pear	Erection of outbuilding	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application, provided that there are not any

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



	Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JZ	to form a garden room and storage.	<p>significant objections from neighbours. We note that the building measures approximately 5.6m by 12.6m overall and has no internal fixtures except for a wood burning stove. It will be close to the house "Camilla" on Bowesden Lane and is only 50cm from the joint boundary so could have some impact on the amenity of that neighbouring property.</p> <p>We have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The services to the building need clarification. Mains water and sewerage will not be required for the proposed uses.</li> <li>• The external lighting needs clarification, in order to reduce visual intrusiveness and light pollution during hours of darkness.</li> <li>• The externally visible workmanship and finish of the rear wall should be of good quality because of the potential impact on the amenity of "Camilla".</li> <li>• Conditions should be attached ensuring that the building is only an annexe providing ancillary accommodation to Cumloden, cannot be used as residential accommodation or as a separate dwelling, or for any commercial use.</li> </ul> <p>(Sent 24/4/20)</p>
20200355  No letter	Cumloden Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JZ	Demolition of existing side garage and utility room and erection of rear and side extension including roof alterations to create further accommodation at first floor level. Front garden alterations including new vehicle cross over	<p>This is a reapplication with changes from Ref 20190755, which GBC permitted. The property is situated within the settlement of Shorne Ridgeway and close to the Chestnut Green Conservation Area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roof height: The proposed changes include an increase in roof height. The previously agreed plans had an effective roof height slightly lower than that of Clearways to the west, while this proposal makes it higher. The Parish Council OBJECTS to this aspect as it will negatively affect the street scene particularly in contrast with the chalet bungalow of Rose Cottage to the east, the amenity of which will also be further negatively impacted. As the proposed use of the loft is only for occasional storage, we consider that lower headroom should be acceptable.</li> <li>2. Highway verge requires clarification: The front garden/parking plan shows the paving and gates being immediately adjacent to the tarmacked footway. There is a comment on the plans about needing to extend the fencing on the western side, and we note on the local maps that there appears to be a strip of green coloured highway verge at the front of the property that should be continuous with that in front of Rose Cottage. This needs clarifying with KCC Highways as there might otherwise</li> </ol>



be encroachment on Highways land.



3. Front garden: We are pleased to note that the applicant is now going to tidy and improve the appearance of the front garden area however what is proposed is a largely unrelieved urban appearance save for some token planters. We suggest that something more like at Clearways would be more appropriate in this location.

4. Metal electric gates: The proposals introduce an urban appearance that is out of character with the area. With these proposed gates being immediately adjacent to the footway (but see Highway verge above), there is not room for vehicles to draw off the road and footway if waiting for the gates to be opened.

5. Concern about overdevelopment: We raised concern previously regarding the previous application 20190755 that the plans constituted overdevelopment of the site. Application 20200356 is also noted which will provide an additional 60sqm of space as a garden room. This proposal provides an additional large room in the loft with another 44sqm of useable floorspace space plus eaves cupboards. Although stated to be for storage it is planned to have a solid staircase and be accessed "frequently", which raises concern about the actual intended use.

6. Glazing on eastern elevation: In the decision notice for application 20190755 there was a requirement for obscured glazing to windows on the eastern elevation adjacent to Rose Cottage, this should be repeated (along with all other relevant conditions) for the present decision notice if permitted.

7. Other Conditions: We request that conditions should be attached to any permission for the

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



			<p>loft room, that it is not a habitable room and can only be used for residential storage ancillary to the residential nature of the house, which is a single family dwelling.</p> <p>(Sent 24/4/20)</p>
20200339	Land Adj The See-Ho PH Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent	Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of two dwellings	<p>The Parish Council wishes to OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>We note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All previous applications to build on this plot of land since 1975 have been refused, including twice at Appeal (one also referred to the High Court).</li> <li>• The most recent previous application 20150818 was for one dwelling for the family of the applicant, this present application is for two dwellings, variously described as “2 market dwellings” or with one said to be for the applicant.</li> </ul> <p>We have the following comments and points of objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Outside the Village Envelope, in Green Belt:</b> The piece of land is outside the village envelope and in the Green Belt where new dwellings would not normally be permitted. It was formerly amenity land connected with the See Ho Public House which was sold off speculatively. No special case has been put forward to justify the present proposal. We do not regard possible provision of self-build plots as being a special case justifying the setting aside of normal planning constraints and adopted local policies. We note that in the Gravesham Borough Council Green Belt Boundary Review Technical Paper December 2009 (Review May 2013, see Extract below), it has been recommended that the village envelope be reduced by transferring all the Ridgeway Bungalows into the Green Belt and also that the piece of land under discussion should remain in the Green Belt. The applicant suggests that the settlement boundary instead “extends past the application site and steps around it” but we disagree with this description. Rather, the present boundary is an irregular shape but only due to the existence and inclusion of the Ridgeway Bungalows.</li> <li>2. <b>Not Infill:</b> As the piece of land is outside the village envelope, the proposal cannot be described as “infill”. The supplied images of other parts of the settlement some distance away from the</li> </ol>



			<p>land under consideration cannot be used in justification.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <b>Area Character:</b> The plot is located where the character of the settlement changes to a more open and rural appearance and it is considered important in underlining that distinction and transition. Building there would reduce the amenity of the area and negatively impact the visual appearance and the amenity of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>4. <b>Out of Character Density and Appearance:</b> The proposed buildings will be at a higher density, and potentially take up more of the available space on each plot, than is usual for residential dwellings in Pear Tree Lane.</li> <li>5. <b>In Front of the Residential Building Line:</b> The applicant has provided their own opinion of the location of the residential building line, but we disagree that the See Ho Public House, which is directly on the roadside but well predates all the residential dwellings, can be part of such an assessment. The actual building line should be taken as a line no further forward than between the fronts of Rose Cottage to Shornebury/Fairwinds or undergoing a step-change from Rose Cottage to then run along the southern boundary of the See Ho's site to the front of Shornebury/Fairwinds. We note that local residents have been refused permission to build structures in front of the building line.</li> <li>6. <b>Ground Changes in the Vicinity Since the Applicants Previous Appeal:</b> The applicant suggests that the nature of the immediate area "on the ground" has changed "considerably" since 2015 but we disagree (see also Hedge below).</li> <li>7. <b>Structures on, and Changes to the Site:</b> The Application documents refer to the site now including "a number of semi-permanent structures" but there has not been any form of planning consent for these. The applicant also refers to other changes that they have made which have altered the condition and appearance of the site but we do not consider that these can then be used to justify further changes, instead there may be a case for restoration to be required.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--



			<p>8. <b>Hedge on Road Frontage:</b> It is not clear from the applicants documents whether or not the tall and thick evergreen hedge that they planted is to be retained, but we suggest that at most a medium height hedge of mixed native species would be more compatible with the area and more appropriate in this semi-rural location.</p> <p>9. <b>Driveway Arrangements and Site Constraints:</b> The documents suggest that there will be one vehicular entrance for the two dwellings but that would require a crossways driveway inside the front hedge, meaning that the westerly property would have less useable space and garden, reducing its amenity. The artists impression appears to show two separate driveways, and this could be a more practical layout.</p> <p>10. <b>Possible Conditions if Permitted:</b> We object in general to outline applications which do not provide opportunity for the final appearance, mass and size to be properly assessed and for appropriate conditions to be attached from the outset. We note that the indicative drawings appear to show single-storey bungalows with fully hipped roofs and without any roof dormers. The applicant has suggested that, if permitted, the roof height of the proposed houses could be limited at this stage but we would additionally request that the roof design as fully hipped and without dormers should also be conditioned, to remain as such in perpetuity and that all permitted development rights should be withdrawn. The design and materials should be similar to the bungalows opposite. The intended occupation of the properties is stated to be for first-time buyers or for older residents downsizing, and if possible these should also be the subject of conditions. Restriction of initial sale and subsequent selling-on to existing residents or their children is also worth considering, as well as perhaps specifying the duration of initial ownership before re-sale.</p> <p>11. <b>Other Planning Decisions:</b> The applicant heavily references other planning decisions in other parts of the country. The only examples quoted are where development was permitted. The number of permissions compared to the total number of Appeals is not stated, so the permitted Appeals could be a minority compared to the number refused. We would in return cite</p>
--	--	--	--

# Shorne Parish Council

## Borough of Gravesham



			<p>APP/R5510/X/16/3143072 and 074 where the Decision notice 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 to this site and this application.</p> <p>12. <b>Regulatory Board Referral:</b> If there is a view that this application might be permitted at this stage then we request that, due to the potential to set a precedent in the Borough, the application should be referred to the Regulatory Board for further discussion and decision.</p> <p><i>Extract:</i>  <b>Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy and Key Supporting Documents</b>  <b>Green Belt Boundary Review Technical Paper December 2009: (Review May 2013)</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">SHORNE RIDGEWAY</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">SITE</th> <th style="text-align: left;">COMMENTS</th> <th style="text-align: left;">CONCLUSION</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Ridgeway Bungalows, Pear Tree Lane.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">On the northern side of Pear Tree Lane opposite the See Ho PH lies a row of 8 bungalows. While close to the main settlement, they are detached and form a small stretch of ribbon development set within open fields. They do not relate to the more built up frontage found along Shorne Ridgeway and as such they should remain in the Green Belt.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>AMEND</b> the Green belt boundary to include this stretch of development. <b>INSET 1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">See-Ho Public House, Pear Tree Lane</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Planning Inspector at the Local Plan 1<sup>st</sup> Review considered that the site should lie outside the Green Belt as it relates to village life. The aim of the infill boundary is not to identify a boundary that includes all facilities but to identify an area of close knit development for planning purposes. The building relates well to the built up frontage along Shorne Ridgeway and therefore it is not proposed to amend the boundary to include the building and car park in the Green Belt. The existing boundary in this location includes the PH and the car park.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>NO AMENDMENT</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Land to the east of the See Ho Public Site.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">To the east of the See Ho PH car park lies a site which used to form part of the curtilage of the PH but has subsequently been sold off. This site marks a change in the form of development between the close knit development found to the west found in Shorne Ridgeway and the more dispersed development found in Pear Tree Lane. It is considered appropriate that the site remains in the Green Belt.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>NO AMENDMENT</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Woodlands Lane</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;">Woodlands Lane currently defines the built up extent of the western side of Shorne Ridgeway. The development on the east side of Woodlands Lane has a regular pattern and forms a cohesive group. That on the western side is more dispersed. It is therefore not proposed to amend the Green belt boundary.</td> <td style="vertical-align: top;"><b>NO AMENDMENT</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Sent 27/4/20)</p>	SHORNE RIDGEWAY			SITE	COMMENTS	CONCLUSION	Ridgeway Bungalows, Pear Tree Lane.	On the northern side of Pear Tree Lane opposite the See Ho PH lies a row of 8 bungalows. While close to the main settlement, they are detached and form a small stretch of ribbon development set within open fields. They do not relate to the more built up frontage found along Shorne Ridgeway and as such they should remain in the Green Belt.	<b>AMEND</b> the Green belt boundary to include this stretch of development. <b>INSET 1</b>	See-Ho Public House, Pear Tree Lane	Planning Inspector at the Local Plan 1 <sup>st</sup> Review considered that the site should lie outside the Green Belt as it relates to village life. The aim of the infill boundary is not to identify a boundary that includes all facilities but to identify an area of close knit development for planning purposes. The building relates well to the built up frontage along Shorne Ridgeway and therefore it is not proposed to amend the boundary to include the building and car park in the Green Belt. The existing boundary in this location includes the PH and the car park.	<b>NO AMENDMENT</b>	Land to the east of the See Ho Public Site.	To the east of the See Ho PH car park lies a site which used to form part of the curtilage of the PH but has subsequently been sold off. This site marks a change in the form of development between the close knit development found to the west found in Shorne Ridgeway and the more dispersed development found in Pear Tree Lane. It is considered appropriate that the site remains in the Green Belt.	<b>NO AMENDMENT</b>	Woodlands Lane	Woodlands Lane currently defines the built up extent of the western side of Shorne Ridgeway. The development on the east side of Woodlands Lane has a regular pattern and forms a cohesive group. That on the western side is more dispersed. It is therefore not proposed to amend the Green belt boundary.	<b>NO AMENDMENT</b>
SHORNE RIDGEWAY																					
SITE	COMMENTS	CONCLUSION																			
Ridgeway Bungalows, Pear Tree Lane.	On the northern side of Pear Tree Lane opposite the See Ho PH lies a row of 8 bungalows. While close to the main settlement, they are detached and form a small stretch of ribbon development set within open fields. They do not relate to the more built up frontage found along Shorne Ridgeway and as such they should remain in the Green Belt.	<b>AMEND</b> the Green belt boundary to include this stretch of development. <b>INSET 1</b>																			
See-Ho Public House, Pear Tree Lane	Planning Inspector at the Local Plan 1 <sup>st</sup> Review considered that the site should lie outside the Green Belt as it relates to village life. The aim of the infill boundary is not to identify a boundary that includes all facilities but to identify an area of close knit development for planning purposes. The building relates well to the built up frontage along Shorne Ridgeway and therefore it is not proposed to amend the boundary to include the building and car park in the Green Belt. The existing boundary in this location includes the PH and the car park.	<b>NO AMENDMENT</b>																			
Land to the east of the See Ho Public Site.	To the east of the See Ho PH car park lies a site which used to form part of the curtilage of the PH but has subsequently been sold off. This site marks a change in the form of development between the close knit development found to the west found in Shorne Ridgeway and the more dispersed development found in Pear Tree Lane. It is considered appropriate that the site remains in the Green Belt.	<b>NO AMENDMENT</b>																			
Woodlands Lane	Woodlands Lane currently defines the built up extent of the western side of Shorne Ridgeway. The development on the east side of Woodlands Lane has a regular pattern and forms a cohesive group. That on the western side is more dispersed. It is therefore not proposed to amend the Green belt boundary.	<b>NO AMENDMENT</b>																			
APPEAL 2019/00067/REF Alternative Reference: PP-08159889	Hartshill Bungalow Thong Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of an outbuilding.	Re: Inspectorate Ref: APP/K2230/X/19/3241778 Gravesham Ref: 20191003 and 2019/00067/REF Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Appeal by Mr S Gill																		

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



			<p>Site Address: Hartshill Bungalow, Thong Lane, Gravesend, DA12 4AD</p> <p>1. Shorne Parish Council and Parish:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Shorne Parish (including the settlements of Shorne Village, Lower Shorne, Thong, Shorne West, 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.</p> <p>Within the Parish there are several designated Conservation Areas and a very popular Country Park, plus other areas of land with higher environmental protection designations including Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar.</p> <p>2. Previous Site Planning history of outbuildings only:</p> <p>20190269 proposed a very large outbuilding at the extreme east of the site, with associated driveway and significant area of hardstanding, this was refused a Certificate of Lawful Development. Our detailed comments on this application can be viewed on the GBC website.</p> <p>20191003 (the application presently under discussion) proposed functionally the same building but with slightly smaller dimensions. A Certificate of Lawful Development was also refused, and this Appeal has now been lodged.</p> <p>3. Additional comments in relation to this Appeal:</p> <p>The Parish Council wishes to make the following comments on the Appeal:</p> <p>a) The property is immediately adjacent to Thong Village Conservation Area, so development on the site may have impact there.</p> <p>b) The applicant states in various applications that the site is not viewable from public space however the site can in fact be seen through the roadside hedge of Shorne Ifield Road. Hedges and tree screening are desirable but easily damaged or removed, in which circumstance the outbuilding would be readily seen and have its full effect on openness. The Highways England plans for the</p>
--	--	--	--

# Shorne Parish Council

Borough of Gravesham



			<p>Lower Thames Crossing if progressed could also negatively affect hedges and trees in the area. We request that, should the Appeal be granted, any consequent planning permission should require retention of the hedges and screening trees on all sides of the property and their proactive maintenance.</p> <p>c) We reiterate our previous comments on application 20191003 (please see Appendix A).</p> <p>d) We fully support the decision made by Gravesham Borough Council to refuse application 20191003. We note also the recommendation for refusal from Highways England.</p> <p>e) Since application 20191003 a subsequent application 20191296 (which omitted the equipment storage area) was submitted in December 2019 and received approval on 10th February 2020.</p> <p>f) In January 2020 Highways England undertook a supplementary consultation on their Lower Thames Crossing proposals. As part of that process, an updated “Red Line Boundary” was published, which now shows Hartshill Bungalow as regrettably proposed for demolition.</p> <p>In summary, we support the refusal of permission for application 20191003 by Gravesham Borough Council and request that this Appeal should be dismissed.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering our comments and representations on this application/appeal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>S. Lindley (Chairman) on behalf of:          Planning and Highways Committee          Shorne Parish Council          (Sent 28/4/20)</p>
PRESENTLY OUTSTANDING			
			<p>20200408</p> <p>Mirrabooka Gravesend Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JJ</p> <p>Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a single</p>

Shorne Parish Council  
Borough of Gravesham



			storey rear extension.
			20200432 Landfall Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA Proposed part landscape back garden following erection of the retaining wall.