

Shorne Parish Council

— Borough of Gravesham —



Meeting No 2

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Full Council Meeting held on

25th June 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
Mr C Rea
Mr S White

APOLOGIES

Parishioners in attendance: None

26 To receive any declarations of interest

None received

27 To approve the minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 21st May 2020

The draft minutes were circulated for comment on 26th May 2020 and again on the 31st May and 19th June including amendments from comments received. However it was noted that there was an error in the finance report. Subject to correcting the figures, the minutes were **AGREED** as a true record.

Although this is how we have minuted it in previous AGMs, the role of Internal Controls and Annual Report Editor are not appointments to external bodies and should not be recorded as such in future at the AGM.

28 Any matters arising not otherwise on the Agenda

Nothing received.

29 Report from the Planning & Highways Committee

29.1 Planning:

- (a) Merrievale – Six applications were submitted. Four have been permitted, one does not require prior approval, and one application for a permitted development certificate relating to single storey extensions to both sides of the property has been refused.
- (b) Cumloden – The application for a garden room was approved, but revised plans for the house were refused. Work has commenced on the previously permitted plans.
- (c) Land adjoining See Ho – Outline planning for two houses was refused.
- (d) Landfall – The retrospective application for engineering work/landscaping the rear garden is still pending determination. Concerns have been expressed regarding the raising of the ground adjacent to the highway to the front of the property.
- (e) The recent application for a lawful permitted development certificate for six static caravans for seasonal agricultural workers at New Green Farm was discussed. Objections have been raised that this should be subject to a full planning application and not permitted development, based on what they may do in future from what has already been done elsewhere. The supporting documentation indicates that they will need considerably more caravans and infrastructure than the six caravans they have applied for. The amount of work that has been carried out already on the farm was discussed, including wind break trees around the edge of the land which has totally changed the landscape. It is also not clear how much land they currently own or rent, which could impact on the landscape and the amount of accommodation needed for seasonal agricultural workers.

29.2 Highways:

- (a) KCC and utility companies have been doing various works, including drain repairs in Manor Field, drain repairs in Woodlands Lane, and repairs to the road surface at the A2 T-junction near the Country Park;
- (b) There are still drainage problems outside Silverdene in Tanyard Hill, with alternate action being taken by Southern Water, then BT, and KCC Highways, but still the problem does not get resolved.
- (c) The consultation for the Traffic Regulation Order extending the 30mph limit in Pear Tree Lane ends at midday on Monday 29th. Members are invited to participate in this.
- (d) KCC has agreed to progress the Traffic Regulation Order for the Forge Lane parking restrictions but we do not know when this will take place.
- (e) Cobham Parish Council is consulting on its Traffic Survey Report which has four proposed options to relieve traffic problems in the village, including pseudo gates, not having any traffic through the village, and other restrictions. Mrs Lindley said that we need to consider the potential impact on Shorne. The consultation ends on 30th June.
- (f) The Members meeting with KCC Highways attended by Cllrs Sweetland, Lane, and Rice was discussed. KCC SPD team has now invited Mrs Lindley to attend on behalf of Shorne Parish Council. Cllr Rice has now withdrawn from the meeting and requested a separate meeting at which Cobham Parish Council will be represented. The next meeting will take place by video at 11.00am on 1st July.

30 Report from the Footpaths, Properties & Greens Committee

(a) Crabbles Bottom:

Mr Gozzett has carried out two cuts of the orchard and meadows so far this year, one in April and one at the end of May. Mrs McCluskey has emailed H & P Conservation Works regarding the footpath and bridleway maintenance, and it is expected this will take place this week. Ms Clifton hasn't been able to contact Mr Jerry Ash who runs a community orchard project in New Ash Green due to the coronavirus situation but will follow this up.

(b) Mill Hill Play Area:

John Vilday is waiting for the bark to be delivered, this has been held up due to COVID-19 but is due to be delivered shortly. We need to get quotes to repaint the play equipment as the painting carried out by Mr Vilday was unsatisfactory. Mr Lane reported that the timber butt which Mr Theobald reported lying on the ground was reinstalled by Mr Dore, who advised that a number of timber butts are decayed. They do not need cementing in as they are removed to provide access when there is need to park vehicles for village events. Ms Clifton and Mrs McCluskey will check to see what is needed.

(c) Grass verges:

Ms Clifton reported that Colin Lawrence has completed this season's supplementary cuts. Mr Lane has reminded AGS Fencing and Hoarding about the re-erection of the village sign and is awaiting a date. The timber post has been delayed due to COVID-19.

(d) Shorne Common Rough:

Ms Clifton advised that the dead branches overhanging Woodlands Lane identified during the tree survey were removed by NPC Tree Surgery at the end of May

(e) Shorne Recreation Ground:

The materials for the new gate have been ordered by AGS and a date for installation is to be advised. Mrs McCluskey has passed on the specifications for the new sign. Once the gate is installed, Mr Lane will fix the new sign to the gate. The height barrier was discussed. Ms Clifton advised that GBC need to raise the barrier for one of their vehicles, but it does not appear that the football teams need to lift the barrier. It was agreed to obtain a combination padlock for the height barrier.

(f) Chestnut Green

Ms Clifton reported that KCC removed the deadwood and reduced in length the large limb growing over the road on the Ridgeway/Pear Tree Lane. The crown reduction work is to be carried out in the appropriate season over autumn/winter.

(g) Village Hall Clock

The order for the automatic synchronous mechanism has been placed and deposit paid to Smith of Derby, and we are awaiting an installation date.

31 Finance Report

Date	Description	Amount	VAT	Total	B/F Precept
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
20/05/2020	DD Eslip	£38.00	£7.60	£45.60	£34,634.01
28/05/2020	BACS SLCC Enterprise	£250.00	£50.00	£300.00	£34,334.01
28/05/2020	BACS S Poole May Salary	£785.18	£0.00	£785.18	£33,548.83
28/05/2020	BACS Smith of Derby	£683.00	£136.60	£819.60	£32,729.23
		£1,841.34	£199.73	£2,041.07	
03/06/2020	DD Vodafone	£24.52	£4.90	£29.42	£32,699.81
08/06/2020	BACS Norris & Fisher	£692.85	£0.00	£692.85	£32,006.96
09/06/2020	DD Nest Pension May	£57.52	£0.00	£57.52	£31,949.44
22/06/2020	DD Eslip	£19.00	£3.80	£22.80	£31,926.64
	BACS S Poole June Salary	£785.18	£0.00	£785.18	£31,141.46
	BACS Kiwi Print Company (Annual Report)	£566.37	£0.00	£566.37	£30,575.09
	BACS Mr B Lane Expenses	£105.87	£21.17	£127.04	£30,448.05

Mr Lane pointed out that the expenses paid in April was for CCTV cameras and the one in June was to One.com for our dedicated email domain.

31.2 Audit Update

Mrs Poole reported that everything is with Martin Thomas. He had some more queries which have been responded to. Mr Lane has seen a very draft version sent through today. Mrs Poole clarified that Martin is our Internal Auditor, PKF Littlejohn is our External Auditor, and Ms Clifton will review the accounts before auditing.

Ms Clifton is uncomfortable with the title of 'Internal Controls' as defined in the Practitioners Guide issued by the Joint Panel on Accountability & Governance as published by NALC, as this is not what she undertakes. She carries out a check before the accounts are submitted for auditing. It was agreed that this should be described as Internal Pre Checks in future.

32 Annual Report

The reports were received from the printer on 16th June, and delivery by volunteers is well underway. It appeared that we were 25 copies short but Mr Lane now has a number of spare copies. Mrs Poole reported the apparent shortage and the printers are providing them at no extra charge. All Members agreed that the report looked good, and Mrs Poole reported that a saving of over £800 had been achieved.

33 Update on Lower Thames Crossing

Mr Lane participated in a video meeting with Highways England on 9th June at the request of Adam Holloway MP. Project Director David Manning advised that there will be a further (online) supplementary consultation, likely to be in July. There have been significant reductions to the land-take for utility diversions. The potential major

impact on Ashenbank Woods has been designed out, and a joint utility solution has been proposed which will remove or significantly reduce land-take alongside the A2 at Shorne. A series of GBC Member briefings that have been set up, starting on 6th July.

The archaeological trenching and utilities investigations are continuing. Complaints have been received regarding Highways England vehicles using Shorne as a route to their worksites. Mr Lane has written to Eva regarding this, and asked for a revised approved route.

Mrs Lindley reported that five separate legacy meetings have taken place on-line, to discuss suggestions for funding community projects on both sides of the river. Mrs Lindley said that at the moment this is a talking shop as the topics and the attendees overlap, lists of topics sent out prior to the meetings do not match meeting agendas, and some people are already trying to get large amounts of money for current projects.

A Non-Motorised User document was circulated after the last legacy meeting, which has proposals for a new circular route, but does not mention bridleways or public footpaths. Mr Alex Hills is representing the local cycling associations. Surveys carried out in cold weather on 2nd and 3rd February reported that not many cyclists were about during peak times, but this needs to be done when weather is a bit warmer. There were conflicting views from Shorne Woods Country Park, which were interested in a BMX track, and Gravesham Council which was not in favour. Mrs Lindley will circulate the paper for comments, but at present they do not want us to send them in.

Mrs Lindley has spoken to Eva Simunovic to discuss the Statement of Common Ground Involvement spreadsheet which covers the issues we have expressed with their comments next to them.

34 Report from Borough Councillor R Lane

The application for 115 flats on the site of the former Maternity Hospital (M Block) was considered at the Planning Committee on 17th June. The decision was deferred until July pending responses to clarifications and considerations requested.

The Strategic Environment Committee on 22nd June mainly discussed GBC Covid-19 response, and the town centre recovery plan. The main items at the Full Council Meeting on 23rd June were proposals to invest £100m in a Travelodge development in Greenwich Peninsular, and £80m in the redevelopment of the Charter area (242 flats at Queen Street, Bank Street, Horn Yard area). This will be brought to the July Planning Committee, along with Clifton Slipways (227 flats) and M Block (115 flats).

35 To receive any report from County Councillor B Sweetland

Nothing to report.

36 Update on the proposed mobile phone mast

It is understood that discussions are continuing with a third party regarding a potential alternative location to Shorne Common. This will now be taken off future agendas unless there is anything to report.

37 Update on Shornemead level crossing

Mr Lane reported that Network Rail has publicised further CCTV images showing off-road motorbikers using the crossing after removing the locks.

The temporary closure expired on 20th May, and KCC has notified us that they intend to make a further Order to temporarily close Public Footpath NS368 at the rail crossing from the 11th July 2020 for a maximum of six months.

Mr Theobald said that they were allowed to put a six month order but if they want to extend it they need to apply to the Secretary of State, which was confirmed at the meeting with Network Rail in March. However this has not been done, and the temporary closure has lapsed, so between the 20th May and the 11th July the footpath should be open. They have now applied for a further six month order which should not be allowed. Mr Theobald will speak to KCC as they need to refuse the closure order unless this is to progress the footbridge, but this is not on the closure order notice. Mr Theobald will write to Network Rail and KCC to express our concerns.

38 Update on the railings in The Street

Mr Theobald has prepared a specification, bill of quantities, Risk Assessment and COSHH assessment, as well photographs and drawings, and we now need to get contractors to express an interest. Mr Bugg has a couple of contractors who may be interested in this and should be able to find a third contractor.

39 Possible options for bus shelters

Mr Lane circulated a table of possible options on 24th May, and a draft specification and illustrations of one possible option on 19th June. Members are invited to consider whether we would be interested in seeking estimated costs. Mr Bugg is going to visit the site with Mr Lane over the next week or two and report back at the next meeting. Mr Rea asked about lighting. Mr Lane said if we were to re instate this, connections to the network would cost a minimum of £1,100 per shelter. Even solar lighting would cost £600-800 for each shelter.

40 CCTV Report

- (a) Mr Lane reported that a resident's car was stolen from the car park at the village hall on Tuesday 26th May. The incident was captured on the Parish Council CCTV system and this was reported to the Police, together with the registration number of a car which drove past the car park on three occasions leading up to the incident. The Police acknowledged receipt but have not requested to see the CCTV or ANPR recordings.
- (b) Mr Lane reported that the Police attended on 17th June to download further ANPR data relating to the shooting incident in Shorne Ifield Road on 9th February 2020.

41 Correspondence requiring action

Nothing received.

42 General matters raised by Members for discussion

Mr Hardy asked about the Zoom Church service which is to be held on Sunday and what time it was. Mr Theobald confirmed it would be 10am.

Ms Clifton asked about putting a plaque on the bench at Post Office Green in memory of Theresa Martin. This may not be appropriate as it may already have been provided as a commemorative bench. Ms Clifton and Mrs McCluskey will look at Shorne Common. This is in addition to a donation for Bowel Cancer as we did not provide flowers at the service due to Covid-19. Mrs Poole advised that Mrs Martin's family will be arranging a commemorative celebration when allowed in the Village Hall.

Mr Lane reported an abandoned vehicle in Pear Tree Lane opposite Bowesden Lane again, this has been reported. Mr Lane and Ms Clifton also re-located the SID to Tanyard Hill today.

Date of next meeting. The next scheduled meeting is on 10th September 2020, to take place on Zoom unless COVID-19 restrictions have been lifted.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 21.11

PLANNING APPLICATIONS FROM 21st May to 25th June 2020:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
<p>20200408</p> <p>Application Refused</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 storey rear extension.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.</p> <p>We note that as existing the house has a balustraded rear balcony over the previous rear extension. The neighbouring house has a similar balcony. To prevent overlooking to the neighbouring property, conditions should be added emphasising that the balcony cannot be extended over this presently proposed extension.</p> <p>(Sent 29/5/20)</p>
<p>20200432</p>	<p>Landfall Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA</p>	<p>Proposed part landscape back garden following erection of the retaining wall.</p>	<p>The proposal that is the subject of this application relates to engineering works in the rear garden of the residential site (shown bounded in red on the submitted OS plan) that have already been undertaken. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this aspect of the changes that have been made to the site provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.</p> <p>There have however been other changes made to the residential site and other land in the ownership of the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Garden Building: We understand that a large structure has been built in the rear garden close to the boundary with "Broadeaves", which might require planning permission with attachment of appropriate Conditions. 2. Spoil deposition on land opposite: There was significant neighbour concern when the applicant deposited a substantial amount of earth and materials from the excavations onto the land on the opposite side of the roadway so forming an elevated platform. This land is shown edged in blue on the submitted OS site plan but is shown coloured green on the KCC Highways maps, so may officially be highways verge. GBC Planning Enforcement were contacted by residents and took action requiring that the deposited material should be removed, however it is understood that some has been left behind and subsequently covered with topsoil. The concern is that the deposition of materials may have caused damage to trees and could affect the privacy of nearby houses by increasing the land height. <p>We would be very grateful if the above two matters could also be assessed and any appropriate actions taken, with any relevant Conditions then being attached to any permission.</p>

			(Sent 29/5/20)
20200457	New Green Farm Land Lower Road Shorne Gravesend Kent	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposal of six caravans for seasonal agricultural workers	<p>The Parish Council considers that this application should not be determined as a Lawful Development Certificate because sufficient grounds exist to require a full Planning Application, for the reasons detailed below:</p> <p>Green Belt location and landscape impact; lack of a landscaping plan: The proposed site is located in the Green Belt where government and local policies do not allow caravan sites or residential buildings, new dwellings would not be allowed, and inappropriate development would be considered harmful. Green Belt is a protected landscape designation, in this case to preserve visual amenity and openness and particularly to ensure that there is a strategic Gap preserved between the built-up areas of Gravesend and Medway. This application would by definition reduce openness and erode the strategic gap creating harm. No “very special circumstances” have been put forward to justify this particular location and no alternative locations appear to have been systematically considered.</p> <p>The proposal is a change of use that will have wide landscape impact to residential areas nearby and on higher ground, particularly if the mobile homes are of a light colour and not assimilated into the landscape. External materials and the buildings appearance and colour should be in keeping with their surroundings and specified on the application.</p> <p>The national planning guidance on seasonal workers caravans does not mention Green Belt status but it is to be assumed that Green Belt designation nevertheless has some relevance. The applicant states that the proposal is permissible, but we disagree. We are aware that there have been permissions given in other areas, which have often attracted considerable opposition from nearby residents, but that does not mean that permission would be automatic or appropriate here, where the Green Belt is the narrowest of all areas around London. The important aspect is not whether or not the area is Green Belt but the reasons behind the Green Belt designation.</p> <p>The applicant appears to be relying on individual Appeal decisions. We refer to Appeal Ref APP/R5510/X/16/3143072 for which 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 even if Certificates have been granted for similar applications regarding different cases and different circumstances in different areas of the country, these cannot be assumed to be relevant to the present application.</p> <p>Adjacent to Public Footpath and established wildlife area; lack of landscaping plan: The area edged in red on the plans is immediately adjacent to Public Footpath NS156 so the locating of the static caravans will detrimentally affect its amenity. The established wildlife area in the former</p>

		<p>chalk pit located just across the footpath could be adversely impacted by this proposal. There could also be privacy and security issues for the workers using the static caravans. We would expect the area to be fenced off from the rest of the farm and from the footpath, but this is not mentioned or shown on the plans. Care will also be needed during all chemical spraying activities.</p> <p>We suggest that there needs to be a landscaping plan showing fencing and proposed boundary trees and hedges, internal plantings to minimise and mitigate impact on the landscape and on local residents and to increase amenity for intended occupants and to enhance biodiversity on the site.</p> <p>National Guidance on seasonal worker accommodation needs to be followed; Risk of groundwater and aquifer pollution:</p> <p>We note that the applicant is a member of the Fresh Produce Consortium who published detailed guidance in 2017 on facilities requirements for seasonal worker caravan installations, and we would expect these to be adhered to for this proposal.</p> <p>https://www.freshproduce.org.uk/media/626669/FPC-Guidance-Caravan-Accommodation-1st-Edition-2017.pdf</p> <p>That guidance states that “planning permission will usually be required”, as do the Health and Safety Executive. The reasons are that much more is required than just positioning the caravans – they also require engineering works such as supporting foundations, solid platforms and hardstanding (also for any associated parking provision if allowed), access steps, dry pathways, and permanent services such as potable water supply, electricity and gas supply, foul drainage and septic tank (there being no mains drainage in the immediate area) to avoid polluting the land, environment and aquifers and causing nuisance to nearby residents and footpath users, arrangements for refuse storage and collection/disposal, pest control etc as detailed in the guidance.</p> <p>The proposed location is within groundwater Total Catchment Source Protection Zone 3 and close to Zone 2, as well as being near to the Ramsar Site and SSSI designated marshland. There need to be foul and surface water drainage schemes that will be acceptable to the local water authority.</p> <p>Associated facilities for workers:</p> <p>The newly built barn was previously stated to have only “toilet and basic mess facilities” for staff, and these were not detailed on the previous or present applications. With more workers numerically, and especially resident on-site, more facilities will be needed. There need to be sufficient facilities to store working clothes and boots, and provision of washing machines and dryers. There is presently no other shelter or shade on the site, and no permission for exterior lighting. The staff facilities need to be shown on the plans and fully described so as to confirm that they are adequate.</p> <p>Land requirement now; camping not permitted:</p>
--	--	--

			<p>The size of the proposed plot for static caravans is not stated but it appears to be a slightly irregular shape measuring 35m by maximum 95m. It would appear from the site layout that the applicant had already intended this installation as the barn (19m by 45.5m) had been offset from the field boundaries and the staff facilities appear to be on that side of the barn. It would have been preferable for the applicant to have submitted their overall proposals for the land in one prospective application.</p> <p>The six static caravans currently proposed each measure 11.5m long by 3.8m wide by 3.3m high and are shown spaced out in the land area, which exceeds presently stated need. No residents should be permitted except in the static caravans (i.e. none residing in tents).</p> <p>Future exponential harvest increase and increased caravan numbers; other land to be serviced; traffic issues:</p> <p>The supporting documentation suggests that there will be a future exponential expansion rate of apples being harvested, and makes it clear that six static caravans are a starter number which will only be sufficient for the 2020 and 2021 harvests (12 or more and 25 workers respectively). Nothing is stated about anticipated worker numbers, and therefore static caravan numbers, in 2023 and 2024. Occupation records should be kept and be available for inspection.</p> <p>The figures show however that it is expected that 105 workers will be needed in/by 2025 just for harvesting (again, apparently only servicing the 67.5ha), which in turn would appear to require in excess of 26 static caravans. That level of expansion would require much more complex overall services on the site and larger worker facilities, and therefore definitely a full planning application. The documentation refers to New Green Farm's 67.5ha of "owned land", and that it is apparently permissible for resident workers to service "off-lying land" or only be working on other sites. If it is the applicants intention to have even more seasonal workers residing on New Green Farm than are needed just for that site then we consider it would be reasonable for location, size and harvest volume information about this adjacent/nearby and "off-lying land" to also be farmed by the applicant to be included in the application in order for it to be properly assessed. The locations and figures in turn inform the number of static caravans to be hosted.</p> <p>We note on the applicant's map of sites that New Green Farm appears to be location F13 but another owned location F16 is also indicated. This appears not to presently be intensive orchards but raises concern over whether a similar scenario is going to arise on another site. There is also concern about possibility of large amounts of produce being transported to New Green Farm from another site/s, although we understand there might be quantity restrictions on such practices. Traffic volumes, vehicle types, sizes and weights, acceptable access routes and operating times will all require defining</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>for approval.</p> <p>Seasonal use, duration of seasons and installation, multi-year installation: We note the application is for installation only between 1st March and 31st December, when the units must be removed. We are unclear whether the Certificate applied for presently permits the six units to be returned again on the following 1st March or whether a new application will be needed. If possible, any permission should be temporary and/or the duration carefully defined. A site licence will be required if there is residential use of the caravans throughout the year.</p> <p>Operational activities and noise nuisance, bin mending and stacking height: The tasks to be undertaken on site are described in the supporting document, and the reason for requiring the caravans is stated to be in order to maximise the hours of work through the use of natural light. Working extended hours by use of floodlights will not be permitted due to potential light pollution, and activities that take place on the site, including all transportation activities, must not result in noise nuisance to local residents. Due to the land topography, noise can travel significant distances in the area.</p> <p>Tasks proposed on-site appear to include mending of fruit bins, this in particular needs conditions over the days and hours of work in order to avoid noise nuisance to local residents and potential complaints. The bins are generally stacked when not in use, if that will also be done on-site then a maximum height limit should be imposed to also avoid landscape impact. Bins are likely to be stacked on extensive hardstanding, which does not have any present planning permission.</p> <p>Proximity of local residential properties: The routine operation and any expansion of the business over time will have increasing impacts on local residents in a populated area. We suggest that it would be preferable for the applicant to be explicit now about their intentions in the area, in order to minimise any future local objections.</p> <p>Concluding comments: We naturally would want to support a business that can, and it is hoped will, provide jobs for local workers, but it is also important that the lives of local residents are taken into account and respected by a large business newly moving into the area from elsewhere.</p> <p>It could be helpful for there to be a meeting between GBC, SPC and the applicant to discuss their future intentions in the area. It might also be in the interests of the applicant to provide information and undertake a consultation with local residents.</p> <p>If the Borough Council assess that a Lawful Development Certificate can be issued for the proposed six static caravans then we would be very grateful if the Decision Notice could incorporate comprehensive narrative to <u>detail what any Certificate does not permit</u>, as we have discussed above.</p>
--	--	--	--

			In view of the indicated future expansion plans, we also consider that it might be beneficial for the application to be discussed at the Regulatory Board. (Sent 22/6/20)
20200474	Milton Rifle Range Mark Lane Gravesend Kent	Application for variation of conditions 9 and 10 attached to planning permission reference number 19990882, to allow night time shooting to take place on no more than 10 evenings per year	<p>Although the ranges part of the application site is to its west, the overshoot area of the range lies within Shorne Parish, and compromises access along Fort Road to the riverbank when the range is in use.</p> <p>Shorne Parish Council would obviously wish to support this application in the national interest but considered that comment should be made concerning some aspects:</p> <p>Number of evening sessions: The proposal states that the previous permission was for 4 evening shooting sessions per year but this was increased to 25 through temporary permissions. The present application proposes to limit the annual evening sessions to 10, but clearly this would be increased again through further temporary permissions if needed.</p> <p>Logging evening sessions: We suggest that the start and finish times of the evening sessions should be logged as well as the date of occurrence.</p> <p>Noise effect on wildlife: The RSPB survey was apparently last carried out in February 2011, only on two dates. Since then Shorne Marshes have been further developed as a wildlife site. It should not delay any permission but we request that updated and more comprehensive surveys should be undertaken, at different times of the year and different wind strengths and directions, in order to assess variably carried noise.</p> <p>Noise effect on residents: We note the references to using quieter weapons in the future, which is welcomed, but that noise impacts are considered for “occupiers of adjoining land and property”. With the land in the immediate area being flat and then rising to residential areas, there can actually be significant noise carried to residential properties over a wide area, and this is worse on summer nights when windows are kept open. Again, we would not want the permission to be delayed but request that some noise studies should be carried out to assess and record the noise impact on local residents. Many residents of Chalk live much closer to the ranges than residents of Shorne Parish yet even for us living further away the noise can sometimes be sufficient to be remarked upon.</p> <p>(Sent 1/6/20)</p>
20200484	1 Garden	Erection of replacement	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal for a large outbuilding within the

	Cottages Court Lodge Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EG	single storey outbuilding to construct a garden shed.	Conservation Area as the design is in keeping with the existing house and the location. We would request though that conditions should be attached stating that the outbuilding is only ancillary to the house itself and cannot be used residentially or as a separate dwelling. (Sent 22/6/20)
20200481	73 Astra Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 4PZ	Application for amendment to planning application 20180129 to reduce the size of the approved front extension to single storey with a pitched roof.	The Parish Council has no objection to this application provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours. (Sent 23/6/20)
20200520 Certificate granted	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.	<i>No letter received, Certificate granted eight days after application validated.</i>
20200566	Mirrabooka Gravesend Road Shorne	Single storey rear extension with a depth of 6.00 metres,	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.

	Gravesend Kent DA12 3JJ	maximum height of 3.20 metres and eaves height of 3.20 metres.	We note that, as existing, the house has a balustraded rear balcony over the previous rear extension. The neighbouring house has a similar balcony. To prevent overlooking to the neighbouring property, conditions should be added emphasising that the balcony cannot be extended further over this presently proposed total extension. (Sent 23/6/20)
--	----------------------------	--	---