

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee
Meeting held on Zoom 12th November 2020**

PRESENT:

Mrs S Lindley (Chairman),
Mrs L McCluskey
Mr C Rea
Mr R Theobald
Miss P Clifton
Mr B Lane
Mr R Hardy

APOLOGIES:

Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chairman)

Parishioners Present: None present

35. Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd March 2020: These minutes were **AGREED** as a true record and signed at the combined “Zoom” Council meeting on 23rd April 2020. Interim reports were given and minuted at subsequent combined “Zoom” Council meetings. This meeting covers the period since the last combined “Zoom” Council meeting, which was held on 8th October 2020

Planning:

36. Planning Applications/Issues:

36a Shornemead Crossing: There was a site meeting at the crossing on 6th November with Damian Hajnus and Joy Oluyomi of Network Rail, attended by Mr Lane, Miss Clifton and Mrs Lindley. Discussion highlighted several points: They have Treasury funding (as they needed additional funds) agreed; Timescale to build bridge is likely to be 2-3 years more, it will be just steps and no ramp (we suggested that the design and location should allow later installation if need was proven), the pre-made bridge that they were hoping for is not available; Likely location on east side as higher ground there than on west if not on roadway itself (see next point); they would like to close the vehicular crossing, as they claim it is not being much used. A train was parked across the crossing while we were there. It was pointed out that National Grid and National Gas need to access their plant near the Fort and have previously needed to take very heavy vehicles across. Damian Hajnus suggested they could instead use the “track” on the north side of the canal – when questioned it transpired that he meant the towpath. We pointed out that this is a footpath and cycle route rather than a track, and being the towpath of the canal it was not built structurally to support the weight of modern, potentially very heavy vehicles which could damage the integrity of the canal itself. There would have to be a consultation with users, and we will be copied in.

Miss Clifton reported that she and Mr Hardy had walked the towpath this week and were passed by four vehicles while doing so, the driver of one stated he worked for the Environment Agency and reported that they have a key to the towpath gate so let themselves through to drive along, they do this as getting permission to cross at Shornemead is very difficult. This led to discussion about who controls the towpath gate and issues keys, Mrs Lindley will contact the Thames and Medway Canal Association and John Pelham to find out and also to clarify the status of the path as regards vehicle use.

The timescale suggested is long and raised concerns about whether Network Rail were deliberately trying to stretch things out. Some members considered that in that circumstance the crossing should be reopened meanwhile, however others thought that the safety issues still prevent that. Mr Theobald will draft a letter to Network Rail and KCC questioning the timeframe and expressing concern about whether enough is being done to expedite the processes now that they have secured the funding for the bridge. The argument against the road crossing continuing is undermined if authorised users are being discouraged from using Shorne Mead Crossing as otherwise recorded vehicle use would be higher. The suggested alternative of accessing from the Training College end would involve a long detour even if physically suitable. It was noted that we have received 15 complaints in writing about the crossing being closed, and we are holding the details of when they were made, and by whom.

36b Flights routing over Shorne – BA London City, Jets Biggin Hill, Army helicopters:

After Lockdown#1 ended, it became apparent that there were increased numbers of low level (3000ft above sea level) small jets passing over Shorne and causing noise disturbance. Several residents had noticed this however degree of disturbance varies depending on place of residence.

Some flights, particularly BA, were off the agreed approach route to London City Airport, which is supposed to be along the Estuary, but the bulk were private jets heading to Biggin Hill. These were being actively diverted to fly up the Kent AONB's, over Rochester Airport and the Medway Towns then over Shorne. Afterwards they were needlessly routing over areas of high population in Gravesend or even north of the river. It was felt to be worth Mrs Lindley raising with appropriate bodies that it has been noticed that the flight paths have changed as if we say nothing the problem is likely to continue and worsen.

There had also been pairs of Apache helicopters from their base in Suffolk passing over very close to the ground (650-750ft above sea level) for about 10 evenings recently that had caused buildings and windows to vibrate, also similarly reported in e.g. Halling and West Malling. Our highest ground is 400ft, topped by houses and tall trees, so there was not much remaining safety margin however as this was military training no action would be taken unless the problems recurred.

36c Woodvale, The Ridgeway – owner has been tidying: The owner and partner have been seen tidying the garden and working on the house, which is welcomed.

36d Park Pale Farm new agricultural barn – see Table, decided as inappropriate procedure: The application was for a very large agricultural barn but it was unclear as to what the agricultural use of the land is presently, GBC therefore ruled that the application was an inappropriate procedure so a full planning application is needed if they want to proceed.

36e Enforcement actions by Gravesham Borough Council:

- **Tanners Grange, Tanyard Hill** – A parishioner reported to GBC that building works were going on at a Barn near the entrance, an enforcement visit has been made.
- **1 Ridgeway Bungalows** – A front wall has been built, enforcement are taking a look at this.
- **Land between 29-31 The Street** – After our prompting, GBC has again requested to the owners that the area be tidied up.
- **Ringland, Pear Tree Lane** – There is on-going unhappiness with the situation from local residents, the GBC Enforcement Officer has said that the Council is discussing about what action would be expedient.

37. Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii), Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members (circulated)

It was agreed that the reports and recommendations of the Planning Committee be noted and that the actions taken be ratified and confirmed by all members.

38. Notices of Appeal:

- There have not been any new notices
- **GBC ref 2020/00048 Land adjacent to the See Ho** – Appeal lodged with Gravesham but still no official notification and it is not listed on the Planning Inspectorate website.
- **GBC ref 2020/00035 135 Astra Drive** – undecided
- **GBC ref 2020/00030 St Katherines (swimming pool)** – has been withdrawn
- **GBC ref 2020/00027 Mill View, Mill Hill Lane** – undecided, a visit by the Inspector had been scheduled for 5th November but had been cancelled, assumed because of Lockdown#2.

39. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish:

Lower Thames Crossing: The assorted land investigations were continuing. The poor temporary road layout of the A2 eastbound approach at Marling Cross had been removed after many complaints about road safety. Mrs McCluskey reported that there had again been problems of vehicles driving along and across footpaths, and unsympathetic exchanges with footpath users. She had again taken this up with Eva at Highways England to get better signage installed, this has now been done. A gas pipe had been damaged during excavations even though the workers knew it was there, gas pressure has been reduced until it is repaired.

The Development Consent Order Application was submitted on Friday 23rd October, the Planning Inspectorate have 28 days (ends 20th November) to decide whether or not to accept it. If so, the documents will only then be published. The next stage afterwards will be the pre-examination period from November 2020 to March 2021. Highways England have promised a meeting to clarify for us what we need to do but this initially appears to be registering as an “interested party” giving reasons. Gravesham Borough Council asked for our views on the Lower Thames Crossing consultations, they have confirmed that our views were similar to others that they received.

There had been information on Facebook that Highways England are going out to advertise in the European Journal for major procurements on 13th November, seeking applications to build the Lower Thames Crossing starting in 2022. Matt Palmer, the project director gave a talk on 11th November at a New Civil Engineer conference but unlike other talks given his overheads were not published, he had been on ITV Local News today.

40. Outside Parish but with impact: Nothing new to report.

Highways:

41. Accident reports: None reported

42. Traffic monitoring, Speedwatch, Lorrywatch:

42a Speedwatch – Miss Clifton provided a report: Due to the latest Lockdown the scheme has had to be suspended. Prior to that it had not been possible for the volunteers to do any surveys with the mobile equipment. The police have authorised a new location for monitoring in Tanyard Hill. The position of the Speed Indicator Device has been changed as of the 9th October 2020 to Thong Lane (North) and is due to be moved again (South) 20th November 2020 with appropriate safety precautions. Some trimming back of vegetation will be needed.

42b Lorries:

- 19th October 2020 – Romanian lorry parked, Pear Tree Lane. Police attended and escorted him on.
- 3rd-4th November 2020 – a lorry in the livery of Lenham Storage was parked overnight in Park Pale. The company were contacted but claimed it was a subcontractor, who they have informed.
- Reports of lorries parking outside Country Park on the verge, unknown dates

43. Road condition/highways issues and Hazards:

43a Salt containers: KCC reported that they have refilled all the salt containers. They offered another large bag as well but Miss Clifton checked the levels in the bag at the Recreation Ground and they were still satisfactory.

43b Butchers Hill: The poor condition of the path surface was reported to KCC by Mrs Lindley on 21st October 2020 (Ref 531595)

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

44a Village gateway sign – design and location: The design of the sign is agreed, with a “Glasdon Gateway” that it will be fixed to, however there are still ongoing conversations continuing about the location. KCC want it to be just where the Recreation Ground land starts, near the existing 30mph sign, only extending the speed limit change by about 5 metres but we would like to see the sign and the speed limit change located much further back towards the A2, as we would like it to include Woodlands Lane and Brewers Road. In other neighbouring villages such as Cobham, the sign and the start of their 30mph zone is much further away from the Village before the houses start.

44b Bollards outside Country Park entrance to protect footway from parking: This will be proceeding with our own funding together with a contribution from the Country Park.

44c Park Pale: Richard Gagg of Harlex had circulated a video of parking and traffic problems at Park Pale over the previous weekend. Several members commented that it was the worst that had been seen there. Attempts continue to get additional protection and enforcement. There are concerns that double yellow lines being extended, as Harlex and the Golf Club favour, could result in the problems being sent elsewhere. As well as the new signage already agreed, KCC are going to put up a sign saying that the road is not to be used for parking for the Country Park, which will remove the situation of drivers claiming that they are unaware. Mr Hardy reported that on a recent visit the Country Park car park was full and people were driving around looking for spaces so the problem was primarily too many people visiting the area.

44d Michael Gardens: Members reported that there are also problems in Michael Gardens presently with additional vehicles being parked there to access footpaths, including parking on the pavement so blocking pedestrians, prams et. Yellow lines might be a good idea there too, and also on another corner nearby although that can cause problems for residents parking as well. Mrs Lindley said that this would be added to the HIP and requested diagrams explaining what was to be proposed.

44e Astra Drive: The problems with speeding on Astra Drive were also mentioned in connection with the HIP updating (see below) so Mrs Lindley also requested diagrams to support that proposal.

45. Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board: No recent meeting but there is to be a KCC Highways: Parish Zoom meeting on 10th December when all the various highways problems will be reviewed. Mr Lane has asked for the speed limits on the Ridgeway to be placed on the Agenda. The TRO has been published so the timetable for implementation now needs to be clarified.

46. Open Consultations:

- Kent rail strategy, ends 17/11/2020
<https://kccconsultations.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/kentrailstrategy2021/consultationHome>
- Gravesham Borough Council Local Plan – various documents including Green Belt Review, site allocations, ends (extended) 31/12/2020
https://localplan.gravesham.gov.uk/consult.ti/REG18S2/consultationHome?fbclid=IwAR2by3n4SVTSRrScYI-KkbdWcCw_ZXkbeoxLaVdgwzv-Pb_HY-7APok2f5o

47. Closed consultations/for information:

- Albion Waterside (Canal Basin) submitted general comments about height, parking, canal integrity. <https://albionwaterside.co.uk/>
There is to be a presentation/Zoom meeting about the project on 18th November, apparently the development site is being expanded.
- Changes to Bluebell Hill junctions, ended 19/10/20 – submitted general comments and preferring Option 3.
<https://kccconsultations.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/A229BluebellHill/consultationHome>
- National, “Planning for the Future” reform of the planning system, ended 29/10/20
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>
(another section “Changes to the Planning System” closed 1/10/20)
General comments were submitted.

Any other business:

48. Matters raised by Members:

48a Highways Improvement Plan (HIP) update for 2021-22: Mrs Lindley had circulated an updated version and requested comments and input from members, this document is used as the basis for discussions with KCC Highways.

48b Halfpence Lane-Brewers Road roundabout: we have been notified that resurfacing works will take place on 16th November.

48c Miss Clifton – Buzz Garden, site meeting held 23rd October: Miss Clifton and Mrs Lindley met Celia Davies from Kent Wildlife Trust regarding the possible Buzz Garden project on 23rd October. Mrs Lindley said that when first mooted, it had been envisaged to

clear an overgrown area on the Common and plant a naturalised Meadow. When Ms Davies looked at Shorne Common she considered that the suggested location would be too dark and that control of existing weeds would be a problem for ground plantings. She favoured using multiple raised beds located nearer the parking/play area. These would have to be cordoned off, which would be more intrusive onto the Common and would give a more urban appearance. The examples that she showed us were large formal areas in major Country Parks and the plantings included some non-native species.

Ms Davies reported that their plans had been compromised by the COVID situation so they have funding remaining that they need to spend by the end of March, meaning that projects have to be fully installed by then. They will pay for everything if a project can be completed in this timescale.

After the meeting Ms Davies had e-mailed that she had noticed some other possible locations on her way out of the village and suggested in front of the shops (members believe this is private land and might compromise parking) or on KCC highway verges such as Tanyard Hill (already naturalised with spring bulbs).

The highways verge on the corner of Malthouse Lane to Forge Lane was discussed as possibly suitable, and also instead of the cobbles between The Village Hall car park and Manor Field where we had already been discussing possibly having plantings which could be in raised beds. Miss Clifton will liaise with Mr Bugg about suitability and then will contact Mrs Davies again.

48d Mr Lane - Bucklebury, Pear Tree Lane: Mr Lane mentioned that there had been parishioner concern about the large outbuilding that had been built in the rear garden. This had been reported to GBC enforcement but seemingly may be permitted development.

49. Matters from other Committees being discussed for convenience: None raised.

50. Matters raised by attending Parishioners: None present.

The meeting ended at 20.59

PLANNING APPLICATIONS from 10/9/20 to 5/11/20:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20200878 Refused	35 Calderwood, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 4QH	Erection of a part two storey and part single storey rear extension.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours. (Sent 15/9/20)
20200830	Westdene Cottage Tanyard Hill Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EN	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a two storey detached dwelling.	The site is relatively large and almost square but wider at the rear. The proposal is to demolish the existing, previously extended bungalow and replace it with a deep, two-storey house with attached double garage. The design borrows from that of the southern neighbour (Guestling) and shows respect for both neighbouring properties, having intermediate roof height, so is sympathetic to the area. The appearance from the front is similar to that of the present form of Guestling but has a larger footprint, being 18.5m wide compared to 15.5m, and will be 12.5m deep at two-storeys across the full width. Guestling has a hipped roof design at the front, with one part subservient, while the new house is proposed to have same-width vertical gables at the front, so it will have a more bulky appearance with impact on the streetscene. The floor area of the existing bungalow is stated to be 182sqm but it has been extended previously, original plans are unavailable. The floor area of the proposed house is approximately 231 sqm. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to the existing bungalow being replaced by a house but there is some feeling that the design is a little bulky and dominant. The garage door design is slightly incongruous to the design of the house and a Regency-style design matching the front door might be preferable. In view of the significant enlargement of the property we request that permitted development rights should be withdrawn for the whole site. (Sent 23/9/20)
20200899	429 Valley Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 5UE	Erection of single storey extensions to existing detached garage at side of dwelling to form enlarged garage, games room, utility room and toilet, with glazed link to existing dwelling; erection of detached garage in front garden	Thank you for asking our opinion about this application. The Parish Council notes that application ref 20200574 was permitted on 17th August 2020. That application included a single garage as did previous application 20190667 which had been refused. Regarding the extension to the house, the plans differ a little in that the extension now has a protruding floor and overhanging roof, and with external structural columns so is a little larger and different in appearance from what was previously permitted. Regarding the larger garage, it is slightly more than 6m wide instead of 3.8m, and depth is unchanged at 5.5m deep. Being wider it will have a higher ridge height and be more visible from the street and to the neighbouring properties. Otherwise our comments are the same as previously submitted for application 20200574 and we

			would request that the same conditions as previously attached should be repeated for this application. Additionally we suggest that due to the extent of additional building on the site, permitted development rights should be withdrawn. (Sent 23/9/20)
20200939	16 Davys Place Gravesend Kent DA12 4DL	Application for a minor material amendment to planning permission reference no 20191247 for erection of an outbuilding in the rear garden for use as a games room. Variation of approved plans for condition 2 to allow the footprint of the proposed outbuilding to be moved. The boundary line distance to 14 Davys Place to be reduced from 450mm to 150mm, distance from the boundary line of 18 Davys Place to 1100mm from 450mm. The distance to the rear boundary to be increased from 450mm to 1000mm. The height of the outbuilding to remain the same with addition of a window with obscure glass to be added to the boundary line of 16 Davys Place and larger glass panels	We note that the building appears to be slightly smaller than in previously approved plans: 8.5m wide by 5.7m deep compared to 8.9m wide by 6m deep. Regarding the modified appearance and location on the site, we have no objection provided that there are no significant objections from neighbours. Conditions should again be attached regarding the building only being an annexe to the main house and not being used for residential accommodation. (Sent 23/9/20)

		to be added to the front elevation.	
20200984	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Demolition of existing detached dwelling, outbuildings and hard standing and erection of a replacement detached dwelling and associated landscaping.	<p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to these proposals for a replacement house, which are in keeping with the site and the area.</p> <p>The structure of the front boundary treatment and gates require clarification in detail as they are not presently described in the submitted plans.</p> <p>We request that conditions should be attached for the garage block that it is ancillary to the main house and cannot be used as a separate dwelling.</p> <p>Regarding the rest of the site, as routinely raised, we would request that conditions should be attached removing permitted development rights.</p> <p>(Sent 14/10/20)</p>
20190290	Nuralite Industrial Estate Canal Road Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7JA	<p>*REVISED/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION* The proposal is for the systematic redevelopment of the existing Nuralite site. This includes the importation of inert materials to cap, and landscape the historic asbestos landfill, thus containing its contamination risk. To demolish the existing buildings of the Nuralite industrial estate, deal with existing contamination, both through capping and removal of areas of hydrocarbon pollution, the laying of new service and utility infrastructure and the</p>	<p>This letter provides comments from Shorne Parish Council only on the revised/supplementary documents that the applicant has submitted in October 2020. The representations that we previously made in July 2019 remain valid and both that and this present submission should be read in conjunction with each other.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted six supplementary/updated documents.</p> <p>1) Revised - Habitats Regulations Assessment 2020 Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altered configuration of Canal Road: The latest version of the proposals include changes to the configuration of Canal Road. These works will impact on the SSSI designated area of Beckley Hill and particularly on the Ramsar site as that lies to the north of the entrance and on one or both sides of Canal Road. That aspect has not been included in the evaluation. • Deficient Map: The map at Appendix 1 does not include the SSSI classified land at Beckley Hill, to the immediate east of the site entrance. • Hydrological assessments: We do not believe the hydrological assessments in Table 1 to be correct. The whole marshes area is interconnected hydrologically through complex ditch and drain patterns, and the proposals include excess water from the site draining into the canal and thence overflowing further into the marshes. • Activities on-site: In the section describing the development there is reference to “.....waste recycling centre, soil and stone processing centre.....”. We do not recall these activities being mentioned previously, and they raise additional concern over greater air and noise pollution. • Canal Remediation: We are uncertain whether there have been any changes to the land profiles etc proposed and detailed in the other Appendices but we would anyway like to see considerably greater remediation of the canal. <p>2) Revised - Nuralite Water Vole Survey Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous damage: Conditions of the southern bank and the canal bed itself have previously

		<p>construction of 11 new purpose built light industrial type units and a site office.</p>	<p>been altered by the actions of the applicant and predecessors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recolonisation potential: If the canal was to be properly remediated then water voles might colonise the canal again from other local habitats. <p>3) Revised - Wintering bird survey Nuralite Industrial Estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity of surveys: As described before, the western part of the site was previously bulldozed by the applicant so the then existing habitat was destroyed. Therefore the surveys are not representative of the less recent conditions of the site. • Limited recovery to date will be re-zeroed: There has however already been some recovery, as evidenced in the survey by the presence of birds on the “red” and “Amber” lists but the site will again be stripped of all habitat by the process of building new industrial units and capping of the western part of the site. • Replanting: It is to be hoped that subsequent replanting might eventually enable recovery to at least the original, and hopefully perhaps an improved state. • Nesting boxes: The recommendation for nesting boxes to be installed on the new buildings is noted however it cannot be predicted as to whether the new range of activities to be undertaken on the site will encourage or discourage their use. • Within-site landscaping: There needs to be significant landscaping and plantings installed and maintained within the industrial part of the site, particularly at the southern border. <p>4) Revised - Construction Management Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer of goods between vehicles: Vehicles destined for the Apex site but taller than the railway bridge height limit of 4.1m should not be allowed to offload onto other smaller vehicles on Canal Road if this will cause obstruction. • Safety along whole of Canal Road: Safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists need to be instituted for the entire length of Canal Road. • Warnings about cyclists and pedestrians: The Road Safety Initiative needs to include warnings about cyclists and pedestrians, especially near the site entrance, and particularly for any over-height vehicles turning at the Network Rail entrance due to the co-location there of Footpath NS156. • Opening hours start too early: The proposed opening hours for construction begin too early (06.00), this should be 07.00 or later, and vehicles should not be entering Canal Road to wait prior to the opening time. • Impact of increased traffic: The proposed increase in traffic including HGV’s will have an unbearable impact on local residents. • One-way traffic system: There is discussion about having a one-way system temporarily for HGV’s using Gore Green Road. In our view, this would need to be implemented for all traffic and to be permanent in order to ensure traffic and public safety. The turn from Gore Green Road onto Lower
--	--	--	--

			<p>Rochester Road is already “blind” and therefore dangerous, and will be more so with additional traffic, particularly HGV’s, using the Lower Rochester Road. This would however be an inconvenience to local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turning onto the B2000: We remain concerned about the large increase in the number of turning movements, including during construction by heavy, and therefore slow-moving, HGV’s, from Gore Green Road turning right onto the B2000. • Passing places: There is discussion about creating passing places on local roads however in many of these the amount of verge available, particularly in Gore Green Road, is either inadequate or non-existent without land being purchased. These could also negatively impact on local amenity. (See also under Revised Transport Assessment below). • Suitability for heavy vehicles: We would also question whether local roads are structurally suitable for use by very heavy HGV’s, and who would be responsible for consequent repairs. • Security gate at entrance: A security gate is now mentioned however this was not shown on the previously submitted plans. • Wheel-washing: On-site wheel washing facilities must not lead to contamination run-off. <p>5) Revised - Transport Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chequers area: The proposed alterations to the Chequers area have been commented on previously in detail, we remain concerned about the overall unsuitability. • Urbanisation: Regarding this change and those proposed to provide passing places and one-way systems and associated signage, overall we are concerned about the degree of urbanisation that will be imposed on local residents and the Conservation Area. • Traffic volume increases: The proposals result in a predicted more than quadrupling of traffic volumes and particularly of HGV’s, these volumes and types of vehicles will have a significant detrimental effect on the safety of local roads and the lives of local residents. We disagree with the applicant’s conclusion that “The resulting impact of the proposed development is not predicted to have a significant adverse effect on the on the operation of the local highway network...”. The increase in traffic levels will also depend on the nature of the businesses occupying the individual units so is likely to be greater than predicted. • Adequacy of turning space before railway bridge: We are not convinced that there is enough space for larger HGV’s to turn in the Network Rail entrance. On-going availability and permission to use this area is not guaranteed so cannot be relied upon. • Accident analysis: Analysis over a longer time frame reveals more accidents, one fatal (in November 2000) on Gore Green Road. It is obvious that more traffic will lead to more accidents occurring as there will be greater opportunity for conflict between vehicles and between vehicles and cyclists.
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening Canal Road into the Ramsar Site: The proposals widen Canal Road and add a footway north of the Railway Bridge however the land on each side of the road here is part of the Ramsar Site and SSSI so we would question as to whether the road can actually be widened etc. • Location and type of footway: Any pedestrian footway would be better on the north side rather than the south. A crossing point should be provided south of the Railway Bridge in relation to Footpath NS156 and an all-weather footway provided continuously from there to the Apex entrance. The structure of the footway should reflect the rural and specially protected natures of the area rather than creating an urban appearance. • Chequers mini-roundabout: The mini-roundabout area needs to also facilitate traffic moving from Church Road to Canal Road, unless this traffic is instead to be compelled to circumnavigate the roundabout. • Displaced resident’s parking: The issue of where displaced resident parking will be located, and the impact of this on the proposals and on road safety, has still not been addressed. • Additional signage: The proposed additional “low bridge” signage is appreciated. • Options for rail transport: The options for using rail to transport incoming and outgoing waste materials have not yet been adequately explored. • Passing places: Regarding passing places (see also under Construction management plan above), these would need to be maintained as available, i.e. checked for fly-tipping several times per day and cleared immediately if found to be compromised. Responsibility for this needs to be assigned. <p>6) Revised - Travel Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims etc vs reality: Aims, targets and potential for non-vehicular modes of access are not the same thing as the reality of what will actually happen. Likewise, “..... best endeavours” to control operational HGV movements.....” do not ensure compliance. • Access route: The point remains that all practical access to the site is by road, via Canal Road and therefore through Lower Higham residential and Conservation Areas. <p>Summary:</p> <p>We continue to object to the proposal to expand the footprint of the industrial area beyond the official/original footprint, and that objection also applies to several large hardstanding areas which have already been laid out and brought into use without planning permission. We also object to the proposed impacts on the historic Thames and Medway Canal and the Lower Higham area. We remain unconvinced that the importation of materials in the quantity described is actually needed to remediate the western part of the site which is not going to be further disturbed. We would like to see an independent opinion regarding the minimum requirement.</p> <p>Among other issues, aspects such as supplies of potable water and electricity, and the safe management of foul and surface water drainage remain inadequately addressed.</p>
--	--	--	---

			The revised/supplementary documents submitted by the applicant have not altered our views that due to the location the proposals are not, and cannot be made to be, suitable. (Sent 27/10/20)
20201012 Inappropriate Procedure	Park Pale Farm, J And B Martin Crayford And Fawkham Park Pale Shorne Rochester Kent ME2 3UD	Application for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for the siting, design and external appearance of a general purpose agricultural building 42.36 metres long, 16.00 metres wide and 8.00 metres high.	<p>The Parish Council has the following comments:</p> <p>Building and site location: The proposal is for a large building (42.36 by 16m, and 8m high). The location has been used recently for open storage of materials. It would be accessed across the adjacent haulage yard.</p> <p>Deficiencies in the submitted plans/information: There is no supporting statement, and the hours of operation are not detailed. The plans do not show any associated hardstanding, and the location, area and nature of this needs to be clarified. The plans show the red line boundary, and implied access as being to the southern end of the building however there are no access doors on this elevation. There are two very large, full height roller shutter doors shown on one of the sides (unclear which one) but no access route is shown to these and it is also not clear whether there is enough space on the site to enable large vehicles to turn.</p> <p>Building purpose and extent and location of associated agricultural land: The purpose of the proposed building is stated to be for agricultural use for the storage of hay, equipment and machinery. The full extent of the adjacent plot of land owned by the applicant is not shown, and overall the area of land being serviced and therefore justifying need for such agricultural use and the size of the building is not described. The location and acreage of this needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Traffic implications: If the related agricultural land is distant from the proposed building we would have concerns about additional traffic volumes and types (which needs specifying in more detail) using Park Pale Road and having to make turning movements at the T-junction with Brewers Road.</p> <p>Landscape Impact: The site is in the Green Belt and the North Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although there are other buildings nearby, due to its size and position this proposed additional building would detrimentally affect landscape and openness.</p> <p>Additional information and Conditions to be attached: No overall landscaping of the site or plantings to screen the proposed building are shown on the submitted plans - these would be desirable additions and conditions, as would the operating hours and information about proposed traffic movements. If permitted, there should also be conditions attached restricting the building to purely agricultural use and governing the extent and height of any outside storage.</p> <p>(Sent 16/10/20)</p>
20201044	Deglan Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	Conversion of first floor over garages to form a family annexe incidental to the use of	<p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal.</p> <p>We request that conditions should be attached stating that the garage building is ancillary accommodation to the main house and cannot be used as a separate dwelling.</p> <p>(Sent 16/10/20)</p>

		the main dwelling.	
20201086	7 Gazelle Glade Gravesend Kent DA12 4PU	Erection of a dormer extension in the south side roof slope and conversion of roof space into habitable rooms; construction of extension to principal (front) elevation to Gazelle Glade to provide lounge with bedroom over.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal. The loft conversion is similar to others undertaken in the area. The house is set back on its plot so the front extension does not extend forward of the building line. (Sent 28/10/20)
20201066	Bucklebury Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	Proposed alterations and remodelling of dwelling including two storey side and rear extensions to main house and use of altered roof space for additional accommodation; construction of attached pool house and subterranean games room to rear garden and triple garage in front of the dwelling.	Bucklebury is a large house on a large plot, in the Green Belt. It is unclear what its size was when originally built and to what extent it has already been altered and extended. The present design is stepped reflecting the change in ground levels of the site. The proposal will greatly increase the floor and built area on the site. The proposed design is non-stepped and has a mansard roof with a steeper roof slope than the existing house. There is not presently any dwelling to the immediate north-west. It is understood that a large outbuilding has been built at the end of the garden against the north-west boundary. The proposals have several elements: Loft conversion with mansard roof: The roof angle is much steeper than at present. It will give a more dominating appearance that will be out of character with the existing building and with other properties in the area. A shallower pitch would be preferable. Two-storey front porch: The roof should also have a shallower pitch and show subsidiarity to the main roof, as at present. A balcony feature has been created however this will not cause overlooking/privacy problems in this location. Two storey side extension (north-west elevation): It would be preferable for the roofline to show subsidiarity in height to the main roof. Otherwise the extension is dominating due to the falling away of the ground level. Steps/stairs to a side entrance of a multi-seated office is noted, this needs consideration for the parking arrangements. Two-storey rear (south-west elevation) extension: No objection in principle but a large full-height window is shown in the loft conversion, which could give rise to overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring dwelling. Windows of side elevations: Windows are introduced on the first and loft floors which could give rise to overlooking and loss of privacy particularly to the neighbouring dwelling. They should be

			<p>reconsidered or otherwise have obscured glass.</p> <p>Subterranean gym/cinema rooms: No objection, note cinema room is shown as 18-seater, visitor parking arrangements require clarification.</p> <p>Pool building: This is approximately 19.5m by 8.5m. The ultra-modern, flat-roofed design contrasts unfavourably with the more classical design of the house and further affects the openness of the site. It is located close to the site boundary and could have landscape impact. A more classically designed building would be more appropriate. The windows on the north-east elevation should either be removed or have obscured glass.</p> <p>Garage and Parking: The proposed garage is in front of the building line and located close to the road boundary of the site. It will reduce openness and be visually intrusive on the street scene. Other local properties (e.g. Windsong nearby) have had such proposals refused. The north-west elevation window should be omitted. Parking places for visitors to the site and other non-garaged vehicles require clarification. There will be an increase in hardstanding area (extent unknown), which must be permeable and laid so that there is not any water run-off onto the roadway. Large trees are located in this area and it is not clear how the garage could be built without causing damage to their roots.</p> <p>Roadside frontage: It is noted that the existing walling and gates are to remain unchanged.</p> <p>Trees and landscaping: Clarification is needed about what will be done with the spoil from the excavations for the gym/cinema building and from digging of other foundations. The site includes a number of large trees which are important in the landscape. We request that any appropriate Tree Preservation Orders should be applied. A plan should be submitted showing all proposed landscaping, with the existing and proposed ground contours and plantings, indicating clearly any trees to be removed or have their roots compromised and giving reasons.</p> <p>Overall comment: More information is needed on a variety of aspects. The designs should be modified to make them more compatible with the site and the design of the existing building.</p> <p>Conditions: In view of the extent of the enlargement of the house and the overall built area we request that permitted development rights should be removed. If permitted, the garage building should have conditions applied that it is ancillary to the main house and cannot be used as living accommodation or as a separate dwelling.</p> <p>(Sent 2/11/20)</p>
20201113	29 Michael Gardens Gravesend Kent DA12 4QA	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension.	<p>The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.</p> <p>(Sent 2/11/20)</p>
Appeal Lodged but no more info			<p>2020/00048/REF</p> <p>Alternative Reference: PP-08628389</p>

			Address: Land Adj The See-Ho PH Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent Nature: Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of two dwellings Status: Appeal Lodged Appeal Type: Appeal Against Refusal
--	--	--	--