

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee
held in Shorne Village Hall on 8th July 2021**

PRESENT:

Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)
Ms P Clifton
Mr R Hardy
Mr B Lane
Mr R Theobald

APOLOGIES:

Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs L McCluskey
Mr C Rea

Parishioners Present: None

53. To receive any declarations of interest.

Mr Theobald declared that he is a resident nearby to 16 Warren View when this is discussed however the discussion will be on general matters.

54. Minutes of the Advisory (Zoom) meeting held on 27th May 2021: The minutes had previously been circulated and were considered acceptable, Mr Lane proposed they should be accepted, Mr Theobald seconded, and all members agreed.

55. Matters arising from the Minutes not otherwise on the Agenda: None were raised.

Planning:

56. Planning Applications/Issues, including Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) decisions:

- a) Tanners Grange, Tanyard Hill - retrospective application for two-storey mixed use outbuilding. This has been permitted with strong conditions, which include not to operate a business.
- b) Park Farm House, Bowesden Lane – This is the second application for the additional house, it has been refused on the same grounds as before. Highways England submitted a letter stating their position.
- c) 25 Coutts Avenue - repeat application for two four-bedroom houses – They have previously applied for four-bedroom, and three-bedroom houses. The latter was permitted but was allowed to lapse. They recently applied for outline permission for two four bedroom detached houses. GBC gave permission but with strong conditions.
- d) Bucklebury, Pear Tree Lane – retrospective application for a gym building. This has been refused.
- e) 1 Ridgeway Bungalows – have now submitted a retrospective application for the wall.
- f) Bethany, Pear Tree Lane – new porch and minor remodelling with wood cladding.
- g) Merrievale, Pear Tree Lane – There has been an application submitted for entrance gates with some adjacent walling. This was not in the original planning application.
- h) 16 Warren View – side and rear extensions. This is a corner plot, narrow at the front. The total land area is quite small for the amount of extension they wish to do, two-

storey both at the side and at the back. There are some concerns about retaining walls of higher ground and impact on neighbours.

- i) Little Priory, Pear Tree Lane – There had been unregulated coppicing in Court Wood at the rear. They are being required to put in a planning application, and will need a tree management plan going forward.
- j) Highbank - Have submitted a planning application to convert and extend their garage as a gym adding to the existing store room and shower room. It was discussed that Conditions should be requested preventing residential use of this annexe.
- k) GBC enforcement updates:
 - a. Land south of Apex Business Park buildings - inspection and feedback still awaited
 - b. Daymer, Green Farm Lane – Building Control had been involved due to the cellar being dug out so close to neighbouring properties but they responded that is it an inter-neighbour matter.
 - c. 135 Astra Drive - Mr Hardy and Mrs McCluskey had kindly obtained some photos, which show that the rear dormer is slightly higher than the ridge of the existing building. However, it has been noted that another property nearby (103 Astra) has the same structure. Mrs Lindley will inform enforcement seeking their advice.
 - d. Shorne Mead, Pear Tree Lane – When the Planning Enforcement Team investigated the unauthorised coppicing they noted that engineering works were being carried out in the rear of this other property and advised the owner that planning permission is needed.
- l) GBC enforcement have created a webpage for updates on applications of significant community interest, see: <https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/home/planning-and-building/planning-enforcement/enforcement-site-updates> Only two presently listed.

57. Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii), Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members (previously circulated). The Report was considered acceptable, approval was proposed by Mr Theobald and seconded by Mr Hardy.

58. Notices of Appeal:

- a) In progress: None
- b) Lodged: None
- c) Decided: None

59. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish:

Lower Thames Crossing: – A consultation about construction impacts is expected to start on 14th July until 8th September 2021. There will be two exhibition dates at Cascades Leisure Centre, at the beginning and end of the period. Highways England will also have their mobile van and a marquee at various locations but these are unknown at present. Mr Lane attended a meeting with Mr Matt Palmer two weeks ago, but no new information was obtained.

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

Highways:

61. Accident reports: Nothing new to report.

62. Traffic monitoring, Speedwatch, Lorrywatch:

- a) Speedwatch: The volunteers undertook surveys on 16th June with 12 people recorded doing between 35-40mph, on 30th June with 2 people recorded doing between 35-40mph, and again on the 8th July when they recorded 13 people doing 35mph and over.
- b) Speeds on Forge Lane – Following the discussions with Mrs Purdy at the previous meeting, Mr Lane and Ms Clifton used the Speedwatch equipment to undertake a sampling survey. They had intended this to be situated at Post Office Green but were asked to move to Forge Lane opposite Cob Drive instead. The recorded speeds were not found to be excessive.
- c) Lorrywatch: Mr Lane reported:
 - a. 16/06/21 – Foreign HGV on pavement outside Country Park, reported to the business
 - b. 25/06/21 P&O Ferrymasters HGV coming from The Ridgeway to Tanyard Hill, reported to the business
 - c. 01/07/21 RJC Lowloaders Woodlands Lane, tried to turn around on residents drive way and couldn't so tried a little further on and has damaged 3 residents gardens, Mr Lane has contacted the business on behalf of those residents.

63. Road condition/highways issues and Hazards:

- a) Forecourt of shops in The Street – Mr Lane has been in contact again with the landlord's agent but there is no progress on this at the moment. Apparently the tenants need to maintain the forecourt but the Agent is reluctant to ask them until trading is more back to normal. Mr mph and over.Theobald had asked if the Parish Council might consider some financial help. While arguably parishioners do use the forecourt, it is private land so a matter between the landlord and the tenants. Other local businesses might question such a decision.
- b) Forge Lane retaining wall - Mrs Lindley has written to Kent County Council Highways again, they wrote back on the 2nd July about an inspection and have now referred this to Gravesham Borough Council. There are on-going differences in opinion over who owns the wall. KCC had taken responsibility previously but apparently the wall is not tall enough to presently be classed as a highway structure
- c) Sewer blockage again Tanyard Hill – This was reported to KCC Highways and Southern Water and has been cleared.
- d) Shorne Ifield Road – A tree that was about to fall across Shorne Ifield Road, was reported to Kent County Council on 20/6/21 and was subsequently felled. However another one in the same location is leaning but has not been felled.
- e) 1 Court Lodge – Overgrown garden possibly hampering sightlines. This was reported by a parishioner expressing concerns, but at the moment does not seem to be a problem.

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

- a) Reconsideration of double yellow lines in Pear Tree Lane opposite Bowesden Lane. This had been discussed in e-mail correspondence. The width of Bowesden Lane has not changed but the problem could be because more delivery vans are using it to deliver to residents, however this is the same problem on all narrow lanes. The trunks of the bushes making up the hedge are now thick and right on the road edge. We had previously written to the See Ho, asking them to cut the hedge back, but looking again at the deeds and the Highways maps, it is not clear whose land it is so who is responsible for the hedge. It would be a pity to have to remove it. Rose Cottage doesn't appear to own the grass area on the other side. It is possible that the splay width of the original unmade track was altered when the kerbs were installed on that

side. The other issue is the vans that are parking opposite the turning, on the main road. Some of the cottages do not have off road parking which is why there are always many cars and vans parked on the road. If yellow lines were put down that could compromise parking by residents. Having cars/vans there also reduces speeds in this area. Mrs Lindley will ask KCC Highways for their opinion but when GBC (as then responsible) were asked previously they did not consider that double yellow lines opposite Bowesden Lane were necessary. Police were also involved by parishioners but did not consider that there was an actionable problem.

- b) Burdett Avenue – A parishioner raised turning problems, especially by lorries and delivery vans. The rubbish lorry, the driver of which knows the problems, backs up the whole of the road to avoid this. Residents are asking if it is possible to have some signs saying no turning, please reverse up. Coutts Avenue has a turning circle, but Burdett Avenue doesn't. Mrs Lindley has written to Kent County Council asking for advice on wording of a sign as it will be non-standard.

65. Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board and KCC Highways:

- a) Joint Transport Board – None since previous meeting
- b) Kent County Council Highways – Meeting held on 11th June: The night before the meeting KCC said they did not have any administrative support and that SPC is required to support the meeting but it is a KCC meeting. Hayes Terrace was raised again as part of the Highways Improvement Plan discussion. KCC are still considering possible solutions for the problem.
- c) Village gateway signs – After informing Mrs Lindley on the Friday that it hadn't been ordered, on the following Tuesday the gateways and signs were installed near the end of Shorne Recreation Ground nearest to Puckle Hill Lodge. One of the signs immediately fell off as they were only glued on with mastic – thanks are due to a local resident who kindly fixed the sign back on again.
- d) Park Pale – Updated signs about not parking have been installed but may need correcting as not correctly worded.
- e) The Ridgeway – Lining improvements are proposed by KCC to go with the gateways. The plans have been circulated to members, please could Mrs Lindley have comments by 16th July 2021. As you come off the A2, before you to get to Woodlands Lane turn off it will say "SLOW" on the road, then in centre of the road, double white lines with cats eyes, half way along Brewers Road before the new Village Sign to say "SLOW" again and install "dragons teeth" road markings. There had also been discussion with KCC about improving safety for pedestrians crossing the road at Woodlands Lane/Brewers Road between entrances to the Country Park, which are not well located. It could be a good idea to build out the kerb to get vehicles to slow down as they are turning in, and possibly a traffic island refuge in the middle of the road where there was a triangle in the past, these will be put on the HIP as possible future projects.
- f) Highways Steward – Ben Platt has been transferred to Ashford, and the new Steward is Martyn Colley.
- g) Bollards outside Country Park entrance to protect footway from parking – awaiting installation, this is taking longer than we expected but the order has been placed.

66. Open Consultations:

- Local Government Boundary Review – There is review of Councillor numbers for Gravesham Borough Council, overall the total numbers will be cut from 44 to 39 and this could then impact on ward boundaries. The consultation runs until 2nd August

2021. There has been correspondence about an information session but no date was given. See <https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/27825>

- There is also a KCC consultation on the bus services. Mrs Lindley will reply as appropriate.
- 67. Closed consultations/for information:** Gravesham Borough Council Gravesend Town Centre Recovery Plan, Survey of Stakeholders – closed 2/7/21, response sent on behalf of the PC, it was mostly tick boxes.

Any other business:

68. Matters raised by Members, or from other Committees being discussed for convenience:

- Abandoned Car, Swillers Lane: Mr Theobald reported that a Parishioner had informed him about a VW Passat car that has apparently been abandoned in Swillers Lane. It has a flat rear tyre and it is not taxed. Mr Theobald has reported this to Kent County Council, and Gravesham Borough Council. Gravesham Borough Council have said they have spoken to the owner and the car has now been removed within 2 weeks.
- Playground Update: Mr Lane reported that the Grand opening is on Saturday 10th July 2021, at 10.30, the Mayor will be opening it with Mr Lane. Mr Sweetland and Mr Holloway have also been invited. Unfortunately, Mr Vilday is self-isolating, so Mr Lane and Ms Clifton have been doing the advance jobs required. Mr Lane contacted Gravesham Borough Council to cut the grass which they duly did, Mr Lane is going to borrow a mower from a local resident to cut around the play area, the bunting has been installed. The new bench will be installed tomorrow. Redlynch still have some items to finalise with snagging, they asked to be up there on Saturday morning, but Mr Lane advised if the work could not be completed by 09.30 then this was not possible. The swings have been put the wrong way round so this will be changed as well.
- Damaged tree on Astra Drive: Mr Hardy reported that a tree on Astra Drive is losing a limb, he was advised to tell Kent County Council Highways and then Gravesham Borough Council.

69. Matters raised by attending Parishioners: None in attendance

The meeting ended at 20.53

Signed Mrs Lindley:.....

Dated:.....

PLANNING APPLICATION representations from 20th May 2021 to 2nd July 2021:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20210407 Permitted	25 Coutts Avenue, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3HJ	Application for outline planning permission with some matters reserved for the demolition of existing house, erection of 2.no four bedroom dwellings and creation of vehicle crossovers.	<p>The Parish Council OBJECTS to this application. We have the following reasons and comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outline application: We OBJECT as a principle to outline applications as they do not provide sufficient information about design, size and mass at the outset, so do not allow proper assessment of the application to be made, including by local residents. 2. Previous application that was refused: The applicant has previously submitted the following application which was refused: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20111048 for two detached 4-bedroom houses (with garages at the front) – reasons for refusal given included that the proposed houses would be out of character with the area, negatively affect the street scene, constitute overdevelopment and have detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. 3. Other previous applications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note that application 20120873 for a pair of 3-bedroom semi-detached houses was also refused for similar reasons. • We note that application 20180322, initially also for two 4-bedroom detached houses, was permitted only after sizes were reduced to 3-bedroom semi-detached and significant design changes were implemented. This latter permission has been allowed to lapse. 4. The present application: This application appears to be attempting to go back to previously refused designs. The Parish Council OBJECTS to the proposal as we consider that this present application promises to cause much the same problems as previously identified. The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the street scene, be out of character with the area, constitute overdevelopment of the site and could have an unreasonable and overbearing effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties, especially that to the east, as building closer to the boundary. 5. Parking: The parking layout proposed could satisfy regulatory requirements but causes reduction in on-street parking availability in the area where on-street parking is problematic and competitive. <p>(Sent 24/5/21)</p>
20210567	Malthouse Lane, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3DS	Erection of a first floor front extension over existing garage, conversion of garage to playroom, new	<p>The Parish Council overall has no objection in principle to this proposal but has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present Numbers 3 and 5 Malthouse Lane are identical, Number 1 is different. The proposal will result in three different designs although arguably the proposal is a better appearance than the now somewhat dated existing design.

		fenestration design, rendering of existing ground floor front brickwork, replacement of hanging tile with new hanging tile, new porch, new soffits and fascias.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of the garage for parking is noted but the house appears to have enough on-site parking although some is tandem. • The colour of the finish of the proposed render needs to be specified and conditioned to only be within shades of white to cream. • We note that the property is adjacent to the Shorne Village Conservation Area and that the changes affect the setting of Listed buildings (St Katharines and Chapel). (Sent 24/5/21)
20210602 Refused	Park Farm House Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA	Erection of new dwelling with associated landscaping, access and parking on land adjacent to Meadow Cottage.	<p>The Parish Council has to OBJECT to this application. The plans submitted for this application and the circumstances described are identical to those previously submitted under application ref 20210007, which was refused permission. Hence the reasons for refusal are unchanged and the refusal decision remains valid.</p> <p>Since the previous application the Planning Statement has been updated (Points referenced below are from this document) and a Land Agents letter provided. The applicant has also written to Gravesham Borough Council (addressed to Cllr Burden), and copied to Shorne Parish Council, with additional information that we have also reviewed.</p> <p>Our reasons for objection, and other comments, are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voluntary not Compulsory Purchase: The Planning Statement states in points 1.1 and 1.2 that the new house will be a replacement for Park Farm House due to that being Compulsory Purchased by Highways England (HE) for the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC). The majority of the farmland owned by the applicant as Park Pale Farm is being Compulsory Purchased but the site of Park Farm House itself is not, being presently shown as outside of the HE development boundary. We understand that as part of the negotiations over purchase of the farmland the applicant has requested that HE should buy Park Farm House and HE have agreed to do that but as a voluntary “acquisition by agreement”. The applicant refers to the situation being “.....not something that the applicants wanted but has been forced upon them.....” (Point 4.4) and the house being “lost to the applicant” (Point 1.2) however the situation is actually a voluntary vacation of the property. 2. Stage of Highways England Lower Thames Crossing Proposals: At this point in time, the situation is that HE had to withdraw their Development Consent Order application that was submitted last year and it has not yet been resubmitted. Plans, including design of plantings in the area and existence of new paths, continue to change, are not presently fixed in nature and construction would not start before 2024 at the earliest. In the Parish Council’s discussions with HE we have stressed the need for existing houses to be surrounded by a protective physical buffer,

			<p>fast-growing and planted up as soon as possible, that would prevent close public access. We are not aware of any present or proposed plans for public facilities in the immediate area or public paths close to houses.</p> <p>3. Park Farm House will not be demolished by Highways England: The applicant states in point 4.5 that Park Farm House is to be demolished, but HE have indicated that is not their intention. It appears that residential use would continue, and HE have not discussed or mentioned to the Parish Council about any intention for non-residential use (see Point 4.9 and applicant’s letter). HE have stated to us that: “The property will enter HE’s property management portfolio. If the proposed LTC works are not deemed to impact the quiet enjoyment of the property, HE may seek to let the property at market rent. Upon completion of LTC works, LTC will seek to market the property for sale on the open market.” and “The property will not be demolished.” In that situation, the proposed property is clearly a new additional property in the Green Belt, without justification, and not a physical replacement.</p> <p>4. Requirement to vacate the house by July 2021: The applicant states (Points 2.2 and 4.6) that they are being required by HE to vacate the house “by July 2021” although the separate letter refers to completion on 31st July 2021. We would expect that the dates could be renegotiated with HE, particularly in light of the on-going delay to the LTC project.</p> <p>5. Previous use of the land: The land proposed is farmland that was previously leased to Meadow Cottage. It was used as an orchard. The land was not part of the primary residential curtilage of either Meadow Cottage or Park Farm House.</p> <p>6. Separate nature of the plot: The application states that “The land has never formed part of Park Farm...”. That may have been the situation operationally due to the previous leasing of the plot to Meadow Cottage however the application plot is part of the Land Registry deed plan for Park Pale Farm under reference K515286.</p> <p>7. Amount of land remaining at Park Farm House: Park Farm House will, on the present HE plans, be left with approximately ½ an acre of gardens. The land that is the subject of this application is another ½ acre. It could be better for the area of the plots to be amalgamated around Park Farm House to increase its amenity. Other land area not required by HE could also be added. These possibilities should be explored with HE.</p> <p>8. Associated land to remain is not shown on a plan: We requested previously that there should be clarification over the location of all the land which will remain in the ownership of the applicant. The application again states (Point 2.2) that once the existing house has been purchased by HE “the applicants will own no other land” but in point 2.9, as in the Land Agent’s</p>
--	--	--	--

letter, that the land being purchased by HE is “with the exception of two small areas including the application site”. We are aware that there are discrepancies between the outline of the HE land plans and the Park Pale Farm deed plans – there is for example a very small triangle of land including a structure immediately south east of the proposed garden, and there is also land immediately east of Park Pale Yard which is either currently part of the existing deed plan or has a separate deed (ref K516238, see also application ref 20210087). These plots are outside the current HE red line boundary. There is another area of land east of Park Pale Yard but west of the proposed HE drainage pond, which is also presently part of the land of Park Pale Farm, but which does not have a final mitigation use by HE identified.

9. Land for “livestock” use: The application states that building the new house “will enable the applicants to continue to safeguard the interests of the livestock on the other land that they are being left with”. The nature and the location of keeping of the proposed “livestock” should be clarified. We have concerns about the viability of what is proposed on such small areas of land. We suggest that the application needs an “after” plan, showing what other land will remain associated with the application site, which areas will be used for “livestock”, and how these will be accessed from the application site as there does not appear to be any direct access from the proposed new house.

10. Supporting information omitted: The applicant’s solicitor’s letter mentioned in the application text has not been made available to the Parish Council.

11. Green Belt and AONB location: The proposed site is located in the Green Belt where new dwellings would not normally be permitted except in very special circumstances, which have not been demonstrated. It is also located in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) where impacts of new buildings must be carefully evaluated. Overall, the proposal would be inappropriate development.

12. Proposed design: The proposed design appears largely satisfactory although we would comment that there is no door to the exterior from the kitchen.

While the circumstances and setting of the existing house will be altered by the LTC proposals, Park Farm House will still be a desirable property that many would be happy to own and live in. The future configuration of the existing property could also be enhanced if the land area the subject of this application (possibly plus other areas not required permanently by HE) was moved, by negotiation with HE, to be adjoining/contiguous with the existing house.

The proposal appears to be a desired new house in the Green Belt rather than a necessity. The

			<p>applicant's removal from Park Farm House is voluntary and the house is not to be demolished, so the proposal is inappropriate development as "Very special circumstances" have not been demonstrated that would override Green Belt policies. Several nearby properties in Bowesden Lane have been marketed recently and could have been purchased by the applicants rather than applying to build an extra house, providing additional reason why a new house is not required in the area.</p> <p>In view of the location, if permitted we also request that Conditions should be included removing all permitted development rights on the proposed plot and all other associated land.</p> <p>We repeat that we have considerable sympathy for the applicants being twice adversely affected by major Highways schemes but regret that due to the actual circumstances we cannot support the application. (Sent 1/6/21)</p>
20210578	Danver Lodge Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Erection of triple detached garage.	<p>The Parish Council has significant concerns about this application, which repeats the garage proposal that was initially included in application 20151125.</p> <p>We note that for the previous application there was other land identified that is also in the ownership of the applicant but this is not shown on the presently submitted plans.</p> <p>Our comments on the previous application were as follows and remain largely unchanged: "The Parish Council requests that conditions should be applied such that the building can only be used as a garage, ancillary to the given location address. The Parish Council notes that the proposed garage is a long distance from the house rather than nearby and grouped with it as would usually be expected. The proposed garage is very far forward on the site, partly in front of the building line created by adjacent properties, so it is requested that the garage should, if it is to be permitted in the proposed general location, be relocated a little further north on the site. The proposed location is presently wooded however sufficient screening trees/shrubs etc should remain after construction."</p> <p>The location is in the Green Belt and this additional building will detrimentally affect openness. Conditions should be applied preventing residential use/conversion.</p> <p>We note that after the previous application most pre-existing trees and shrubs were removed from the site despite having been shown on the plans. Therefore if permitted we also request that a tall hedge or other plantings should by condition be required to be planted and maintained in order to effect visual screening of the building from the roadway. (Sent 1/6/21)</p>

20210625	23 Davys Place, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 4DL	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension.	The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal subject to there not being any significant objections from neighbours. (Sent 1/6/21)
20210621	35 Calderwood, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 4QH	Conversion of integrated garage to home office/study.	The Parish Council has no objection to this application subject to there not being any valid objections from neighbours. The proposal includes a theoretical loss of one parking place however the existing garage is narrow so probably not useable for most cars. The plans show that three open-air parking places will be provided on the site. (Sent 14/6/21)
20210618	8 Coutts Avenue, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3HJ	Erection of a single storey rear extension.	The Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to there not being any valid objections raised by neighbouring properties. (Sent 14/6/21)
20210663	Gardeners Cottage Brewers Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LB	Demolition of the existing two storey extension on the north (front) elevation, formation of new entrance, two dormer windows within the roof slope and a two storey extension to the eastern end. New single storey extension to the west elevation and alterations to the fenestration on the south (rear) elevation and roof. Lean-to storage shed on east elevation.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application. We have the following comments however: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The present property is small with respect to the size of its curtilage. It is situated well-spaced from any neighbours, surrounded by parts of Shorne Woods Country Park and other woodland. The site is located in the Green Belt and the North Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but the proposed extensions will not have significant detrimental effect. • We have a few comments/questions about the design/the plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The two doors to the outside (are two needed?) from the unlabelled area adjacent to the new kitchen, and that into the east (side) elevation, do not have any weather protection. o On the south (rear) elevation view a small canopy structure and another structure below it are shown on the new extension but nothing equivalent appears on the proposed ground floor layout although the canopy alone appears on the east (side) elevation view. Is this feature needed? o The new front door or the two small dormers could be repositioned slightly to provide more mutual symmetry to the entrance frontage. • We request that Tree Preservation Orders should be placed on any qualifying trees on the site, and a Woodland Management Plan be required if appropriate for any relevant areas of the site. • We request that permitted development rights should be withdrawn for the site, to restrict any further buildings on the site being constructed without full planning permission.

			(Sent 23/6/21)
20210433	1 Ridgeway Bungalows Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JY	Retention of wall and railings to front.	<p>The Parish Council notes that regrettably, this application is retrospective.</p> <p>The Parish Council OBJECTS to this application, for the following reasons/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is for an up-to-1.2m high brick wall topped with 2m total height pillars, to be infilled with metal railings. We consider that the proposal is inappropriate as out of character with this part of the local area which is presently characterised by open frontages or at most a low fence or a hedge. • The proposal would be detrimental to the street-scene, introducing a harsh, urban appearance to a semi-rural area. • A similar application Ref 20200355 nearby for brick walls and railings over was previously refused. • We note that no gates are proposed/included in the plans. • We suggest that the wall should be removed in its entirety and hedging (preferably mixed native species) should be replanted. Alternatively, as an absolute maximum, there could be a low (no more than 1m high) wall with plantings behind it. <p>(Sent 23/6/21)</p>
20210695	The Old Police House Tanyard Hill Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EN	Application for a Lawful Development certificate in respect of the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension.	<p>The Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to there not being any valid objections raised by neighbouring properties.</p> <p>(Sent 23/6/21)</p>