

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Parish Planning & Highways Committee Meeting held on
27th January 2022 in Shorne Village Hall**

PRESENT

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

APOLOGIES

Mr C Rea

In attendance:

No Parishioners attended

107. To receive any declarations of interest for any items on the agenda

No declarations were made.

108. Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 11th November 2021

The minutes had previously been circulated, were proposed by Mr Theobald and seconded by Mr Lane, and all present approved.

109. Any Matters Arising from Minutes not covered in the Agenda.

None were raised.

Planning:

110. 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) – All were approved by members.

111. Planning Applications of note and GBC decisions: There have been responses made to 15 planning applications and one Appeal since the previous meeting in November 2021, as per the table of planning applications. In the table in the previous minutes, the GBC planning decisions have been updated if already known.

112. Tree surgery work applications: Mrs Lindley reported that although it could just be the time of year, it is however noticeable that there have been more applications than usual for Tree Works, eight in total. These all appear justified but the thinning, and in some cases removal of diseased trees, will have a noticeable effect of loss of vegetation cover.

113. Variance between representations and Gravesham Borough Council decisions: Mrs Lindley had mentioned this at the previous Council Meeting. There have been some

instances recently where the GBC decisions did not fully accord with the Parish Council's views. It is unclear how planning applications are allocated to officers, as one officer seems to feature more often. While disagreement is bound to happen sometimes, there have been several instances recently which have caused concern, particularly where the decision leads to the setting of precedent or where points of particular concern had not been addressed.

Examples are:

- a) High ridge, Pear Tree Lane applied for a side extension. The title and the plans indicate that the property is to be rendered so we included in our representations our standard comment about colour. In the GBC officers report our comment is dismissed saying that the property is not going to be rendered.
- b) Cumloden, Pear Tree Lane applied several times to redesign their frontage. Each time we pointed out that part of the frontage is designated highway verge and asked GBC to confirm the position with KCC but that didn't seem to be done. KCC did confirm to us verbally and said that they would write to the householder. The Officer report stated that we had questioned, and the applicant had proved, that they owned the land however we had never queried the ownership only whether the land was actually available to be built on as proposed in the submitted plans.
- c) 28 Coutts Avenue is a chalet bungalow with attached garage and workshops, on a large double plot. There were outline applications first for 4 dwellings, then 3 – original house existing outline plus one other mirrored at the front, and a second new build behind. We commented in both applications that the two front dwellings were in line with the adjacent building line to the west although the last house in the row is set further back. An application was submitted to greatly change the existing bungalow into a house, a design out of character with the area and extending forward of the building line, so even further forward in relation to the last house. We had expected GBC to refuse the application due to both aspects however the officer report dismissed our concerns and stated that the building line in the area is variable however that is not presently the case on the south side of the street.
- d) 16 Warren View had submitted applications to extend the house and for it to be rendered. We objected to that aspect as it will be out of character with the area but also included our standard comment that if permitted the colour should be within white to cream. The decision notice refers to external materials being as per the plans but the plans do not state or show the proposed colour. Subsequently an e-mail was sent to the case officer requesting clarification and re-sent later but no reply has been received.

Mr Lane suggested that Mrs Lindley should try to meet or have a discussion with Wendy Lane at GBC regarding these concerns, Mr Theobald offered to attend with Mrs Lindley.

114. GBC enforcement updates: There have been no updates received. Although GBC have created a web page for updates on major enforcement issues there is nothing similar for minor issues. It is reasonable that enforcement cases should not be public before confirmation however updates should be available to relevant Borough and Parish Councillors, another topic to raise with Wendy Lane. Mrs Lindley received a message saying that due to an IT error GBC had only just found our queries about 135 Astra Drive (rear dormer above ridge height) and an access driveway installed to a garden on Shorne Ifield Road. No further information has been received regarding these previous queries: the Land south of Apex Business Park buildings (inspection awaited); Shorne Mead, Pear Tree Lane (engineering works). It is understood that there is to be an enforcement visit to Ringland, Pear Tree Lane (see also representations reported in the applications schedule) but it had to

be delayed due to illness. Merrievale, Pear Tree Lane appear to have undertaken engineering works altering the land levels without permission.

115. Notices of Appeal: There have been no new notifications or decisions received, there are four active cases which includes Ewhurst, Bowesden Lane which had representations submitted (see the attached applications schedule). The other 3 are being dealt with by the “Householder Appeal Process” whereby neither the Parish Council or Gravesham Borough Council are allowed to make any further representation.

116. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish: Lower Thames Crossing – it has been quiet our side of the river, but it is understood that there will be another mini Consultation possibly at the end of March 2022 for 4 weeks, prompted by changes being required to the Tilbury Field park proposal. This has happened because the recently designated Freeport have now said that they will require some of the land for expansion. Mr Lane reported on a meeting with Mr Palmer and Mr Holloway, he confirmed that the consultation is mainly about Tilbury but there are also some other changes south of the river but no fundamental changes to the route. Mrs Lindley reported that Eva had called her briefly just before Christmas and said that the Development Consent Order consultation will be “sometime in 2022”. The smart motorways rollout has been paused nationally.

117. Outside Parish but with impact: Ebbsfleet Central East – this is the area around Ebbsfleet International station, so is of importance to everyone needing to access and park at the station. The recent consultation was poorly structured as it had various sections but you had to answer each section individually then come out to go into the next one, however meanwhile it wasn't clear which sections you had already answered. There appeared to only about 55 responses made in total. The important proposals to note are that the existing car parks will be built on, with high rise offices and flats immediately around the station itself. New car parks will be provided outside the main area so that accessing the station will involve a 5-minute walk through shop and restaurant areas. They only propose to provide the same number of parking spaces as at present but it is not clear how they would prevent residents, shop and office staff from taking up spaces.

Highways:

118. Accident reports: Mrs McCluskey reported that on Marling Way there appears to have been a car accident as a damaged car is on the pavement and has been there for over one week. Mrs McCluskey will report it to the police.

119. Traffic monitoring,

- a) **Speedwatch:** Mrs Lindley thanked Ms Clifton and the volunteers for their hard work, and Mr Lane for sending the information through from the SID. Ms Clifton reported that there had been five very productive sessions undertaken, with 14 1st letter offences and there were some repeat offenders detected. Mrs Lindley asked Ms Clifton to remind people of the codes: MO2 means this is the second time they have been seen exceeding the limit so a 1st letter has been sent, MO3 is the third offence. No MO4 has been recorded yet. FO1 is a letter for excessive speeding which is 15MPH above the local limit.
- b) **Lorrywatch:** There was a report on 08/12/2021 that RS Skips vehicles were seen in Green Farm Lane, Mr Lane has written to the company, who apologised saying that the driver was new to the job.

120. Road condition/highways issues and hazards:

- a) **Forecourt of shops in The Street** – Mr Lane has been in correspondence with the Agent and the owner is obtaining quotations for repairs
- b) **Manor Field** – The sinking pavement has been repaired, but the stream is still flowing (ice hazard) this has been reported previously but will be reported again.
- c) **Pear Tree Lane near traffic lights** – A resident reported overhanging trees, this was been reported to KCC #599755 and there no longer seems to be a problem.
- d) **Forge Lane, corner** – surface was deteriorating, this was reported to KCC # 606273, and has now been repaired.
- e) **Crown Lane, BT manhole cover** – this was reported to KCC # 606274, Mr Theobald reported that this was repaired just before Christmas.
- f) **Mill Hill Lane/Crown Lane** – blocked gullies were reported several times, last KCC #606275. KCC called and apologised that due to an oversight the work had not been commissioned but has been now and will be scheduled soon. Two of the gullies were in the closed section of Crown Lane, Mrs Lindley gave KCC the code for their lock.
- g) **Hedges in Thong Lane** – Mrs Williams reported that these have been cut back.

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

- a) **Manor Field** – There have been further incidents of driveways being blocked by parking, some residents paid for white lines to be installed. This can be done by official contractors such as Archway <https://www.archwayhighwayservices.co.uk/>
- b) **Hollands close, school parking** – Mrs Lindley sent e-mails to the PCSO and the School, the PCSO replied suggesting maybe some signs be put out at bad times and also advised to contact Nick May at Gravesham Borough Council. We have not had a reply from the school. It may be an idea to get yellow lines just on a few of the corners of the roads affected. Mrs McCluskey suggested a stand-up lollipop lady which says “Think! Do not park here” she has seen these being used at Whitehall Primary School. There are concerns though that signs could obstruct the pavements.

122. Feedback from KCC Highways:

- a) **Kent County Council Highways and HIP (Highways Improvement Plan)** – Mrs Lindley and Mr Lane attended a meeting on Teams which was held 30/11/2021 by Ian Grigor. The meeting was very good and seemed productive but we have not heard anything since e.g. proposing another meeting.

KCC said that they would find funding for the 20 MPH zone, which would be out of the trial funding they had and would be bringing the plans forward in preparation for the next financial year.

They informed us that fixed speed and volume traffic sampling is no generally longer considered necessary as they have access to GPS data from mobile phones (similar to Google maps), which enables them to identify all problem areas. We requested data for all parts of Thong Lane, Mill Hill Lane and Tanyard Hill/The Street/Forge Lane but this has not yet been received.

KCC said that they would sort out getting some children warning signs for near the playground.

We asked about costings of various works and the need for street lighting, this does not seem to still be an absolute requirement as reflector lights are now acceptable. Example costs are: standard zebra crossing £15,000; toucan crossing £25,000; kerb built out £16,000; traffic island £14,000 including bollards and solar balls but you are supposed to also have a dropped kerb and tactile paths which might not be suitable in

rural locations. Ms Clifton asked about the tentative idea for a kerb build out and traffic island at the junction of Woodlands Lane with Brewers Road, Mrs Lindley said it would cost in the region of £20,000 to install this so more discussion needs to be had on this. Mr Theobald commented that having a path along the edge of the common had been attempted in the past. Members considered that we might usefully ask the Country Park to review the locations of their paths and entrances.

- b) **GBC:KCC Joint Transport Board** – The meeting on 01/12/2021 was cancelled and the next one should be on the 09/03/2022. KCC are refusing to attend unless it is done as a zoom meeting as the travelling time for evening meetings detracts from available working hours. This is a discussion between GBC and KCC for them to resolve.
- c) **Village gateway road markings** – These were installed on the 6th Jan 2022, they have also installed the “Dragons teeth” markings as well as the SLOW signs and speed roundel.
- d) **Forge Lane 30mph, and Gravesend Road speed limit reduction** – Mrs Lindley has sent the response to the statutory consultation which closed on the 10/1/2022.
- e) **A2 T junction with Brewers Road** – National Highways responsibility, works are to be programmed, with thanks to Mr Lane for all his hard work on this.
- f) **Update the Highway Improvement Plan** – Mrs Lindley will update this and send it around for comment. The next highways meeting is the 10th March so any suggestions for additions are welcomed before then.

Consultations:

123. Open Consultations:

- a) Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 Review – closes 09/02/2022
https://letstalk.kent.gov.uk/kmwlp/preview?utm_source=ehq_newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ehq-Public-consultation-on-refreshed-Kent-Minerals-and-Waste-Local-Plan&utm_source=ehq&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=website

124. Closed consultations/for information:

- a) KCC Kent Heritage Conservation Strategy, closed 13/12/2021
https://letstalk.kent.gov.uk/heritage-conservation-strategy?utm_medium=email&utm_medium=email&utm_source=ehq_newsletter&utm_source=ehq&utm_campaign=ehq-Kent-Heritage-Conservation-Strategy&utm_campaign=website
- b) National Highways “Vision for route strategies – planning for the future of our roads” – closed 31/12/2021
<https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-work/our-route-strategies/>
- c) Various roads in Gravesend, Higham and Shorne, Gravesham - Amendment 6: Speed limit order – closed 10/01/2022, a response has been response sent
https://letstalk.kent.gov.uk/gravesend-speed-limit-order?utm_source=ehq_newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ehq-New-Traffic-Regulation-Order-Consultation-in-Gravesham&utm_source=ehq&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=website
- d) Local Government Boundary Review – closed 10/01/2022, a response has been sent
<https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/have-your-say/27825>
- e) Medway Housing Infrastructure Fund (“Future Hoo”) – closed 10/01/2022, a Teams meeting was held on the 9th November which Mrs Lindley attended. It was discussed as to what operational extend the new railway finally will have. There are two footpaths of concern: Kings footpath goes from Higham common out onto the

Marshes, they have been talking about re-routing it east of St Marys Church but now looking at rerouting it to a Cattle Arch tunnel under the railway line. It is not clear whether joint use between footpath and cattle is a good idea. It is also liable to flooding in that area. A response was sent on behalf of Shorne Parish Council.

https://www.medway.gov.uk/homepage/275/housing_infrastructure_fund

- f) Ebbsfleet Development Central East – closed 14/01/2022, a response has been sent

<https://ebbsfleetcentral.commonplace.is/>

- g) Kent Design Guide – closed 17/01/2022

https://letstalk.kent.gov.uk/kentdesignguide?utm_source=ehq_newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=ehq-Have-your-say-on-sustainable-design-for-Kents-built-environment&utm_source=ehq&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=website

Any other business:

125. Matters raised by Members

- a) Tree felling in Great Crabbles Wood – Mrs Lindley reported that a Parishioner had raised concerns. Mr Lane was able to clarify that it was routine tree felling under license. Note that Great Crabbles Wood is owned by Cobham Hall Estate, and the land on the east side bordering onto Crutches Lane is owned by Gads Hill Farm.
- b) Christmas Tree on Post Office Green - Mrs Lindley reported that Parishioners had requested to have a living Christmas Tree on Post Office Green. This is a Footpath, Properties and Greens issue, and only would become a Planning and Highways issue if the tree should obstructed traffic sight lines.
- c) Community Assets Register - Mrs Lindley reported that the Clerk and herself have registered the Rose & Crown Public House as decided at previous Council meetings..
- d) Highbank (Mill Hill Lane) access route - Mr Lane reported that we have had a communication from Highbank and we need to give it some thought before the next Council meeting.
- e) Shorne West welcome sign - Mr Hardy reported that the Welcome to Shorne West Sign has been re installed.
- f) Queens Jubilee Dinner and Dance - Mr Lane asked what date was preferred and Friday 3rd June 2022 was agreed.
- g) Crown Lane entrance to Footpath NS164 - Mrs McCluskey reported that Rob Shove has kindly fixed the gate and installed a Concrete Block next to it to stop the motorbikes gaining access.

126. Matters raised by attending Parishioners - None attending

Date of next Parish Planning & Highways meeting – 10th March 2022

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 20.57

Signed Mrs Lindley:..... Dated:.....

PLANNING APPLICATIONS from 7th November 2021 to 20th January 2022:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20211326 Approval of details	Cumloden Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JZ	Application for approval of conditions 4 and 6 attached to planning permission reference number 20190755 relating to the soft and hard landscaping scheme to front (4) and land reserved for parking (6).	<p>This application is a revised version of the proposals submitted as part of refused applications refs 20200355 and 20210966. The reasons for the refusals are set out in the respective detailed Officer Reports.</p> <p>The latest design proposal has taken note of some of the previous comments and advice however some items also remain unaddressed. Additional comments and photographs have helpfully been provided by the applicant.</p> <p>The present proposal has a single driveway in the established position for the site, and a single wide wooden sliding gate (1m high on the plans) which retracts behind a hedge. These changes increase the compatibility with the local streetscene.</p> <p>The Parish Council however continues to have concerns about some aspects of the proposals and we have the following comments:</p> <p>1) Design of frontage: The design remains almost completely paved save for two small acers in pots and a very narrow flowerbed. The adjoining property Clearways to the west has a highly paved frontage (see Plate 4) however this was installed without having been included in their 2013 planning permission and there is no highway verge beside the pavement there. Noted that the frontage is stated to be “reserved for car parking”, the meaning of this needs to be clarified, and perhaps regulated by Condition.</p> <p>2) Location of the hedge and soakaway, and clarification of the depth of the highway verge: The proposed 1m high laurel hedge is shown planted right up to the edge of the pavement whereas we believe that this encroaches on the highway verge as shown on the KCC Highways street plans. Similarly for the position of the proposed channel drain.</p> <p><i>Extract from KCC Highways mapping (public):</i></p>



We note that the photographs supplied by the applicant show that the original wooden gate was in line with the fence of the house immediately to the east, as in accordance with the KCC Highways street plans. The previous hedge was very overgrown and had encroached onto the Highway verge.

We believe that the proposed hedge should be planted in a bed that is fully behind the original gate line and the continuation of the line of the fence from the next door east property to the forward end of the dividing fence to Clearways, however this must be clarified with KCC Highways.

We have asked previously for this to be officially clarified with KCC Highways by GBC and request this again.

Other comments arising from the applicant's statement document:

- Permeable nature of paving – this has not been confirmed. The concern is not just about having block paving but the overall permeability of the installation and the functioning of any soakaways, i.e. whether the proposals will prevent excess water draining onto the roadway.
- Insetting of gates from the roadway – a greater insetting distance was recommended however, as the applicant has shown, the proposed gates are in line with the previous gates on the property and those next door to the east (as Plate2). It would seem though that these gates are/were rarely closed. This matter should be reviewed against their previous advice, by the GBC Highways Development Management Officer.
- Security concerns – the applicant reports that they have had cars stolen twice and the

			<p>garage burgled once. We were not made aware of these incidents at the time and would obviously express our sympathies however they are not typical for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Wall at nearby frontage</u>, Plate 5 – this is the subject of enforcement action. Retrospective planning permission has been applied for (ref 20210433), to which the Parish Council objected, and the decision is awaited • <u>Gates on driveway to Stables opposite</u>, Plate 6 – these gates are set well back from the roadway. <p>(Sent 9/11/21)</p>
<p>20211314</p> <p>Permitted</p>	<p>25 Coutts Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HJ</p>	<p>Reserved Matters Application for the approval of details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to outline planning permission reference number 20210407 for the demolition of existing house, erection of 2.no four bedroom dwellings and creation of vehicle crossovers.</p>	<p>The property was granted outline planning permission for two 4-bedroom dwellings under application ref 20210207 however 4-bedroom dwellings had previously been refused permission for reasons including cramped rooms and overdevelopment of the site. Permission for two three-bedroom dwellings was previously granted under revised application ref 20180322 but this permission was allowed to lapse.</p> <p>In the present application the applicant has continued with the reversion to proposing nominal four-bedroom, detached layout dwellings however this once again provides minimum sized and cramped accommodation out of keeping with the area.</p> <p>The Parish Council continues to have significant concerns about this proposal and has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the street scene, the design is considered unsatisfactory and would be out of character with the area (cramped layout and alien external design), and in our view would constitute overdevelopment of the site. • The reversion to detached dwellings places the buildings closer to the neighbouring boundaries although mitigated with hipped roof design on the outer sides. • The internal layout is cramped for the number of residents proposed, the 4th bedroom being particularly small due to angled ceiling on two walls even if the floor area is minimally compliant with guidance. • The parking layout proposed could satisfy regulatory requirements but causes reduction in on-street parking availability in an area where on-street parking is problematic and competitive. We note that the previous advice from GBC Engineering about reducing of the

			<p>number of vehicle crossovers and providing visibility splays has not been implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would set an undesirable precedent in the area. <p>(Sent 22/11/21)</p>
<p>20211361</p> <p>Refused</p>	<p>Courtlands, Gravesend Road, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3JR</p>	<p>Demolition of existing house and outbuildings and erection a of a new two storey Georgian style 3-bed dwelling with associated landscaping.</p>	<p>The applicant has previously submitted several applications for this site, the most recent being Ref 20210368 for a swimming pool and three large outbuildings in connection with, and extensions to, the existing house. That Lawful Development application was approved by GBC, however to date, the outbuildings and swimming pool have not been constructed. This present application seeks to retain the permission for the swimming pool and three large outbuildings but to demolish and rebuild the existing house with larger dimensions.</p> <p><u>NB: The application refers to a 3-bedroom dwelling (two-storey) but the Planning and Design Statement describes a 4-bedroom dwelling (three storey) - this requires clarification with the applicant.</u></p> <p><u>Plans for the second/loft level have not been provided and this deficiency must be rectified.</u></p> <p>We also note that the “stable” (“stables” in point 3.2 of the Planning and Design statement) is described as an “existing gym room” on the Size Comparison Plan - it appears to have been converted to residential use without planning permission, and we question whether it can contribute to the Size Comparison considerations.</p> <p>There are a number of elements to this application:</p> <p>1) Demolition and rebuilding of the existing house with larger dimensions:</p> <p>The Parish Council has <u>no objection in principle to this element</u> of the application as the site is large, the built forms are set well back, there will be relatively low impact on the streetscene, and immediate neighbours will not be detrimentally affected.</p> <p>We note however that the house was previously/has already been extended by more than 100% compared with its original footprint.</p> <p>The proposal reduces openness in the Green Belt by virtue of the increased width and mass of the building, which has a less blending design and will be visible in the landscape from higher ground.</p> <p>2) Discrepancies between submitted plans and the Planning and Design Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 5.38 refers to the “Boot Room” on the plans actually being a boot room/cycle store but in point 5.54 states that cycle storage “....could be provided within the garage due to the size proposed” – the actual intention requires clarification. Point 5.38 refers to “stairs to the loft providing further storage or addition dressing room

			<p>facilities” and Point 5.39 states that “the landing to the loft is provided with an oriel window to the projecting gable to provide natural daylight” however the plans do not show the staircase or any layout for the second/loft level. Clarification of the window type is also required as it appears on the plans to be just a circular window.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 5.42 refers to the proposed house as “4-bedroom” (as does point 5.49), “the fourth bedroom provided in the loft space” and that “all of the bedrooms are en-suite”. Clarification and detailed plans are needed regarding the intentions for the second floor/loft level. We note that no windows or other ventilation, fire protection and fire-escape arrangements are shown for the second/loft level. <p>3) Other comments on the proposed design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of symmetry – The Planning and Design statement refers on page 20, point 5.37 to the layout as being symmetrical however this is not the case and might be reconsidered - with a subsidiary side extension on the east side but not on the west the design looks unbalanced. Proposed outbuildings - The need for outbuildings was predicated on there not being sufficient accommodation in the main house however there is presently an opportunity to remedy this and reduce the sprawl of built forms on the site. We note e.g. that there is now provision of an office in the main house and a desk area is shown in the second bedroom. The plans do not include e.g. a basement level, or as presently submitted, any use of the loft level. The Parish Council considers that use of the site could be considerably more compact than presently proposed and would like to see the overall number of built structures reviewed and consequently reduced in size and number. The area of hardstanding is being extended, this must be permeable. <p>4) Previous Approval for Outbuildings and swimming pool</p> <p>The application assumes that the outbuildings that were previously permitted in relation to the existing house are still permitted with its replacement and a completely new planning application however we would question whether this is automatically the case. As confirmed by the applicant, the outbuildings have not been built or even commenced at this date, so consideration should be given as to whether this present application, if permitted, supersedes all those prior.</p> <p>5) Suggested Conditions (assuming all plans are correct as presently submitted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The loft level does not have any permanent access and can only be used for storage. Any residential use of the loft level or changes to the roof design and fenestration would require planning permission.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outbuildings are only annexes to the main house and cannot be used residentially or as separate dwellings. Excepting with additional planning permission they cannot be joined together or otherwise altered, cannot be subject to any change of use or used for any commercial purpose, cannot be repositioned or extended, and the pool cannot be enclosed. All hardstanding must be permeable. If permitted, this application supersedes all previous applications including for Lawful Development. <p>(Sent 22/11/21)</p>
20211411 Approval of Non-material amendment	Little St Katherines Forge Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3DR	Application for non-material amendment to planning permission reference number 20190388 to allow changes to the fenestration of the new draught lobby.	<i>Assessed no need for additional comments</i>
20211409 Withdrawn	High Ridge Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Single storey rear extension with a depth of 8.00 metres, maximum height of 4.00 metres and eaves height of 3.80 metres.	<i>Withdrawn, no notification received</i>
20211382 Permitted	28 Coutts Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HJ	Demolition of garage and sun lounge and erection of a two storey front extension incorporating new integrated garage, alterations and raising of the roof, erection of rear dormer windows to create habitable rooms on first floor, erection of	<p>This property is an existing chalet bungalow, similar in style to others in the area which have fully hipped roofs. It has had small front and rear box dormer loft conversions, one small side dormer set towards the back of the roof providing a storage area, and a ground floor rear extension. The existing deep, double plot is being subdivided through demolition of the existing garage.</p> <p>The Design and Access statement for the previous permitted application Ref 20190870 refers to “retention of the existing three-bedroom dwelling on site” and that 28 and 28A will be mirror images, so any consent for No 28 will inform the design of No 28A. On the revised proposed block plan as permitted, numbers 28 (this property) and 28A (new 3-bedroom property) were shown with their identical layouts smaller at the front than at the back and in line with the building line of the neighbouring property at No. 26 which is itself forward of that of No 30.</p>

		a single storey rear extension, creation of new vehicular access and laying of hardstanding.	<p>This proposal however is for a larger 4-bedroom, double-fronted house that comes forward of the building line and is of a style that is out of keeping with other properties in the area.</p> <p>The Parish Council OBJECTS to this application with the following reasons/comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application constitutes overdevelopment of the site and will result in a cramped form of development with very low amount of amenity space. • The proposed style will be out of character with the immediate area, detrimental to the street scene and would set an undesirable precedent. • The proposed extensions come forward of the building line of No 26 and this will be an even greater difference to the building line of No 30. • The proposed front dormer should be reduced in height so as to show subsidiarity to the main roof. • The outline comparison is misleading as the proposed dwelling will be of much greater bulk and depth than the existing property. • The parking proposal has a wider crossover than presently, which would compromise parking in an area where the roadway is narrow and on-street parking is difficult and competitive. • The parking spaces are smaller than standard guidance being less than 5m long, and space 3 does not leave room for opening the garage door. • The parking layout shows that a vehicle parked perpendicular to the street could block access to the other two spaces. • The property will have a very small rear garden and private amenity space, much smaller than commonly found in the area. We suggest that property 28B might be relocated on its much larger plot to allow longer gardens for 28 and 28A. <p>The Parish Council considers that layout changes and renovation of the existing property would provide a suitable three-bedroom dwelling as originally intended and permitted.</p> <p>However, if this application is to be permitted, conversion of the garage to residential accommodation should be prevented by Condition. The hardstanding should be permeable and not allow water to drain onto the roadway.</p> <p>(Sent 1/12/21)</p>
20211403 Approval of details	1 Cheney's Cottages Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend	Application for the approval of conditions 3, 4 and 5 attached to planning application reference number	<p>The application is for discharge of conditions, the previous application Ref 20200630 having been refused. The property is located in the Thong Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that the plan submitted with this application differs from the sketch previously submitted for the September 2019 planning application ref 20190929, and the subsequent successful Appeal submitted in February 2020, as the parking area is twice as large</p>



Aerial view, April 2019

Regarding the application to discharge the Conditions:

Condition 3 (External facing materials including paths etc): The planning statement refers to gravel being laid on existing concrete/hard surface. This would be true for the path from the road to the front door, which seems to have been laid between May 2018 and April 2019. The plans now submitted show another path element being newly proposed, leading to and from the parking area.

The parking area was previously grass and a (removed) hedge. Builders rubble appears to have been deposited on the grass. This area is now to be gravelled which will create a large bare area twice as large as previously indicated and permitted, the proposed parking area now being approximately 12m wide by 9.2m deep. This may be overlarge.

The plans refer to “existing timber fencing” but this appears to be newly installed. The parking area is fully fenced off from the garden so we suggest possible Conditions that the parking area is only ancillary to the house and cannot be leased out or used to operate a business.

It is noted that no vehicle gates are shown, addition of these would require planning permission.

Condition 4 (Visibility splay): It is stated that the front hedge will always be kept at only 1m high however the splay relies on being able to see across neighbouring frontages, over which the applicant has no control. These other frontages are used for parking so there will be times when the view is blocked and vehicles will have to inch out until the driver can see.

It needs to be clarified with GBC highways about what they intended by their advice and whether or not they consider that the presently proposed visibility splay arrangements are satisfactory.

Condition 5 (Soft landscaping): If the front hedge is to be kept trimmed to 1m high then it is unlikely to provide good wildlife habitat.

The Parish Council had previously requested that the hedges should be mixed native species and

			<p>this was supported by implication in the Planning Appeal decision which says: “Notwithstanding the details submitted, full details of soft landscaping shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include schedules of plants noting species; location.....”</p> <p>No overall planting scheme has been provided apart from the front hedge, and the plans do not e.g. include flowerbeds or any other plantings on the site, the plans referring only to grass areas. Overall, we do not consider that this Condition has been satisfied however we note that other houses in the row have similar trimmed monoculture hedges.</p> <p>(Sent 12/12/21)</p>
<p>20211421</p> <p>Certificate Refused</p>	<p>Thong Lodge Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD</p>	<p>Application for Lawful Development Certificate for proposed conversion of existing stable into annex incidental to the main dwelling.</p>	<p>This application is a revised version of refused application Ref 20210835.</p> <p>The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal, for a habitable bedsit annexe, but has some comments/concerns:</p> <p>1) Loss of the existing stable for animal use: It needs to be confirmed/assured that the existing stable is permanently redundant (i.e. the applicant no longer keeps any horses/other livestock on the site) lest residential conversion now results in a subsequent need for another stable or other outbuilding at a future date. Has extending the main house been considered as an alternative to losing the stable/outbuilding?</p> <p>2) Need for an annexe: The application does not provide any information about why the residential conversion is needed, who will occupy it etc, e.g. is it for use only by family members.</p> <p>3) Green Belt and AONB location: The property is located in the Green Belt where new residential buildings would not normally be permitted. It is also just inside the boundary of the North Kent Downs AONB. As the stable building already exists conversion will not lead to significant additional reduction in openness but the altered nature of the building and any associated garden area (not shown on the revised plans) will have some minor visual impact and intensify residential use of the site.</p> <p>4) Layout and use of the proposed annexe: The proposal is now for a bedsit however, as the building has a full bathroom and could easily have kitchen facilities installed it is capable of use as a separate dwelling. The layout has three doors, two double width, which is a lot for a small structure – these could compromise use of the building.</p> <p>4) Proposed Conditions: We request that it be considered to attach Conditions to any permission such that the annexe is</p>

			only associated with Thong Lodge, cannot be used as a separate dwelling or to operate a business/for other commercial activity and cannot be extended without planning permission. In view of the overall amount of building and extension that has taken place on the site over time we would also request that permitted development rights should be withdrawn for the site. (Sent 12/12/21)
20211423 Permitted	The Barn Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Partial demolition and conversion of existing attached barn to provide additional living accommodation and associated works to main dwelling.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION IN PRINCIPLE to this proposal, which appears sympathetic to the character of the area, provided that the brick and flint walls, and any other relevant period features, are conserved and retained. (Sent 13/12/21)
20211032 Permitted	8 St Katherines Cottages Forge Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3DR	Retrospective application for re-rendering of property, replacement fascia and soffit, new downpipe, relocation of gutter from cutting across gable into soak away and replacement of existing double glazed windows with new double glazed casement windows.	The Parish Council notes that this property is located in the Shorne Village Conservation Area but the application is retrospective. There appears to have been pre-works discussion with GBC, but the requirements for planning permission to be obtained prior to works being done were not actioned. The materials used and the changes made have largely been like for like replacements, with the windows becoming more compatible with the style of the terrace. We would value the opinion of the Conservation Architect as to whether all the changes made are considered acceptable. Our only adverse comment relates to the satellite dish on the front elevation, which is inappropriate for a Conservation Area as visually intrusive. It would be preferable for this to be relocated to a less obtrusive position. (Sent 13/12/21)
20211422 Prior Approval is Required and Refused	Agricultural Barn Warren Farm Swillers Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3ED	Application for determination as to whether prior approval is required for the proposed change of use of the agricultural barn to a dwelling with associated building operations under Class Q(a) and (b)	This application is similar to Ref 20171312, to which the Parish Council also objected and which was refused. Our previous comments have been repeated or updated. The Parish Council does not consider that the overall criteria in Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order have been met. The building does not appear suitable for conversion. Being just a frame without existing floor or services it is not already capable of functioning as a dwelling so conversion would require substantial building operations, construction of structural elements and engineering works including access drive continuation, vehicle hardstanding and pathway. We consider that the nature and location of the proposed dwelling, and the planning history of

		<p>of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.</p>	<p>the site, are such that a formal planning application should be submitted for this proposed development.</p> <p>The Parish Council therefore has to again OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>We submit the following reasons and comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village envelope, Green Belt, land designation: The Warren Farm site is outside the village envelope of Shorne, so in an area where Green Belt policy applies. The site is classified as a local wildlife site although it has been subject to more intensive farming in recent years. 2. Landscape impact, light pollution, privacy: An inhabited building in this location will have landscape impact for the Green Belt and the nearby Shorne Woodlands landscape area. The building would cause additional light pollution in an area that is presently dark, especially as the proposed building has a large number of windows and rooflights (six) for its small size. Perhaps this aspect of the design could be reviewed. <p>The existing building is on the southern boundary of the field. Its southern flank is partly screened from wider view by bushes and trees growing close to its wall, which would not be practical for a residential building with windows, which should be retained. As it is located on higher ground and right on the border of the land, a converted building would be visually intrusive to a wide area of view and would affect the openness of the rural area.</p> <p>Both the barn and the adjacent walking path would mutually have their amenity and privacy compromised by this conversion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Justification for new dwelling: No “very special” reasons have been provided to justify the creation of a new and additional dwelling in the Green Belt. 4. Need for a barn on a smallholding, barn not redundant: Warren Farm was previously given permission to convert the “Apple Store” to residential use, to become a farmhouse for the smallholding. A smallholding needs to have covered storage for feed, machinery and equipment, and shelter for animals – for practical reasons these should be located near to the farm residential accommodation. This facility is being/can be provided by the present barn structure hence it cannot be said to be redundant. 5. No additional agricultural buildings: If conversion should be permitted, the question arises as to what additional/replacement agricultural building(s) will be needed instead of the existing barn, where on the site they will be located and how they will be accessed. This could further adversely affect the openness of the rural setting and again be detrimental to the Green Belt. <p>We note in connection with this point that a stable building has also been built on the site.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>6. Potential need for replacement barn: A replacement barn would need to be built and brought into use before the existing barn could be converted but there is no current planning application/permission for that purpose.</p> <p>7. Suitability for conversion: We would question the suitability of the building for conversion. There is no current floor and the steel uprights are just set in concrete blocks.</p> <p>8. Proposed versus actual boundaries: A red line bounded area is shown on the OS site plan. As a converted agricultural building the permitted residential curtilage would normally be very narrow around the building, differently configured than the area shown on the plans. The future use of the remainder of the recently defined field needs to be clarified as it would otherwise appear that a much larger area is being defined for dedicated use by the proposed dwelling. It is noted that a significant number of windows are shown as looking outside of the building at the sides and rear.</p> <p>9. Vehicular access, turning and parking, refuse bins and cycles: The vehicular access arrangements are in common with the converted Apple Store building but are incomplete as the extension to the driveway is not shown on the plans, and neither is there a turning area or locations for refuse bins and cycle storage.</p> <p>The Parking spaces appear to be 5m long by only 2.5m wide. These are small and likely to be impractical.</p> <p>10. Future access to remainder of the smallholding: It needs to be clarified as to how access to the rest of the smallholding will in future be made and maintained. The barn is bordered by an unmaintained highway now used frequently as a walking path to Public Footpaths so safety issues might arise through increased vehicular usage.</p> <p>11. Cramped development, future changes not permitted: The proposed dwelling is small and will create a cramped form of development out of keeping with the general area. No extensions, loft conversions or additional buildings should be permitted.</p> <p>12. Detriment to the amenity of the Apple Store: Having a driveway to another property passing through and so close to the existing previously permitted barn conversion will be detrimental to its amenity.</p> <p>(Sent 14/12/21)</p>
20211394 Permitted	The Hendleys, The Ridgeway, Shorne,	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension	<p>This property is located in the Chestnut Green Conservation Area.</p> <p>The application has a number of elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolition and replacement of existing conservatory at the rear – No problems identified • Replacement of hardstanding – The proposed paving will have a better and more

	Gravesend Kent DA12 3LN	with glass roof, replacement of existing hard standing with regatta style paviments and replacement of existing garage side door with new composite door.	compatible appearance than that existing. • New side door – This will be more in keeping with the property and area. Any suitable period features should if possible be retained during internal works. (Sent 14/12/21)
20211509 Permitted	The Silver Birches Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA	Erection of a first floor side extension, with alterations to the external surfaces of the existing house.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this proposal, subject to their not being any valid objections from neighbours. (Sent 11/1/22)
20211504 Pending – description revised	Robin Hill Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA	Demolition of rear extension and construction of two storey rear extension with the extension of the roof spaces to provide first floor accommodation. Internal alterations to create integral garage.	The Parish Council has NO OBJECTION to this proposal, subject to their not being any valid objections from neighbours. (Sent 11/1/22)
20211463 Pending	Ringland Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	Application for non- material amendment to planning permission reference number 20180629 to allow new and/or altered window/door openings	This property has been the subject of many planning applications and undergone a variety of building works. Two plans have been submitted with this application. For comparison purposes 15031-01R of June 2018 is taken as being the existing plan, and 15031-04R of November 2021 is taken as being the proposed plan. This latest application has a number of elements, and the Parish Council has the following comments:

		<p>and fenestration, revised central feature to front elevation and render detailing, revised flat roof eaves detail, revised pitched roof covering, external lighting, extractor fans, flues and cctv.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) New and/or altered window/door openings and fenestration: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Windows at front – changes are noted that appear to be mostly raising the sill height, which is accepted, however a full height window is introduced on the first floor – this would preferably also have a raised sill height. The overall appearance is negatively altered from the original proposed plan due to more randomly mixed window shapes and placements. b) Windows at rear – the ground floor windows now have very large panes, which is accepted. Similarly to the front, a full height window has been introduced on the first floor, which might preferably have a standard sill height. c) Rooflights in front roofslope – two shown and accepted, already installed after April 2020. d) Attic level windows in rear box dormers – these have already been installed. This took place after the latest Google aerial view which was dated April 2020. 2) Revised central feature to front elevation and render detailing, revised flat roof eaves detail, revised pitched roof covering: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Revised central feature – The porch door is noted to be moved to the very front where it will not have any weather protection. b) Revised render detailing – accepted c) Revised flat roof eaves detail – accepted d) Revised pitched roof covering – accepted 3) Exterior Lighting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodlighting – this should be motion and daylight sensitive and directed so that the lights do not shine outside of the property. They should also include timers to switch the lights off again after they have been triggered. • Other exterior lights – these should be at low light intensity levels, daylight sensitive and motion activated to time controlled greater intensity level. 4) Extractor fans and flues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extractor fan positions – these are accepted however operationally they must not cause noise and other nuisance to neighbouring properties. • (See also air-conditioning below) 5) CCTV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCTV – the installation must conform to national guidelines on range of view, storage and retention of images. 6) Other points:
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire safety – the access to and escape from the attic floor requires expert fire safety input as there may need to be a fire door protecting the bottom of the access stairs, which are assumed to be walled off from the atrium. • External air-conditioning units – it is understood that several air-conditioning units have also been installed, including on the north side close to the boundary and neighbouring property. These are not shown on the plans but should be. They must not encroach within 1m of the boundary or cause noise nuisance to neighbours. • Two-storey rear extension – the present plans show a two-storey rear extension however this would more accurately be described as a single storey rear extension with creation of a basement underneath: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Previous application refused - application Ref 20190688 for a lawful development certificate in respect of the already built rear two-storey extension was refused. Despite already existing it was not included in the title or plans of withdrawn application Ref 20210236. The two-storey rear extension is again not mentioned in the title of this present application Ref 20211463 but has now been shown on the plans. It should be officially included and properly considered at this time, otherwise its depiction in this present application could infer that planning permission has been granted. o Basement level – the basement level has windows shown. Plans for this level, detailing its use and function, need to be submitted. o Engineering works – there has been excavation at the rear and some raising of land levels at the northern end of the house, which have involved engineering works including building of retaining walls and new boundary treatments. These works should have required planning permission. o Flights of steps – these have been introduced on both sides at the rear. <p>7) Closing comments: In view of the large amount of development that has taken place to this property, we request that permitted development rights should be withdrawn for the whole site, to ensure that it is explicitly understood that all future/further alterations must be subject to planning permission. The Parish Council questions whether, taking all the above works and installations into account, the nature and extent of the changes that have been made from what has been permitted might be assessed as significant enough to not qualify as non-material amendments but instead to require a full planning application. (Sent 10/1/22)</p>
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

20211554 Refused	1 Genesta Glade Gravesend Kent DA12 4PR	Erection of a single storey front extension and construction of a dormer to south and north elevation.	<p>The Parish Council wishes to make the following comments:</p> <p>The building is situated well forward of the standard building line of other nearby properties except for the mirrored property immediately opposite. The proposed single storey front extension could adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties and be detrimental to the street scene by reducing the sense of openness in the area. The building opposite is noted to have a small and largely glazed front porch extension.</p> <p>The Parish Council dislikes box dormers that are not subsidiary to the main roof however such designs have already been permitted in the area.</p> <p>The proposal involves building full-width box dormers on both sides of the existing pitched roof. To the best of our knowledge, only one application for such a design has previously been made and permitted in the immediate area (see application ref 20190130) however that property is one that borders the fields on one side so only affects one neighbouring property, from which it has a good separation distance.</p> <p>Bathroom windows should be obscure glazed and not openable below 2m height. Consideration should be given as to whether other first floor side windows should be only high-level windows or also obscure glazed below 2m so as to ensure mutual privacy.</p> <p>(Sent 11/1/22)</p>
-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>APPEAL 20211254 GBC 2021/000 25/REF Appeal dismissed</p>	<p>Ewhurst Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA</p>	<p>Outline application for the erection of a 3 bedroom detached dwelling with all matters reserved other than access and layout; demolition of existing granny annexe and utility room.</p>	<p>APP/K2230/W/21/3275442, Written docs</p> <p>Thank you very much for notifying us (via Gravesham Borough Council) about this appeal. Shorne Parish Council wishes to make the following representations:</p> <p>1. Shorne Parish Council and Parish: Shorne Parish Council is a Local Authority constituted under the Local Government Acts. The Parish lies to the east of Gravesend, in the Borough of Gravesham in the north-west of the county of Kent. Shorne Parish (including the ancient settlements of Shorne Village, Lower Shorne, Thong/Riverview, Shorne Ridgeway and Pear Tree Lane) is located in the Green Belt. It is bounded by Chalk and the urban border of Gravesend to its west, and Higham Parish and the Medway Towns to the east. It extends from the A2 in the south to the middle of the Thames in the north. Within the Parish there are several designated Conservation Areas and a very popular Country Park, plus other areas of land with higher environmental protection designations including Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar.</p> <p>2. Previous representations: The Parish Council OBJECTED to the planning application Ref 20211254. Our previous representations are attached at Appendix A. We consider that the points made then remain valid, so request that they should also be taken account in connection with this Appeal.</p> <p>3. The decision by Gravesham Borough Council (GBC): The Parish Council agrees with and supports the decision made by GBC to refuse the original application.</p> <p>4. The Appeal The Parish Council also wishes to OBJECT to this Appeal. We have the following additional reasons and comments, based on review of the original application together with the content of the Appeal Application Form and Planning Appeal Statement submitted by the Appellant. Application Form: On the Application Form the address of the property and the Appellant is now given as “Annexe, Ewhurst Bowesden Lane” however, as an annexe to a main property, it should not have a separate address as it is not a separate dwelling.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<p>Planning Appeal Statement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point 2.2 states that, regarding the existing dwelling, the new dwelling “...will not impinge upon its existing residential amenity.”, however the existing dwelling will be losing its side entrance lobby and utility room, and would only have a very narrow gap to the new western boundary. • Point 4.7 refers to new dwellings being “...sympathetic to local character...” but this proposed shoe-horning in of an additional small and very different kind of dwelling is out of character and therefore unsympathetic. • Point 4.11 discusses inappropriateness, which we consider is the case with this proposal for undesirable densification and backland development. • The Parish Council has concerns about the setting of precedent which could substantially change the nature of the currently spaciouly laid out Bowesden Lane area. • Point 4.12 refers to limited infilling within a village however this site is outside of the settlement boundary, and another application on that basis recently failed at Appeal (please see Land adjacent to the See-Ho PH, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne Ridgeway, Kent DA12 3JX APP/K2230/W/20/3258951) • Point 4.12 (and 5.5) also refers to the new buildings being”...in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.”. The proposal is contrary to this point as it proposes a 3-bedroom, two storey dwelling that is larger in all dimensions than the existing small, one-bedroom and single-storey annexe. • Point 5.4 refers to “...infilling of a gap...” however, as we submitted previously, there is no gap here, such as might be seen elsewhere on a double plot where the house is built to one side, and the proposed property does not have a garden frontage to the roadway. The existing house is built centrally on a large plot as is characteristic for Bowesden Lane. • Point 5.5 appears to be missing its end. It starts referring to the bulk of the proposed property, which is much greater than the existing annexe. • Point 5.6 refers to the lack of demonstration of “very special circumstances” however this situation has not changed as the circumstances now put forward do not meet the criteria. • Point 5.10 states that “...new development should integrate with the existing built development.” but then goes on to cite reasons that are actually against this proposal. • Point 5.11 states that “The proposal would be visually attractive. It will integrate well with the surrounding area....”. These are subjective opinions with which the Parish Council does not agree.
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 5.12 appears to be about a completely different property as it refers to “dwellings”, an “existing bungalow”, “the neighbouring Highfield development” and “the road frontage of the site”. Point 5.13 suggests that the proposal would be “... in keeping with the character and appearance of its surroundings...” but we disagree. Point 5.14 may also be referring to a different property as it states that “The layout of the new dwelling would be spacious, set within the site...”, “...will have.... Garden space at the front” and then goes on to discuss views of a Council that “... certain rooms have a poor access to natural light.....”. This present proposal is only outline, although we remain unhappy that the actual proposed design has not been submitted. Point 5.15 refers to “... turning area from the existing access to Bowesden Lane” but concerns previously expressed by ourselves and others about inadequacy of turning provision within the site itself have not yet been addressed apart from the Appellant expressing their own satisfaction. Although two parking spaces are provided, there is a question about where parking will occur if there are more vehicles than two or when there are visitors. Point 6.1 states that the proposal “... would not be out of character with the area ...”, with which we disagree, and then that it “...would result in a substantial improvement in the street scene.” We are unclear how that would be the case so this may also be referring to a different property. <p>5. Summary and Concluding comments: The Parish Council OBJECTED to the original planning application and still OBJECTS to this Appeal. We reiterate our previous representations and have additionally made new representations based on the Appellants submitted Appeal documentation. We support the decision of refusal that was made by Gravesham Borough Council for the original application and humbly request that this Appeal should be dismissed. (Sent 12/12/21)</p>
APPEAL 2021/000 37/REF	Greendale Queens Farm Queens Farm Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HU	Proposed summer house/out-building.	No notification received, Householder Appeal – no reps allowed
APPEAL	Bucklebury Pear	Retrospective	No notification received, Householder Appeal – no reps allowed

2021/000 48/REF	Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	application for erection of a single storey outbuilding to be used as a home gym.	
APPEAL 2021/000 57/REF	Fairwinds Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JX	Application for removal of condition 4 attached to planning permission reference number 20120315 for Construction of enlarged roof on both sides of dwelling to provide two additional bedrooms at first floor level; conversion of eastern garage to dining room and full enclosure of both semi-enclosed courtyards.	No notification received, Householder Appeal – no reps allowed