# SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

## Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee
## Meeting held on 7th November 2019 in Shorne Village Hall

PRESENT:

Mr R Theobald (Acting Chairman)
Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chairman)
Miss P Clifton
Mr B Lane
Mr R Hardy
Mr S White

APOLOGIES: Mrs S Lindley (Chairman), Mr C Rea, Mrs L McCluskey

Parishioners Present: Ms M Burton (Green Farm Lane)

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 19th September 2019.

The minutes were **AGREED** as a true record.

2. Matters arising from the Minutes not otherwise on the Agenda.

There were no matters arising from the Minutes.

Planning:

3. Planning Applications/Issues pending:

a) 28 Coutts Avenue – This application, for 4 dwellings with 2 on land behind the others, was considered to be an overdevelopment and out of character with the area. GBC instead permitted 3 dwellings (one at the rear).

b) Courtlands, Gravesend Road – This is expected to go before the Regulatory Board on 27th November, SL will attend. The application is for a large and robust (double skin brick walls, tiled roof) stable building (4 bay plus tack room), detached barn, driveway and hardstanding area on current agricultural land with change of use to equestrian. There is concern that there could be future residential conversion (and an additional dwelling beside), leading to ribbon development along Gravesend Road if this was permitted.

c) Cumloden, Pear Tree Lane – GBC has permitted a 6 bedroom house projecting further back at two-storeys where presently there is a small chalet bungalow. There had been concern about impact on neighbouring properties.

d) 1 Bunny Hill, Tanyard Hill – GBC has refused this. The proposed house was a little large for the site, and projecting forward and backward of the building line.

e) Hartshill bungalow, Thong Lane/Shorne Ifield Road – Applied for a large outbuilding, the previous application for this was refused by GBC (but see also Appeals section below). The proposed building is still too large and with inappropriate uses for a residential garden – garage for 3 cars at far end of garden needs long driveway, equipment store for maintenance of other land, open log and equipment store. Again a large double skin brick building with tiled roof, so concern about future residential conversion.

f) Castlefield Gravesend Road – damage to verge, building works. It is unclear what is going on at the site. There was a "Pre-application" discussion about 2years ago and site visit but no applications. Existing house has poor design and structure. Extensive outbuildings and two-storey shed (appeared to have had residential use) all without planning permission. Recently seen piles of bricks and ready-mix concrete lorry. KCC investigating damaged verge, GBC is investigating buildings on site.

g) Clockhouse, The Ridgeway (metal railings with sliding gates) – correspondence took place with Faye Hobbs at GBC who achieved some modifications.

h) 14 The Street – There has been some correspondence with a commercial planning service (hired by Gravesham), the front wall to street is to be retained, "garage" (unusable for vehicles) and side wall to the Village Hall.

4. Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii), Schedule of Planning Applications (26) dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members:

This had been circulated previously, see end of minutes.

5. Notices of Appeal:

a) 29-31 The Street – Appeal APP/K2230/W/19/3235909 Response submitted reiterating previous comments, see schedule

b) Hartshill Bungalow, Thong Lane/Shorne Ifield Road – Appeal APP/K2230/C/19/3220892 against enforcement notice relating to previous dismissed appeal (bungalow extension) - Pending response, by 29th November. There is confusion at present as to which application and decision they are appealing about as they have submitted another Appeal as well.

6. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish:

a) Lower Thames Crossing – Ground Investigation Works continue, Ground Penetrating Radar end October to mid December, offered meeting to discuss Development Consent Order (to be arranged as soon as possible).

b) Path to railway crossing next on west of Shornemead - This is very churned up which is believed to have been caused by BICC Cables with the work they are doing in the area.

c) Telephone Mast proposal - Proposed base station installation (Cell Ref CTIL207665/76994TEF) land at Shorne Scout Hut, Mill House Lane, the Parish Council will be writing to confirm that we are not happy with the letter they have written to us and will be objecting to a telephone mast in this location. We may need to seek additional specialist advice on this matter. We will be writing to Parishioners via the Parish magazine stating we are opposing this proposed development.

7. Outside Parish but with impact:

a) "Metro-Tidal" lower Thames rail crossing proposal with barrier across Thames - Metro-Tidal had previously in 2008 proposed a tidal power lagoon installation near Cliffe, part of a Lower Thames Crossing alternative scheme. Presently they are continuing ambitious blue-sky plans for a railway loop from Gravesend eastwards through Hoo Junction, north across a new Thames barrier at Grain, then back westwards in Essex. This would cause problems for environmental areas as it restricts the Thames flow over the coastal fringe and locks shipping out in the North Sea at high tides/storms.

b) Crossrail – As a linked reminder, Crossrail had obtained agreement a long time ago for land at Hoo Junction to be "safeguarded", for use of the sidings for maintenance and train storage. There would be ensuing problems of additional vehicular traffic on Green Farm Lane and Queens Farm Road. See http://74f85f59f39b887b696f-ab656259048fb93837ecc0ecbcf0c557.r23.cf3.rackcdn.com/assets/library/document/a/original/abbey_wood_to_hoo_junction_book_05-10-09_watermarked.pdf

Highways:

8. Accident reports: None notified

9. Traffic monitoring, Speedwatch, Lorrywatch:

a) Speedwatch results - the equipment has just been collected after being repaired and monitoring will resume tomorrow morning.

b) Lorries – No specific reports

10. Road condition/highways issues and Hazards:

a) Trees/Vegetation overhanging roads - 2 Park Cottages, this is actually 3 Park Cottages, a letter has been written and a response received from the property owner who has been in contact with KCC and has requested that yellow lines are put outside his property so they are able to cut the vegetation.

b) Verge outside Silverdene, Tanyard Hill stream – drain repair awaited, possibly end November. KCC have put a camera through the drain between Innis Coillte and Tanshaw. There was a blockage which they cleared, but they also found that the drain joint outside Silverdene had broken and the two sections are now mis-aligned and therefore water is flowing out at that point with nowhere else to go. They will be replacing that section. Regarding the water in the roadway, the box is owned by BT but does not appear on any maps/plans. BT have been to look at it but cannot figure out what the cause is - there is apparently no linkage to any drain or stream. KCC are chasing this.

c) Verge in Park Pale – some overgrowth problems to be cut back soon, part of verge already cut by Golf Club but damaging SSSI area. KCC are looking into this and will be cutting back the brambles on the path and not interfering with the rare Orchids

d) Butchers Hill (top) – Puddles still need filling (reported to KCC previously) around half way up and ground levelling as the surface has deteriorated.

e) Mill Hill Lane, Edges and potholes – repairs done to good standard.

f) Dip on Tanyard Hill near Court Lodge causing puddle – this has been filled.

g) Brewers Road and Pear Tree Lane speed limit reduction – the Highways Improvement plan was submitted on 25th September. The Scheme manager is unavailable due to illness, but there was a meeting with a Scheme Engineer on 15th October (also toured whole area), in KCC's hands presently. Mr Lane will also bring this up at the Transport Board meeting.

h) Pear Tree Lane resurfacing – this was completed and potholes at the top of Tanyard Hill were also filled.

i) Crown Lane resurfacing – works still awaited.

j) Railings on The Street – these need repainting, the PC will arrange this.

k) Cobham road sign initiative – proposal to adopt in Shorne. Mr White has offered to start a spreadsheet on surveying for faults with existing signs (e.g. faded, dirty, slipped) and incorrect/additional signage. These will then be reported on the KCC website and at meetings.

l) Cob Drive area road signs – two road signs were lying down as rusted through, this was reported to KCC and also observed by the visiting Schemes engineer who also noted them down for action within 4 weeks, one sign has since been put up.

m) Green Farm Lane temporary road closure – a road closure was noted on Friday 1st November, believed to have been by National Grid but no prior notification was provided.

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

a) Car parking on double yellow lines opposite the Rose and Crown – a broken down vehicle was moved to there and left for several days in a dangerous position. The owner identified on social media and apologised for breaking down.

b) Yellow lines at Chestnut Green and Bowesden Lane – these have been installed and several residents have thanked for this especially the increased visibility at Chestnut Green

c) Yellow lines proposal at corners of Cob Drive, Crown Lane and Malthouse Lane – this is with KCC but they have also requested us to undertake a local consultation prior to progressing

d) Yellow Lines refreshing at Pondfield Lane and Brewers Road – these lines have faded, will be reported to KCC.

12. Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board:

No meeting since 19th September, next meeting will be on 4th December.

13. Open Consultations: Nothing to report

14. Closed consultations/for information: Nothing to report

Any other business:

15. Matters raised by Members:

- KCC contribution to Speed Indicator Device (SID) – There had previously been overfunding from KCC by £1,400.00, KCC has agreed that it can be put towards the SID purchase.

16. Matters from other Committees being discussed for convenience:

a) Shornemead Crossing closure by Network Rail – This was discovered at the weekend by Canal Association members and discussed on Facebook. Despite being a registered footpath it has been closed by Network Rail without any prior discussion and alleging safety concerns. The same was cited in 2012 but nothing has been done since reopening in 2016 to improve safety (i.e. build a bridge) so they appear to only be concerned when they want to be. It is a situation where routine and safe users are punished for behaviour of abusers of the crossing, an incident with a mini bike had been circulated on the web. Mrs Lindley reported the closure to the KCC website on the evening of 2nd Nov. Further actions need planning. Mr Theobald will follow this up with KCC with various evidence, but this may require specialist advice.

b) Cobham Lodge – Mr Lane has reported that there is now a new revised planning application that has been submitted.

c) Tree Preservation Orders volunteer - Mr Lane has had a request from a resident in Pear Tree Lane who would like to put Tree Preservation Orders on some of her trees.

d) Police action against nuisance bikers - Miss Clifton reported that on the 9th October 3 bikers were issued with a Section 59 notice by the police.

e) Fly-tipping Shorne Ifield Road - Mr White reported that this evening there was fly typing in Shorne Ifield Road of soil and debris all over the road which was discussed on Facebook this evening by a resident. (*Post meeting note: A local resident cleared this on Friday morning.*)

f) Condition of site at Daymer, Green Farm Lane - Mr White raised that the roof of Daymer has been missing for months now as well as the windows having been removed. He enquired if there some restriction on how long a property this can be left in such a state. Mr Lane has given Mr White an e-mail address at GBC to report (quoting the planning application number) the situation to them and to ask about planning conditions on the site.

g) Thong Lane temporary closure - Mr Hardy has reported that Thong Lane was closed on Monday by Telecom but it was not notified prior.

h) Sofa left in front garden - The Clerk reported that she has written to the relevant resident concerning a sofa that has been left for some time in a front garden, a response is awaited.

17. Matters raised by attending Parishioners:

- Representation from Lower Shorne - Ms Burton had wanted to come along and see how the Parish Council works as she feels that Lower Shorne is left out. Mr White said this is why he has now joined as a Councillor and if she has any comments he will be happy to help her and others in Lower Shorne.

Meeting finished: 21.04

Signed by Mrs Lindley ……

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS SINCE 19th September 2019:**

| Ref | Address | Description | SPC Submission |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20190929 | 1 Cheneys Cottages Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AA | Removal of part of existing hedgerow to the frontage and formation of vehicular access with new gate and formation of vehicle hardstanding. | The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal provided that all materials used are compatible with the location within a Conservation area.<br>We would welcome the input of the GBC Conservation consultant about the suitability of the proposals and particularly the proposed Holly hedging, we had previously suggested that the hedging should preferably be mixed native species (which could include Holly).<br>(Sent 14/10/19) |
| 20190938 | 135 Astra Drive Gravesend Kent DA12 4QF | Erection of a single storey rear extension with a pitched roof, and erection of first floor side and front extensions. | The Parish Council notes that the application title refers to a single storey rear extension with pitched roof, as per previous application 20190390 which was refused permission, however this is not shown on the section plans and side elevations. The existing and proposed roof plans are also confusing.<br>Assuming that this present application is in fact only for the front and side two-storey extensions, the Parish Council has no objection in principle to that proposal, provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.<br>(Sent 14/10/19) |
| 20190974 | 18 Burdett Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HP | Erection of a single storey rear extension. | The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.<br>The proposal is for an 8m deep and 7.3m wide extension but it is single storey, screened from the eastern side by an existing outbuilding and for the western side is approximately the same depth as the existing house there. Therefore it should have only minimal impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.<br>(Sent 14/10/19) |
| 20191000 | Northleigh Gravesend Road Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7DX | Application for the removal of condition 5 of planning permission reference number 20080509 for the change of use of garage/boathouse into two bed and breakfast units involving construction of new pitched roofs on proposed units, existing garage and open car port: to allow use for a hobby room | The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposed change of use provided that there are no objections from neighbours, however we OBJECT to the proposal to remove condition 5.<br>The reason for our objection is that condition 5 includes a statement preventing use as permanent self-contained residential accommodation, and this clause should remain in place.<br>(Sent 14/10/19) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | and storage. | |
| 20191003 | Hartshill Bungalow Thong Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD | Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of an outbuilding. | The Parish Council has to again OBJECT to the proposal, with the following comments:<br>1. This proposal is broadly similar to Application Ref GR/2019/0269 which was refused, and we fully support that Gravesham Borough Council decision.<br>2. New dimensions and design: We note the slightly reduced dimensions, from approximately 21.25m wide by 8.6m deep to 17.4m by 6.6m, however this remains a very large and solid building which will impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The design of the building creates an unattractive view for occupants of the bungalow.<br>3. Additional built area: From the plans submitted, the built area of the original bungalow was 100 sqm, to which another 100 sqm has already been added, doubling the original ground floor land take. This totals 200 sqm not the 166 sqm stated in the accompanying letter. In addition, although plans showing it have not ever been submitted, and the access stairs have only been shown on one ground floor plan (20180461), the first floor has seemingly also been converted to residential use, type of use and floor area unknown. This present proposal is to add a further 115 sqm of ancillary building (not 100 sqm as stated in the accompanying letter) plus a considerable amount of associated driveway/hardstanding, the area of which should also be taken into account as it will be lost from the useable garden.<br>4. Residential use versus agricultural use: The proposed outbuilding is within the residential curtilage of Hartshill Bungalow and has to be evaluated solely on that basis, i.e as ancillary to a residential dwelling. However some of the proposed uses are not domestic, or of the scale usually associated with domestic use, that could reasonably be regarded as incidental or related to the enjoyment of the dwelling itself.<br>5. Practicality of proposed location: The proposed location is at the far end of the garden, impractically distanced from the house and the main road, and the building is overall larger and more extensive in nature than would normally be considered necessary or appropriate for a residential property.<br>6. Impact on amenity: The Google aerial view (date approximately May 2018) shows that the proposed building and associated driveway/hardstanding will impact considerably and detrimentally on the amenity of the extended bungalow and that very little garden will remain. |




*Google aerial view, approximately May 2018*

7. Garage and driveway: A triple garage is proposed which exceeds normal residential garage requirements (two parking spaces would be considered sufficient for a three-bedroom property) and dimensions. The location involves creating a new driveway the full length of the site for access, plus hardstanding area, both considerably encroaching on the grassed garden area and being detrimental to its amenity. We suggest that it would be much better for the amenity of the bungalow and site as a whole for the residential elements to be located much nearer to the bungalow and the road, perhaps immediately to its west or associated with the permitted parking and turning area (see 20120409) at the front of the property although this does not presently seem to be in use for that purpose.

8. Services: No services to the proposed building, or exterior lighting, are defined. There are no windows or rooflights supplying any natural light.

9. Equipment store: The size and nature of the equipment described exceeds normal requirements for the management of a residential curtilage and the design and access statement makes it clear that this equipment is for maintenance of the adjacent agricultural land. The correct location for a building to store this equipment is therefore on the agricultural land itself. Also, from the description in the accompanying letter, the need for the equipment store area is stated as temporary, which leads to a question about what that part of the building will be used for subsequently.

10. Wood store/Clothes drying/Sheltered storage: This area is 6m by 2m internally, which exceeds normal domestic provision. What is proposed is excessive in size and nature for a residential property and poorly located as impractically far away from the bungalow it is supposed to serve.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 11. Impact on Green Belt: The proposal would create a large new permanent type of building in the Green Belt where none presently exists, and where none would normally be permitted. It would be visually intrusive with impact on the landscape and on openness.<br>12. Lack of special circumstances and Lower Thames Crossing aspects: No conventional special circumstances have been put forward to justify the proposal. The accompanying letter mentions the imagined impact of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing but the plans for that are not finalised and the application for a Development Consent Order will not take place until next summer (based on presently available information). Therefore this proposal is premature as it is presently impossible to predict whether or not there will be any impact on the property or what that might be, and consequently conjecture about possible impact cannot be taken into account and used to justify the proposal. Should the LTC plans proceed, we would expect that as part of the LTC project all appropriate and necessary mitigation (e.g. regarding noise and dust control, and increased security) would be put in place prior to construction, also with relevant financial provisions or compensation. Awaiting that phase and negotiating with Highways England could be of financial advantage to the applicant and there would be adequate time once the plans have been finalised for any required planning permissions and necessary building works to be undertaken ahead of construction work beginning in the area. We also note that Highways England anyway need to be consulted about this application as the property lies within their Red Line Boundary.<br>13. References to case law and other Appeal Decisions in the accompanying letter:<br>a) Reference is made to the case law of Emin vs SSE (1989) but arguments on that basis have failed in other easily found Appeal decisions, e.g. APP/U2235/X/12/2177741 and APP/G3110/X/10/2143003.<br>b) Reference is made to an Appeal decision (Ref APP/R5510/X/16/3143072 and 074) in Ruislip but examination of the original application and the Ruislip Council officers comments, plus the several subsequent applications for the same property reveal many differences: Although classed as Green Belt that property is surrounded by urban development including extensive hardstanding carparks and a large pub/restaurant; the applicant was not asking for a use relating to another piece of land; two separate buildings were being applied for (children's playroom and domestic store) when one would have sufficed; and most importantly, examination of the present Google aerial view shows that the structures permitted on Appeal do not appear to have been built – instead the applicant has gone on to apply for extensions to the existing house. The Decision notice also states in Paragraph 6 that "….each case should be considered on the basis of the particular facts and circumstances." Hence discussion about what happened in other, different cases and different circumstances in a different area of the country may anyway not be pertinent.<br>14. Conditions if permitted: If this proposal should be permitted, we request that strong conditions should be imposed including that the building is only ancillary to Hartshill Bungalow, does not have any |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | residential rights and cannot be used for any residential purposes or as a separate dwelling. In view of the statement concerning temporary use of the machinery store, any permission might also be temporary or personal to the applicant with a requirement to seek new permission prior to any future change of use.<br>(Sent 17/10/19) |
| 20191026 | 31 The Street<br>Shorne<br>Gravesend Kent<br>DA12 3EA | Minor alteration to the position of an existing access point to the drive to move this opening over to the west. | The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal.<br>(Sent 14/10/19) |
| 20191038 | Landfall<br>Bowesden Lane<br>Shorne<br>Gravesend Kent<br>DA12 3LA | Enlargement to the existing dormer extension in the eastern roof slope. | The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal, provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours, as it should not create any additional overlooking.<br>However, as a comment on the proposed design, we consider it would be preferable if the proposed extensions to the dormer did not extend right up to the side wall of the house but instead were a little inset (symmetrically) so as to give more of an appearance of subsidiarity to the main roof.<br>(Sent 14/10/19) |
| 20191071 | The Lodge<br>Watling Street<br>Gravesend Kent<br>DA12 5UD | Erection of a two storey rear and side extension. | Thank you for asking our opinion on this application, the site lies partly within the Parish boundary.<br>The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours.<br>The building is screened from wider view by woodland and there is enough on-site parking for the size of the house.<br>(Sent 17/10/19) |
| Planning Inspectorate Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W/19/3235909 Gravesham Borough Council Ref: GR/2018/0857 and Appeal Ref: | Land between 29 and 31 The Street, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent | Demolition of the existing garage and erection of a detached no.3 bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and landscaping. | Thank you for notifying us (via Gravesham Borough Council) about this appeal. Shorne Parish Council wishes to make the following representations:<br>1. Shorne Parish Council and Parish:<br>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 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.<br>2. Our previous representations:<br>Our previous representations of 27th August 2018 are reproduced at Appendix A, and we request that these should also be considered as part of this Appeal response.<br>We note that the application was submitted on 14th August 2018 but a "Supporting Statement" was |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2019/00057 /REF | | | subsequently submitted three months later on 12th November 2018, after our representations had been submitted.<br>3. Additional comments in relation to this Appeal:<br>In responding to this Appeal we would add the following comments:<br>Planning history: The site has been the subject of several planning applications for building a house since 2006. All applications were withdrawn/refused because the designs were considered inappropriate/too large for this narrow plot in a visually sensitive location: 20061089 (withdrawn), 20070976 and 20090640 (both refused)<br>Site condition: The present owners purchased the site in 2013, since when it has been left undeveloped and generally untended and overgrown, so occasioning adverse comments from residents (please see photographs of examples of site condition in Appendix B).<br>Site width: There has been concern expressed regarding the true western boundary of the site at the pavement border, and this may affect the achievable site layout. We note that the neighbours have placed a wooden post at the left side of the site to show what they believe to be the correct front boundary position.<br>Parking arrangements: We note and support the comments from the Gravesham Borough Council Highways Development Officer expressing concerns about the parking provision. The building needs to be set back further, to at least 6m, in order to prevent parked vehicles overhanging the footway. As the site is narrower at its road frontage, there will be barely enough width for two parked vehicles and these will occupy the entire frontage leaving little space to access the front door of the building or the narrow side gate. The proposed open frontage for parking is a layout not otherwise seen in the area, and there is no boundary wall or plantings to screen the vehicles from view.<br>Additional habitable rooms/bedrooms: Although the application is for a three-bedroom dwelling, we note that there is a room on the first floor labelled “study” which appears to be 2m by 2.7m, i.e. large enough to be a fourth bedroom, whereas a similar size and perhaps more suitable area on the ground floor is shown accommodating a second dining table. There is also a space on the attic level which appears to be 2m by 2m and could also accommodate a bed. Both of these lead to concern that the actual number of bedrooms in occupation and therefore the number of occupants could be greater than expected for the stated three-bedroomed house applied for. If so this would have further negative consequences in the area as on-street parking locally is difficult and competitive.<br>4. Summary and Concluding comments:<br>We support the comments made by Gravesham Borough Council in refusing planning permission based on the plans that were submitted.<br>Our expectation had been that revised plans would subsequently have been submitted that took into account the concerns expressed and the comments about the design (which had been intended to help |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the applicant) that we had made in our representation to Gravesham Borough Council of 27th August 2018.<br>While we would like to see the circumstances of the site resolved, we have concerns about the present application and consider that the unmodified design is unsuitable for a variety of reasons (as also stated in our previous representations, see Appendix A). We therefore request that the Appeal should be dismissed.<br>Thank you very much for considering our representations and comments on this application/appeal. |