SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee held in Shorne Village Hall on 23rd September 2021

PRESENT:

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

APOLOGIES: Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs L McCluskey
Mr C Rea
Mrs Sarah Poole

Parishioners Present: None

70. To receive any declarations of interest: No declarations were made.

71. Minutes of the meeting held on 8th July 2021: The minutes had previously been circulated and were approved.

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

Planning:

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

a) **Scout Hut, Mill Hill Lane –** New shed/wooden hut, Permitted
b) **Hillside Farm, Butchers Hill –** Retrospective application for outbuilding, Permitted
c) **Cumloden, Pear Tree Lane –** Front boundary wall and sliding metal gates, Refusal of details
d) **Thong Lodge, Thong Lane –** Conversion of stable to residential annexe, Refused
e) New Green Farm, Lower Higham Road – Application for new house in Green Belt on Agricultural grounds, representations objecting pending submission
f) **Fairwinds, Pear Tree Lane –** Removal of protective Condition, to object
g) **Nuralite, Canal Road, Higham –** GBC had e-mailed to wrong addresses, discussion meeting to be held about wording of Conditions and S106 agreement, date awaited. The site is now for sale for £12Million

74. Any GBC enforcement updates: No new information

a) Land south of Apex Business Park buildings (inspection awaited)
b) 135 Astra Drive (rear dormer above ridge height)
c) Shorne Mead, Pear Tree Lane (engineering works)

75. 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) – Approved, please see Appendix to these minutes (decision details have been updated)

Initials

76 Notices of Appeal: Appeals Lodged (awaiting further information):

a) **2021/00025 Ewhurst Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA**. 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.

b) **2021/00037 Greendale Queens Farm Queens Farm Road Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HU**. Proposed summer house/out-building.

77. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish: Lower Thames Crossing

All attentions had been focused of the recent "Construction Impacts" Consultation which had ended on 8th September. There had been two information sessions held at Cascades, and the mobile information van had been at several other locations in Gravesend. Detailed responses had been submitted by Mrs Lindley for the Parish Council and Mr Lane as Gravesham Borough Councillor, and members thanked them for their considerable efforts in producing these. Otherwise there has not been any other new information of note.

78. Outside Parish but with impact: None new, the London Resort project is being further delayed, there does not seem to be a mechanism for cancelling National Infrastructure Projects once selected.

<u>Highways</u>:

79. Accident reports:

a) **7th August 2021 – The Street**: Damage to parked vehicles and kerb walls, details had been discussed at the Council meeting held on 9th September.

b) **3rd September 2021 – The Street**: Damage to parked vehicle also reported.

80. Traffic monitoring,

a) **Speedwatch**: Miss Clifton was thanked for her report previously circulated. Mrs Lindley commented that the PC is often asked what are "we" doing about speeding traffic but the Speedwatch activities are undertaken by volunteers and it is unfortunately noticeable that residents who complain do not generally then volunteer when informed about the opportunity to assist. Sessions had been undertaken on 15th July at Tanyard Hill northbound, between 08.39 and 09.36 when 15 vehicles were reported. The maximum speed detected was 41mph. 12 vehicles were the first record and three will be sent police letters. On 2nd September, the same timed session at Tanyard Hill southbound detected two vehicles, both first records.

b) **Lorrywatch**: 12th August 2021, the only information was from Facebook that the vehicle was badged "Northwood". To remind, in order to take action we need full information (and preferably some photographs) including location, date, time, numberplate, size, direction of travel, and any names/markings on the vehicle. Mr Lane updated that the owner of the RJC Lowloaders vehicle that had caused damage to gardens in Woodland Lane when turning has had the required repairs carried out, for which we are grateful to the Company.

81. Road condition/highways issues and Hazards:

a) **Forecourt of shops in The Street** – no update at present.

b) **Forge Lane retaining wall** – this has been repaired, seemingly by KCC.

c) **Tanyard Hill running water** – KCC Highways had reported this to Southern Water but we have not had any further information about findings or any proposed actions.
d) **Manor Field** – the sunken pavement area is marked up for repair
e) **Warren View** – Mr Theobald reported that repairs had been undertaken to the wearing course at the side of the road.

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

a) **Mill Hill Lane -** Warning signs about children in the roadway are proposed near the playground on Mill Hill Lane, Mrs Lindley will ask KCC via their website and also add it to the Highways Improvement Plan
b) **Manor Field** – Problems with driveway blocking due to inconsiderate parking continue and are being monitored. There had been a particularly bad incident on 11th September related to a large party at the hall, a vehicle had parked on the grass bank of one of the houses.

83. Feedback from GBC/KCC Joint Transportation Board and KCC Highways

a) **HIP (Highways Improvement Plan)** – no meetings have been held or contact received since Claire Venner moved job. The replacement has not been notified to us but Mr Lane advised that it is Ian Grigor.
b) **GBC:KCC Joint Transport Board** – this was held on 8th September 2021, Mr Lane advised that once again there were no KCC Officers in attendance.
c) **Village gateway road markings** – awaiting installation date.
d) *Forge Lane 30mph limit* (in connection with 40mph limit on the A226 Gravesend Road) – awaiting installation date.

84. Open Consultations: Consultation on continuance of booking system at the Council recycling centres, end 30th September. Members considered that the PC should not respond officially as Parishioners views were likely to be mixed.

85. Closed consultations/for information:

a) **Local Government Boundary Review** – proposes GBC Councillor numbers reduction – closed 2/8/21, response sent on behalf of PC
b) **"National Highways" (Highways England), Lower Thames Crossing Community Impacts Consultation** – closed 8/9/21, response sent on behalf of PC

<u>Any other business</u>:

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

a) **Malthouse Lane** – problem with vegetation overgrowth causing blockage. This has been reported twice to KCC by thre PC. A parishioner contacted Mr Sweetland who has assured that the clearance will be done by the 14th October.
b) **Traffic speeds on Tanyard Hill** – a Parishioner had e-mailed about this, they had recently moved into the village and were concerned to know what the PC is doing about the problems. Mrs Lindley was asked to respond for the PC.
c) **NW Kent Countryside Project** – the PC had been sent details of this group and Mrs Clifton will investigate whether they can help with undergrowth clearance on the Commons.
d) **Outdoor Gym equipment for Shorne West** – this is still under consideration and might be a suitable item for LTC funding.

87. Matters raised by attending Parishioners: None in attendance

The meeting ended at 21.25

Signed Mrs Lindley:……..

Dated:……..

Table of PLANNING APPLICATIONS – since 2nd July 2021 until 15th September 2021 – for P&HC 23/9/2021: (With updates on outcome where relevant**)**

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20210773 Permitted	Bethany 2 Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JS	Erection of a single-storey porch extension to existing entrance. with ancillary changes including areas of render, timber cladding and new windows.	The Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to there not being any valid objections raised by neighbouring properties. The colour of the cladding should be as shown on the 3D visual images (seems to be natural cedar), the colour of the painted rendering should be a shade within white to cream. (Sent 19/7/21)
20210644 Consented	Court Wood Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent	Retention of tree coppicing to trees at court wood.	*Not sent to SPC by GBC* *Consented with conditions before comments could be made*
20210824 Revised plans submitted	16 Warren View, Shorne, Gravesend, Kent DA12 3EJ	Erection of a two storey side and rear extension, installation of rooflights in the side elevations and construction of one balcony and 2 Juliet balconies in the rear elevation.	The Parish Council has to OBJECT to this application in its present form. • This property is presently one of the smaller houses in Warren View, the plot is broadly triangular, narrowest at the front. • Several other houses locally have been altered in a variety of ways. The principle of alteration is accepted but there are objections to what is proposed, particularly the size, depth and bulky design of the two-storey rear extension. • The proposals would approximately double the floor area of the house in comparison with existing, which could be regarded as over-development of the site. 1) Street Scene: • The street facing front elevation will of itself be compatible with the local streetscene, but the proposed painted render on the side elevations will be detrimentally visible from the roadway. 2) Side extension on the eastern flank: • This is stepped and comes very close to the boundary on this side. • It is understood that there is a retaining wall which will need care during building works. • Number 15 is a little uphill topographically but the length and two-storey nature of the side and rear extension will be significantly detrimental to its amenity. 3) Western flank: • The land falls away more on the western flank and towards Tanyard Hill so the two-storey rear extension would be very dominating and overbearing in appearance for other local properties, particularly to Number 17. • It is understood that there is a retaining wall which will need care during building works.

			• There is a floor to ceiling window on the ground floor of this side of the extension which would overlook the garden of Number 17 – this should be Conditioned to be obscured glazing or removed from the design. 4) Rear Extension: • The proposed rear extension is a very dominant design out of character in the area. • The adverse effect on immediate neighbours could be reduced by stepping back the second storey, without greatly compromising the layout or room sizes. 5) Glazing and balconies: • The large amount of glazing combined with glass balconies will make other properties nearby feel very overlooked and will negatively affect their amenity. • This amount of glazing will cause significant problems with heat gain. • The glazing at the rear should be reduced in area to overall be more compatible with other properties in the area, and more considerate of the close neighbours – it does not seem necessary to have an actual balcony (largely recessed but extending beyond the rear wall of the house), two juliet balconies and a glazed gable end all in the same master bedroom suite. • The glazing in the rear first floor bathroom should be Conditioned to be obscure glazed below head height to ensure privacy. A double-width juliet balcony is an unusual feature in a bathroom. • Consideration could be given to reducing the number of rooflights to reduce potential for light pollution at night. • Metal or brick external balustrades might be more compatible with the area than glass. 6) Painted render: • The proposed painted render on the side and rear walls is out of character with the area and would make the property stand out in in a visually intrusive manner in local views. • The colour is shown as a pale yellow whereas if to be permitted it should be a shade within white to cream, as standard for the wider area, however plain standard brickwork would anyway be preferable in this location to match the other existing houses. 7) Parking on the site: • The existing garage will be replaced but the new one will not be wide enough to accommodate two cars, and existing hardstanding to the east of the house will be lost. • A parking and site layout plan should be submitted showing that there will be sufficient parking provision and turning area, the driveway position, the extent of any new hardstanding and any boundary treatments/gates. 8) Plans showing ground levels: • In view of the topographical complexity of the site, plans should be provided showing the proposed construction within the detailed ground level context.

			9) Request for removal of permitted development rights: • In view of the size of the proposed extensions, if to be permitted then we request that permitted development rights for the whole site should be removed, in order to further protect the amenity of other properties in the area. (Sent 19/7/21)
20210807 Approved	Merrievale Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Application for approval of conditions 4 and 5 attached to planning permission 20200984 relating to the hard surface and boundary treatments and soft landscaping.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to these proposals. (Sent 19/7/21)
20210846 Revised plans, Permitted	The Barn East Court Farm Church Lane Gravesend Kent DA12 2NL	Erection of a two storey extension connect to the main dwelling by a glazed link and to be used as ancillary to the main dwelling.	Thank you for asking the opinion of Shorne Parish Council on this application. The site lies just outside the Parish Boundary but could have adverse visual and landscape impact on Parish areas, including on openness of the Green Belt. We note that this application is a revised version of application 20200176, which was refused by GBC and then dismissed at Appeal. We have the following comments on this application: • The present proposal aims to answer some of the previous objections by having a smaller footprint, reduced amount of glazing and a sunken ground floor to reduce the overall height. The reduced footprint has less impact on the available garden space but this remains significant. • The length of the reduced building still means that the eaves overhang of the roof gable end protrudes slightly on the lateral view so might better be reduced just a little more in length so as to prevent this. • The northern flank wall is built right up to (and possibly over) the boundary of the residential plot which will mean that its roof overhangs outside of the plot. The building should be reduced in width or moved at least 0.5m southwards. • The appearance and layout continue to give the impression of self-contained residential accommodation, in a format that could be construed as capable of becoming a separate dwelling. • The proposed building is an annexe rather than an extension. A well designed, historically sympathetic and visually compatible attached extension to the barn building might be a preferable means of providing additional residential accommodation for the barn if this is required. • The glazed linking corridor seems out of character with the existing building and conveys separateness rather than connection as would be more appropriate for an extension. It is considered

			that the design of the corridor could be made more compatible with the existing building that it serves. • No special circumstances have been put forward to justify the need for the proposal, which still has impact on openness in the Green Belt. Should the proposal be permitted in this format then there should be very strong conditions attached that it is only an annexe ancillary to the main house, preventing its use for long-term accommodation or as a separate dwelling, or for any commercial/business purpose. (Sent 9/8/21)
20210862 Permitted	Highbank Mill Hill Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HA	Erection of a single storey extension to the east side of the garage to form a gym, lobby and gardener's toilet with associated paving. The formation of a covered walkway and a glazed open porch to the front of the house to link with the garage extension and an increase in the roof pitch of the existing garage.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to these proposals, provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours, but has the following comments: • The main garage roof will be higher than at present so therefore more visible from the footpath. However clay roof tiles and hung tiles will be an improvement on the existing metal roof etc as they will be more in keeping with the existing house and the general area. • Standard Conditions should be attached specifying that the garage etc is an annexe to Highbank, is not residential in terms of providing sleeping accommodation, cannot become a separate dwelling or be used to operate a business. • Due to the extent of additional development that has already taken place on the site we suggest that permitted development rights should be removed. (sent 26/7/21)
20210623 Refused	8 St Katherines Cottages, Forge Lane, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3DR	Removal of existing detached garage and erection of a relocated detached garage.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal, provided that there are not any significant objections from neighbours, but has the following comments: • The proposed garage is much larger, being 6.2m wide x 7.7m long x 4.2m high (at the front), than the previous existing one however the proposed design and materials are more compatible with the house and Conservation Area. Sufficient garden space is indicated to remain. • There is only 5m depth for the single space of visitor parking in front of the garage doors. If permitted, care must be taken that any parked vehicle does not encroach on the roadway. • Routine parking arrangements require availability and use of the garage. • Standard Conditions should be attached specifying that the garage is an annexe to the house, is not residential in terms of providing sleeping accommodation, and cannot become a separate dwelling or be used as separate business premises. (Sent 26/7/21)

20210883 Permitted	Scout Hut, Mill Hill Lane, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3HA	Demolition of existing wooden storage shed and erection of a larger wooden shed.	The Parish Council has no objection to this application, which is on land in our ownership. We support the Scouts in their aim of enhancing their facilities and thereby the experience that they can provide to troop members and other users. (Sent 9/8/21)
20210875 Permitted	Hillside Farm, Butchers Hill, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3EB	Retrospective application for the erection of a single storey detached outbuilding.	The Parish Council notes that: • Regrettably this application is retrospective. • If not located in a Conservation Area this application might be permitted development There are three relevant issues: Structure and appearance of the outbuilding: The outbuilding is a robust structure however the design, materials and appearance seem carefully chosen and compatible with the original house and Conservation Area. The roof tiles will weather darker. The Parish Council does not object to these aspects. Location on the site and orientation of the shed: A picture of a wooden shed is included in the site photographs but it is not clear where in the garden this was located and whether or not the new outbuilding is a replacement in the same position. The Parish Council considers that the location of the outbuilding on the site and its physical orientation could both have been better. If asked in advance we would have suggested that the outbuilding would have been better located deeper into the garden and orientated with its long side along a boundary. The close proximity of the rear to the boundary compromises maintenance. Suggested Conditions: Although it is relatively small we request that any permission for the outbuilding should still have Conditions attached such that it is only an annexe to the main house, and cannot be extended or used residentially. (Sent 12/8/21)
20210966 Refusal 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	This application is a revised version of the proposals submitted as part of refused application ref 20200355. The reasons for refusal are set out clearly in the detailed Officer Report. There has been a slight adjustment to the depth of frontage and addition of a narrow flowerbed but otherwise the plans remain unchanged. The Parish Council continues to OBJECT to the design and layout proposals and has the following comments: 1) Depth of Highway verge requires official KCC clarification:

		scheme to front (4) and land reserved for parking (6).	The proposed wall and gates have been moved a little back however the exact dimensions of the Highway Verge requires official clarification by KCC to ensure that the proposals are correct. It would appear that the brick pier at the east side should be located behind the continued line of the front fence and driveway edge of Rose Cottage to the east, so the dividing hedge may need to be cut back slightly to allow this to be built. The same line should then be continued parallel to the kerb to meet the end of the dividing fence to the west, again with the brick piers and any walling behind that line. 2) Front garden design We are pleased to note that the applicant proposes to tidy and improve the appearance of the front garden area however what is proposed still has an out-of-character, largely unrelieved urban appearance save for three planters and a short length of narrow flowerbed. (We note that the front garden design at Clearways to the west was not included in its 2013 planning permission so no official precedent exists). 3) Brick wall with railings over and metal railing electric gates: The proposals would introduce an urban appearance that detrimentally changes the streetscene as it is out of character with the area. It would also set a precedent for other future applications. It would be preferable for the frontage to be open as at Clearways or closed with hedging as elsewhere in the immediate area. There is no land height need for any retaining wall. There is still not room for vehicles to draw fully off the road and footway if waiting for the gates to be opened. The gates would need to overlap when both were open. 4) Adequacy of parking availability: The proposal to have an in-and-out driveway removes another on-street parking space from the area. There is already sometimes competition for on-street parking locally, which is exacerbated due to the applicant routinely parking several business vehicles on the public highway as well as on his own frontage. It is not clear, given the comments made previously by the Highway Development Management Officer, as to whether KCC will permit another dropped kerb here so we would suggest that this aspect should be established before any permission is granted. (Sent 16/8/21)
20210975 Permitted	The Old Police House Tanyard Hill Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EN	Erection of single storey rear extension.	The Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to there not being any valid objections raised by neighbouring properties. (Sent 9/8/21)

20210835 Refused	Thong Lodge Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Application for change of use of the existing stables to form an annexe, incidental to the main dwelling house, and erection of a single storey extension to the annexe.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal but has some comments/concerns: 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? 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. 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 associated garden area will have some minor visual impact and intensify residential use of the site. 4) Proposed Conditions: We request that it be considered to attach Conditions to any permission such that the annexe is only associated with Thong Lodge, cannot be used as a separate dwelling or to operate a business/for other commercial activity. 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 16/8/21)
20201374 (Revised plans) Permitted	The Barn, East Court Farm, Church Lane, Gravesen d Kent DA12 2NL	Erection of new stable and equestrian storage building.	Thank you for asking the Parish Council's opinion on this revised application. The site lies just outside the parish boundary but would have landscape impact to our area. Please also see our representation previously submitted on 25th January 2021. Revised drawings have now been submitted before determination, the Planning Statement has not been updated. The revised plans show modifications which lead to some improvement however we still have the following comments (following the response and structure we used previously): The revised proposal is for a large, fully permanent, single L-shaped building with overall dimensions of 23.25m by 22m (plus roof overhangs) and a floor area of 341sqm. It now has the appearance of a bungalow rather than a house, and would provide stabling for 10 horses (with demolition of the other stable and store at the north-west of the paddocks), plus associated compounds. Although now only on one level, the greater part of the building is still over 7m high. The hay and feed storage is still part of the same building where the horses are kept rather than, as is more usual, being in a well separated building on its own.

			As before, we note that the applicant previously demolished a three section (two-horse) stable building (application ref 20190265), which was presumably redundant and had not been used to accommodate horses for some time. There was also subsequently an application Ref 20190289 For a two-horse stable and store on the shared meadow area, associated with The Granary, but that was withdrawn before determination. ***Additional comment, we note that the application address is incorrect: The application address is given as The Barn, but the site appears to be registered separately as "Land adjoining East Court Barn", so is not part of the curtilage of The Barn. We had previously understood the proposed stable as intended to be an outbuilding related to the residents at The Barn and The Granary but that does not seem to be the case. 1) Landscape impact We consider that the scale, form and mass of this building would still have landscape and Green Belt impact when viewed from the north, west and the east. It also has detrimental impact on the setting of East Court Manor, a listed building. The design of the taller section is barn ended whereas the nearest buildings are all gable ended. Being separated from the cluster of original farm buildings, the proposed building extends the built forms into the open countryside causing encroachment and loss of openness. It further increases the density of development on the site. We note also that the applicant has submitted a new application Ref 20210846 after the previous refusal of permission and subsequent dismissal of Appeal over their previous application (Ref 20200176) for additional ancillary accommodation adjacent to The Barn. We consider that although there has been some reduction in bulk, at the expense of increased floor area, if there is a proven need for such a large stable then an overall low-rise structure with separate hay and feed barn would be preferable as that would create a more gradual transition from open field to built environment. 2) Overall size; Domestic vs Commercial usage: The overall size of the building and number of horses to be accommodated exceeds normal assessments of maximum suitable size for domestic associated stables: in some other Council areas these are restricted to 11m wide by 3.5m deep by 3.5m high measured externally. Between the supporting statement and the correspondence in April 2021 through Rural Planning it remains unclear as to who would be using the stable, for what purpose and whether on a private or commercial basis. We feel that this should be stated explicitly as otherwise the use of the building for commercial purposes should be prevented by Condition. The suggested partial use for racehorse rehabilitation appears to be a Commercial use and could give rise to greater traffic movements than would be expected from purely private use, so further information is needed on this aspect.

			3) Building Design a) Size of stalls and flexibility: • The stalls are all 3.6m square, while national guidance gives a minimum figure of 3.65m square, so the dimensions should be slightly increased. (We note that at Mr Arnold's facility in Northfleet the stalls are 3.6m by 3.75m). • This size provides only for horses less than 16 hands tall. In the interest of flexibility for future needs/owners, consideration should be given to having some stalls suitable for larger horses (e.g. 3.6m by 4.2m) and possibly one for veterinary care/foaling (e.g. 3.6m by 4.8m). b) Ceiling height on ground floor: • We note that the revised proposal has an improved design with an internally pitched roof over the stalls, which would appear to now provide adequate clearance/headspace and ventilation. • However, the ceiling height over the shower/toilet, tack room and easternmost two stalls is over-high. It might be better (also for reasons of fire safety) for the entire stable area itself to have the same lower roof height with a solid dividing wall all along to divide it off from the hay and feed store unless this area is separated off. c) Corridor width: • This is still 2.8m including any opened doors but recommendations seem to be to have 3-3.6m to allow two horses to be led past each other. (We note at Mr Arnold's facility in Northfleet the central corridor is 3m wide, 2.85m excluding the stall doors) • ***Additional point: We note at Mr Arnold's facility in Northfleet that is referenced the stalls have sliding doors, which appear to be more usual, whereas this proposal has hinged doors. d) Hay store: For reasons of ventilation, keeping the hay dry, prevention of dust generation, prevention of mould development and fire risk, it is usually recommended that bulk hay and feed should be kept in a separate barn/shed but the bulk store here is still not separate. (We note that at Mr Arnold's facility in Northfleet the bulk hay and feed storage is in a separate building) e) Ancillary accommodation: • The toilet and proposed shower room are located in the hay and feed store area but on the east side so furthest away from doors, meaning that contamination could be walked across the width of the hay and feed store floor. The access arrangements/location could usefully be reviewed. Building Control should give advice but we think that there should be at least a lobby with a fire escape/external access door to/from the outside and probably a protected corridor fully across the hay and feed store with another fire door into the hay and feed area. Alternatively, please see also our comments about ceiling height and separating off the hay/feed storage building. • The proposed shower room is unusual and perhaps unnecessary when so close to the residences

			that the building apparently serves. Ventilation will be important as otherwise there could be problems from moist air reaching the stored feed etc. (We note that at Mr Arnold's facility in Northfleet there does not seem to be a shower or toilet in either building) • It is normal to have some kind of utility room to wash and dry required equine items although the facilities in the houses could be used instead or the items taken off-site. • Similarly there needs to at least be a drinking water outlet in a clean space if not a small pantry facility, storage for basic medicines and first aid materials, and a handwash basin readily accessible in the stable area. • There needs to be a designated "washdown" area for the horses, this could be outside located where it should be unshaded and sheltered. • There is an alcove in the new plans adjacent to the tackroom that does not have any internal structures or functions defined, this area needs clarification. f) Fire doors and partitions (see also shower and toilet above): • The door from the stable into the hay and feed store needs to have a very high fire rating. • There needs to be a full height, very high rated fire partition between the hay and feed store and the stabling area. g) Floor composition and drainage: The floor composition needs to be chemically resistant and laid sloping so as to drain either outwards or inwards to a drainage gully. h) Overall drainage arrangements: The drainage arrangements for wastewater and sewerage for the building and whole area need to be clarified and the location and type shown on the plans. i) Stall "Window" positions: The southwestern corner stall still does not allow external socialisation, if this is deliberate the plans should note this. 3) Site layout: a) Loss of paddock/grazing area: Some loss previously occurred when the access route was built, and this proposal takes further land out of grazing use. b) External shelter: The design does not provide any external shelter to the horses in bad weather. c) Muck heap size and location, and other refuse arrangements: • The muck containers shown, with dwarf brick walls, are too small to accommodate several days output from ten horses. • Disposal arrangements and waste transport require clarification and licensing as do the drainage arrangements. • The muck storage is located immediately adjacent to the padel court which could result in noxious smells in the area while playing. Otherwise it is over 15m from residential accommodation. • ***Additional point: There will also need to be bins for disposal of routine waste and a location for the storage area for these needs to be defined on the plans.

			d) Fence heights: It is stated that 1.25 m is intended but 1.4m would be preferable, especially on the perimeters of the paddocks. e) Grazing: The British Horse society recommends 1-1.5 Acres minimum per horse for full grazing whereas the applicant will have only 6.2 Acres grazing remaining for ten horses. This implies that a considerable amount of bought in hay and feed will be needed as well as straw for bedding. f) Gates into main paddocks: Three double gates are shown opening into the eastern paddock, the purpose of these requires clarification or otherwise only one seems needed. g) Exercising arrangements: We note that there are no bridle paths in the area. h) Remediation of "meadow" and "garden" areas shown on plans: The situation of the "garden" and the north part of the "meadow" requires clarification. They may have been cleared up further since then but the latest available Google Earth view shows these areas still being used for open storage and parking, despite the permitted building of a 16-car garage. i) Track to woodland: A track to woodland presently passes through the north part of the "meadow" area, future arrangements for this also need to be clarified. j) Compounds around the proposed building: • It needs to be made clear to the applicant that the altered field boundaries and the two compounds will not become a "curtilage" associated with the building and would be returned to agricultural/equestrian use should the building no longer be required for its permitted purpose. • The horse trailer compound is presently shown as open at its rear (southern) end k) Hardstanding and access/turning for vehicles: The limits of associated hardstanding are not shown. No associated parking or turning areas are shown. Summary: Overall, we continue to have many questions and concerns about this proposal. As a permanent building, the proposal could be regarded as amounting to overdevelopment of the site. The building will detrimentally affect openness and encroach on the Green Belt. Suggested Conditions if the application should be permitted: If to be permitted, we would suggest the following conditions might be attached or indicated in accompanying text, as appropriate and possible: • The stable building is only ancillary to The Barn and The Granary, for the personal use of the occupants (this depends on the clarification of the intended users). • The permission could be made personal to the applicant. • The building cannot be used for any commercial purpose. • The timeframe for the removal of the other stables (north-west corner of the paddocks) should be defined. • The building can only be used as horse stables and storage for associated bedding, feed and

			minor equipment, no other uses should be permitted. • No residential stay is permitted and the building cannot be converted to residential use or to become a separate dwelling. • The surrounding land will return to agricultural/equestrian use should the building no longer be required for its permitted purpose. • Permitted development rights should be withdrawn for this building (and the whole site) in order to control any subsequent extension or conversion to another use, or creation of any other structures on the entire site without formal planning permission. This is in order to preserve openness. (Sent 31/8/21)
20210970	Land At New Green Farm Lower Road Shorne Gravesend Kent	Erection of a 4 bedroom detached dwelling to provide accommodation for the farm manager and their family,with associated landscaping, biodiversity enhancements and drainage infrastructure.	The Parish Council has to OBJECT STRONGLY to this application, the reasons and comments on the plans and submitted documents are as follow: Green Belt location: • The proposed site is located in the Green Belt where new dwellings would not normally be permitted. • The proposal would have significant adverse effects on openness and lead to further damage to the Green Belt's purpose in this area, which is to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence of discrete communities. • The proposed site is located centrally in the parcel of fields, where it will have maximal landscape impact to the surrounding area, especially when viewed from higher ground. • No attempt has been made to cluster the proposed residence together with the other new buildings on the site. • The proposal will introduce nocturnal light pollution into a location that is presently completely dark. • We do not consider that sufficient "very special circumstances" have been evidenced that outweigh the considerable landscape harm that this proposed additional property would cause. • We are also concerned that this application could set a precedent for other workers suddenly being required to be residential on-site at small agricultural units. Nature of the "Farm": • "New Green Farm" is a parcel of arable fields that were bought by ACGoatham and are being turned into intensive orchards. • There is no historic farmstead that we are aware of at this location. • It is not a livestock farm (meaning horses, cattle, pigs) • It is very small being only 67.5 hectares. Residence for a farm manager: • We note that the applicant is the CEO of the very large, diversified, multi-site Company. As such

			he is not a mere “farm manager”. • The supporting documentation describes in detail business justifications demonstrating that the bulk of his and his wife’s responsibilities will be away from the site. • We consider that the claim that there needs to be a resident farm manager is tenuous. • If such a need was regarded as essential then this should have formed part of the earliest planning applications and been identified from the outset rather than the applicant undertaking piecemeal expansion of the built forms on the site. • It does not seem a good idea for a family to live so close to likely insecticide spraying. The “Sight and sound” claim: • There is no livestock (meaning horses, cattle, pigs) on the site that might require monitoring, which would be the usual attempted justification for a residential need. However we consider that in modern times CCTV and alarm systems are an adequate substitute for on-site presence. • It is claimed that the temporarily resident seasonal workers require monitoring and supervision but these persons are adults who are all capable of independent living at a distance from their original/usual home. • We consider that it could be an invasion of the workers privacy and detrimental to their personal freedoms to have the CEO of the employing Company located so close nearby. Equally, it is not appropriate for the CEO to be continually available to the lowest grades of workers. We would expect there to be a management hierarchy in place for that purpose. • We would expect one or more of the temporarily resident workers in the caravans to be senior to the others and to oversee/organise their work and also for such a large Company to have staff welfare officers who would make both planned and unannounced visits. • The usual arrangement in large multi-site Companies is to have a roster of staff on-call to deal with any emergencies, as it is not reasonable for one person to be continuously on-call. • We do not consider that the level of emergencies likely to occur justifies a resident manager. • We do not consider that the number of seasonal workers being housed at the orchards, which is a small site, are great enough to justify a residential manager need. • On-site resident managers are not the norm in this type of agricultural endeavour. Pre application discussions: • We note that there have apparently been two pre-applications discussions with GBC. These did not involve the Parish Council, who have not been approached or consulted by the applicant. • Except where apparently quoted, the full content of the referenced Appendixes 2 and 3 have not been made available to us. The Proposed location on the site

			• Although the one of the principal claims is that there is a need to provide security to the stored caravans when empty, these are by design distant and out of sight from the suggested position of the house as they are "hidden" behind the barn. Furthermore, if security is a concern, then locating the caravans adjacent to (and the barn near to) a public footpath also seems an unusual choice. • We would have expected the "farm managers" dwelling to be closer to the barn and the plant/structures that are an alleged security risk. • The immediate area is characterised by scattered residential dwellings, of which there are 3 relatively nearby, and which are all located directly off the Lower Higham Road. The Parish Council considers that if there was a genuine and provable need for a farm managers dwelling we would have expected it to be located nearer the road, with direct access, and adjacent to the main access track which it could then monitor and control. The design and plans: • The house is stated to be being built for the Company CEO and his family and appears over-large and over-specified to be regarded as a genuine and generic farm manager's house. • The purpose of the in-and-out part of the driveway is unclear. • The curtilage is excessively large for its stated purpose. • The plans do not show or discuss any boundary treatments (walls, fences, gates etc) and this information must be provided with the application. • If the purpose of the office is to interview staff etc then it would be better for it to have an external door and washing facilities. • The proposals as presently shown have poor security arrangements. • A lower rise building would have less landscape impact. • The plans do not include information about drainage and sewerage arrangements. • The plans do not include details of any exterior lighting, which must be controlled by condition. The input from Rural Planning (point 5.10 of the Supporting Planning Statement): • This opinion has not been published on the GBC website as a separate, original item. • The Parish Council agrees with and endorses the quoted opinion from Rural Planning • The Parish Council also is unaware of any similar applications in connection with orchards having been submitted in Gravesham or on the Hoo Peninsula. • We are not aware of any other orchards with seasonal workers where a genuine need for a new residence for a farm manager has been cited as justification, including other sites in the ownership of the applicant's Company. The Covid-19 pandemic: • Reference is repeatedly made to effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on working practices however the major effects are on the wane and working restrictions are unlikely to continue longterm, hence we

			do not accept this as justification. Opinion of local residents: • The general view of local residents is that this is a largely spurious and application, manufactured with the intent of circumventing planning rules that are designed to protect communities and the local environment. Conditions: • If GBC should somehow be minded to permit the application then a long and strong agricultural tie should be imposed, in line with the stated agricultural need justification. • We would also request that permitted development rights should be withdrawn for the entire site so that extensions, loft conversion or any alteration to the roofline should not be allowed, in order to prevent further erosion of openness. Also, that no outbuildings or other structures can be built on the site without planning permission and that exterior lighting should be very carefully controlled. The Parish Council requests that GBC should REFUSE this application. Should GBC Officers somehow be minded to permit the application or be undecided then we would also request that the application should be called in for discussion at the Planning Committee. (Sent 6/9/21)
20211001 Refused APPEAL SUBMITTED	Fairwinds (formerly Shornebury) 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.	The Parish Council has to OBJECT to this application, and has the following reasons/comments: • Fairwinds (formerly Shornebury) was greatly extended following planning permission 20120315, and Condition 4 of the permission is standard locally in those circumstances. • Condition 4 prevents “further extensions or roof enlargements” without planning permission. The 2012 decision notice gives the reason as being “In order that any proposals for further extensions to the dwelling may be subject to planning control to enable consideration of matters such as its impact upon the character of the property and the openness of the Green Belt”. • Condition 4 does not impose an outright ban on any extensions or roof alterations/loft conversions just requires them to go through the formal planning application process. Proposals which are appropriate for the house and curtilage and do not significantly or unreasonably impact on neighbours would be unlikely to be opposed by the Parish Council. • The purpose of the Condition 4 is as stated above, to protect the local environment from excessive or inappropriate or poorly designed development that damages local amenity and the Green Belt. • Since 2012 several outbuildings have been built on the site: a detached double garage in 2013 with planning permission and a very large outbuilding at the rear in 2017 with a lawful development certificate, plus a brick wall on the road frontage built despite being refused permission in 2013. • Other applications for a triple garage with accommodation over, and a carport (both in front of

			the property) and a very large conservatory at the rear were refused by GBC although it should be noted that the Parish Council did not object to the Conservatory. After the refusal of the Conservatory we would have expected the applicant to have discussions with GBC to establish a permissible design and to then successfully submit a new application but that does not appear to have happened and neither was there an Appeal submitted. • We note that there has not yet been any application seeking to further alter the roof so there is no evidence that the existence of Condition 4 would prevent this. • The submitted examples of Appeal decisions do not seem entirely relevant to the circumstances of this property, and other Appeal decisions stress that each application must be considered individually. • We consider that the 2012 Condition 4 is entirely reasonable and request that it should remain in place. (Sent 27/8/21)