SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Planning & Highways Committee Meeting held on 9th November 2023 at Shorne Village Hall

PRESENT Mrs S Lindley (Chairman)
Mr J Bugg (Vice-Chair)
Ms P Clifton
Mr R Hardy
Mr R Lane
Mr C Rea
Mr T Rochard-Pullen
Mr R Theobald
Mrs D Salmon (Parish Clerk)

APOLOGIES None

In attendance: Cllr Leslie Pearton, Gravesham Borough Councillor

Not in attendance: Mrs L Williams

Mrs Lindley invited Cllr Pearton to discuss the Goods Vehicle licence application at Apex Business Park, Queens Farm Road and other associated issues regarding large vehicles using incorrect routes.

Cllr Pearton began by confirming his frustration that the application at Apex Business Park had been approved today. He has been in constant contact with GBC and KCC Highways regarding this application, and the lorry/large vehicle problems in the area, however, no one wants to take responsibility. He has provided evidence of the issues but still no action taken by the relevant departments. This is an ongoing problem and he wants the Parish to know that he will not be giving up the fight.

Mrs Lindley advised that there is an additional issue regarding the land south of Apex Business Park. This has been raised by Shorne Parish Council since 2020 and GBC state they are monitoring the situation. However, buildings have been erected and no action taken. Mr Lane commented that GBC do not seem to have any enforcement action in place for these situations. Mrs Lindley has asked Cllr Pearton to raise this further.

Mr Lane explained the current situation with Green Farm Lane residents' concerns and the lack of help from KCC regarding additional signs. The signs requested have been refused as KCC state there can only be one sign despite photo evidence of more than one sign being erected in neighbouring parishes. Cllr Pearton will be taking this matter further.

Mrs Lindley thanked Cllr Pearton for his work and comments. Cllr Pearton wished to stay at the meeting for a short while to learn what is happening elsewhere within the parish.

55. To receive any declarations of interest for any items on the agenda:
Mrs Lindley neighbours the property that led to a question to GBC about use of properties as an Air BNB, under item 7(c) of the agenda. As the discussion will be general there is no requirement for Mrs Lindley to not participate.

56. Minutes of previous meeting held on Thursday 28th September 2023:
The planning table has been updated since distribution due to the application for 1 Genesta Glade being refused permission.
Minutes approved by ALL.

57. Any Matters Arising from Minutes not covered in the Agenda:
None.

Planning:

58. Report of Delegated Action taken under Standing Order 8, (c), (d), (f) (i) Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with by the Chairman in Consultation with Members (previously circulated):
Since the planning application Table was circulated:

- Furzy Lea, Bowesden Lane – two storey side extension, refused.
- Starwood, Pear Tree Lane – dwelling at rear, refused.

All confirmed as a true representation.

59. Planning Applications of note and GBC decisions:
None to list.

60. Any GBC enforcements updates/new items:

(a) Unit 23 Apex Business Park – Goods Vehicle operating sire relocation
Discussed with Cllr Pearton at the start of the meeting.

(b) Land south of entrance to Apex Business Park
Discussed with Cllr Pearton at the start of the meeting.

(c) 'AirBNB' use of properties
Mrs Lindley has referred this Parishioner question to GBC, they asked for more information but have not yet replied. Mrs Lindley had looked on-line and there are several Air BNB's and similar advertised within Gravesham, and we are not aware of any issues arising from these locations. Nuisance could be caused during use by temporary residents including from arrivals and departures. There is not currently any evidence of the property in question being used as an Air BNB anyway, or nuisance being caused, so no action is needed at this time.

(d) Other new reports

- Cheynes Farm Barns (Thong Lane) – It had been reported that skips were located on site and were being used to sort materials. Mr Lane asked GBC but it is within the terms of permitted use. The situation will be kept under review.
- Gwendon, Pear Tree Lane – There was a rear extension application, however it was noted that they had cleared part of the neighbouring woodland (in their ownership) for residential use and parking a significant number of vehicles.
- Furzy Lea, Bowsden Lane – excavated soil from permitted applications is being deposited at the lower end of the garden. This is potentially raising land levels which is 'engineering works' and requires permission.
- Park Pale Farmhouse – Garage previously permitted to south of the house but it has been discovered that it has been extended and undergone residential conversion. Local residents have witnessed residential use.

(e) GBC Enforcement Team service reduction
Mrs Lindley was concerned to receive a bounceback message stating that "…..capacity within the Planning Enforcement team is going to be reduced and therefore our focus will be on serious breaches including works to listed buildings, works to protected trees – those covered by a tree preservation order (TPO) or within a conservation area, demolition of important unlisted buildings in conservation areas, and development that causes concern for public safety." This would seem to be the opposite to what many would regard as being needed and could usefully be taken up with GBC at a future Parish Council Chairs meeting.

61. Planning Appeals:

- **New Green Farm (house), changed to 'In Progress' (Hearing) – letter not received**
  A parishioner received an Appeal notification letter dated 26th October but as at today's date (9th November) Shorne Parish Council has still received no correspondence despite the statutory requirement, GBC have been informed. A response will be sent based on and re-iterating our previous representations.
- **Bucklebury, Pear Tree Lane – Appeal lodged over garage in front of house**
  Previous building work had been undertaken without advance permission. The application for a garage at the front has been refused by GBC but an Appeal has been lodged.

62. Major Plans etc affecting the Parish:

- **Lower Thames Crossing Development Consent Order – planning inquiry in progress:**
  (a) Various hearings held. Concerns with KCC and Shorne Woods Country Park regarding their income generation proposals for a potential new car park at Thong Lane. Proposals have expanded to include cycle hire, café/restaurant and no longer said to be for users of Shorne Woods Country Park but for encouraging general visitor increase to our area. All agreed that KCC's proposals were not supported.
  (b) Documents were submitted by Mrs Lindley at two deadlines (3rd and 31st October). The next document deadlines are 14th, 17th and 28th November. There are 4 Issue Specific Hearings and 2 other hearings to be held during the 22nd-28th November period.
  (c) Mrs Lindley met with the local security lead at Bowesden Lane on 2nd October about resident's security concerns for vacant properties and land.
  (d) Teams meeting attended by Mrs Lindley with the tunnelling lead on 9th October to obtain more information about tunnelling processes, particularly the ground preparation tunnel and alternatives that could be less damaging.

63. Outside Parish but with impact:
Nothing to report.

Highways:

64. Accident Reports:
No new reports.
An anecdotal report at Shorne Cross Roads but insufficient details were provided.

65. Traffic Monitoring:

Speedwatch and SID information, Lorrywatch

- **Speedwatch** – Mrs Clifton presented recent data and confirmed that one letter has been sent to an offender.
- **Lorrywatch** – Mr Lane had contacted RS Skips over a vehicle identified but they responded citing legitimate reasons for it being in the village area.

Mr Lane advised that since starting Speedwatch and introducing the SID we have seen consistent gradual reductions in average speeds.

66. Road condition/highways issues and hazards:

- **Green Farm Lane** – Southern Water proposed road closure outside Tanglewood, 13th November for five days
- **Hayes Terrace** – another 'road rage' incident had occurred, KCC have been informed by Mr Lane.
- **Park Pale** – subsidence/defect (and gas leak) – Mr Lane took photos and sent them to KCC. Representatives from KCC are visiting the site on 17th November and Mr Lane has offered to meet them.
- **Shorne Village centre 20mph scheme** – roundels installation expected 9th/10th November.
- **Swillers Lane** – Mr Theobald reported the surface breaking up after recent heavy rainfall. Patching of the potholes is to be done on 13th November taking one day.
- **Manor Field** – it is noted that surface water is outflowing in various places again so confirming that the problem is not just a leak.

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

- **Traffic calming requests on Facebook** – Parishioners have again raised requests on Facebook for traffic calming measures that have already been considered and are not possible under KCC's restrictions due to cost and other considerations.
- **Green Farm Lane** – KCC monitoring has showed that traffic speeds were satisfactory but there were excessive numbers of large vehicles/HGV's. This requires further investigation and discussion but meanwhile KCC are still refusing to allow or install extra signage despite this being in place in Cobham.

68. Feedback from KCC Highways:

- **Highway Information Pack 2023/24** - issued again by KCC in October, circulated by Mr Lane.
- **Highways Improvement Plan (HIP)** - draft update was circulated in late September for review. No comments have been received so Mrs Lindley will finalise for the forthcoming meeting.
- **HIP meeting with KCC** – to take place on 13th November.

External Consultations:

69. Open Consultations:

None relevant identified.

70. Closed consultations/for information:

- Grain to Tilbury electricity grid – closed 29th October https://www.nationalgrid.com/electricity-transmission/network-and-infrastructure/infrastructure-projects/grain-to-tilbury/document-library
  Mrs Lindley attended a Webinar on 18th October, asking some questions and subsequently completing an on-line form. This is regarding an additional electricity cable tunnel under the Thames, it will require planning permission.

Any of business:

71. Matters raised by Members, including from other Committees being discussed for convenience:

- **Shornemead Crossing** – We have been advised that work has commenced and the bridge segments will be installed the weekend of 24-26 November. Mrs Lindley has checked that the route works vehicles will be taking is satisfactory.
- **Clerk Training** – Mr Lane proposed that Mrs Salmon should attend the online KALC 'Clerk in Action' training session, costing £50. ALL approved.
- **Foothpaths, Properties and Greens small works contractor** – Mrs Clifton to distribute details to all members.
- **Footpaths, Properties and Greens** – Fencing quote still awaited for crabbles bottom.

8.50pm – Cllr Pearton left the meeting, thanking the Parish Council.

- **Outdoor Gym Equipment – Michael Gardens** – Mr Rea has obtained quotes for outdoor gym equipment suitable for residential areas. He is liaising with GBC who own the land. Shorne Parish Council can assist GBC financially if required.
- **AED Shorne West** – Mr Rea confirms that GBC will assist in fitting a security camera at the site of the new AED.
- **Bus Shelter Lighting** – Mr Rea has been in contact with UK Power Networks regarding possibility of lighting for the bus shelters at Shorne Crossroads. He requires a map at a scale of 1:500 to submit to UK Power Networks.
- **Councillor Training** – Mr Rochard-Pullen confirmed that the time and date of training forwarded by Mrs Salmon was suitable, Mrs Salmon to book with KALC.
- **Bus Shelter Update** – Mr Lane is chasing the chosen contractor for a confirmed start date.
- **Grant Application** – Mrs Salmon advised that an email request from Citizens Advice Bureau for a grant had been missed before the Finance Meeting on 26th October so proposes it be added as an agenda item to Parish Council Meeting on 23rd November. All agreed. Mrs Salmon to re-circulate the original request.

72. Matters raised by attending Parishioners (at discretion of the Chairman):
None in attendance.

Date of next meeting. The next meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee will be held at 19.30 on Thursday 25th January 2024.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.05pm.

Signed Mrs Lindley :…….. Dated:……..

This page is left intentionally blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS SINCE 28th September 2023:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20230954	Furzy Lea , Bowesden Lane, Shorne, Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a two storey side extension.	The proposal is for an approximately 4m wide by 10m deep, two-storey side extension, set back by a few centimetres from the central frontage. The property will become a 5-bedroom, 2-bathroom (one en-suite) dwelling. Parking arrangements are unchanged with two garage spaces available plus hardstanding, so appear satisfactory. The size of the extension represents a 50% increase in the floor area of the existing house, which will be over the "one third rule" limitation and will significantly increase its bulk, with negative impact on openness in an area that is Green Belt and bordering an AONB. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal on its own but notes recent planning approvals 20221191 for an 8m deep single-storey rear extension and 20230240 for a large gym building. Taken together, the quantum of proposed construction on the site is very large, and the previous approvals should also be taken into account if permission is to be granted. We would also request that permitted development rights should be withdrawn. Engineering works being undertaken: We note also that work has started on the site and that spoil is being deposited at the southern end of the property, some distance from the works, where it may raise land levels while constituting engineering works. We would be grateful if this could be considered as a Condition may also be needed about this. (Sent 4/10/23)
20230942	Starwood Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Demolition of existing stables and removal of containers and hardsurfacing and conversion of existing concrete framed structure to form detached bungalow with three bedrooms plus single storey rear extension, front porch and use of existing access.	This is a reapplication of refused Applications Ref 20220531 and 20221342 with minor alterations, so effectively almost the same. Hence the reasons for refusal will also be the same. The Parish Council again has to OBJECT STRONGLY to this application for the following reasons and comments: 1) Plots of land, land ownership, access: The land area shown is composed of parts of two parcels of land however the ownership remains confused: • the rear land of Starwood K424735, stated previously and presently as being in the ownership of the applicant • the narrow access track on the west side that is part of K654169, this was established previously to be in the ownership of the applicant's children but is again now stated to be in the ownership of the applicant. The actual situation requires verification. The manner in which proper and permanent access is to be maintained to the rest of K654169 needs to

			be clarified as no proper route of access is shown. It is not appropriate for access to be via a residential garden, or a route that might come to be in different ownership. As the existing accumulated structures, including the barn structure, are said to be redundant and are to be removed, we suggest that the original track on K654169 should be reinstated. 2) Green Belt Location; Landscape character The proposed property is located in the Green Belt where a new dwelling would not normally be permitted due to detrimental impact on openness. It remains the case that no valid "very special circumstances" have been cited that might override this restriction. The proposed location would also cause harm to local Landscape Character. 3) Backland development and precedents The proposal would be a backland development which is by definition undesirable. Contrary to the applicant's statement that ("There are many examples of long access roads providing access to backland dwellings along this stretch of Pear Tree Lane", see applicant's point 6.19), there are in fact no backland residential buildings on the entire north side of Pear Tree Lane. On the south side there are only two: one purpose-built residential property, "Furze Bank" which was permitted in the 1950's, and "Sunridge" which is a mixed-use building, previously related to the historic Bushylees Farmhouse and which was converted from genuine stable use. Permission of this proposal would create a precedent in the area, particularly as Starwood is already set well back on its plot, which could lead to other backland proposals being impossible to resist. 4) Out of character with the area; Amenity of neighbouring dwellings The area is characterised by single detached houses built on large plots, this proposal would be out of character with the area. The proposal will be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring dwellings, especially "Colesmead" to the east. 5) Proof of redundancy of existing buildings It is claimed that the hay barn and various stable and storage structures are all redundant however further information is required proving this in case removals and any conversion might lead to pressure for more barn and stable structures to be built elsewhere on the properties owned by the applicant and his children, so leading to further erosion of openness of Green Belt land. However, if they are all truly redundant then there is no valid reason why they should not anyway all be removed. 6) Suitability of structure for conversion The barn structure was built on (at the time) non-residential land that was previously orchards. It

			appears to be merely a concrete frame with some timber posts. There does not appear to presently be a floor or any existing services. We question whether the existing structure can be regarded as a building suitable for conversion and whether conversion to a residence can be achieved without considerable engineering works. 7) Other points about plans, layout and design/changes since the previous applications: • A double gate is still shown in the northern boundary fence, clarification is required over the need for and proposed use of this non-residential feature (see Point 1 above). • The layout remains the "wrong way round" on the site, with the "front door" at the rear so not relating to the roadway but rather to the open countryside. In our opinion the layout should be turned round by 180 degrees. • The previously proposed two car garage at the back of the site has been replaced by three open air parking spaces further south, towards the roadway. • The plans do not indicate how surface drainage and sewerage needs will be met. • The Applicant references other planning decisions however these relate to very different locations and circumstances. • The Applicant considers that their proposal can be regarded as "infilling" however the site is outside the village/settlement envelope and there is no other property at the rear of the Starwood curtilage. There is also local precedent against their view as, at the land adjacent to The See Ho, Appeals were dismissed on two occasions, see the latest under ref APP/K2230/W/20/3258951. The Parish Council OBJECTS STRONGLY to this application. We request that the application should be refused, and that enforcement action should be taken concerning the various buildings and structures that have been erected without planning permission, including the menage constructed in Starmore Wood, as discussed in a previous decision notice. In view of the extent of built form proposed on the site, we also request that, should Officers be minded to permit the application, then Conditions should be attached withdrawing permitted development rights for the entirety of both the quoted Land Registry titles, to prevent further encroachment onto the Green Belt, open agricultural land and woodland. However, should officers be minded to permit this application we would also request that the application should be called in to the Planning Committee to enable wider discussion and informed participation in any decision. (Sent 4/10/23)

20230943	Starwood Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JU	Application for removal of condition 2 attached to planning permission reference number 20050912 for the erection of a detached garage, to allow the store in the roof space above the garage to be used as a hobby room and construction of a dormer extension in both side roof slopes of garage to provide enlarged roof space for the hobby room/store to allow use of detached garage as an annexe in connection with main dwelling house.	Regrettably, this appears to be another retrospective application at this property. The Parish Council has to **OBJECT** to this application for the following reasons and comments: **1. Previous planning application decisions:** The Applicant cites two previous Planning permission decisions as relevant: • Ref 19750472 states: (iii) the building shown on the submitted drawings as "motor house" shall not be used otherwise than for the accommodation of private motor vehicles, for the personal enjoyment of the applicant, and shall not at any time be used in connection with any trade or business or for living accommodation without the prior permission of the District Planning Authority. • Ref 20050912 states: 2 The building hereby permitted shall be used as a hobby room/store for the residential occupants of Starwood House, the building shall not, at any time, contain any living accommodation and no trade or business shall be carried on therefrom The above demonstrate that the Applicant has been informed twice that the garage building cannot be used as living accommodation yet despite that the building has been converted to residential living accommodation use. **2. Lack of "very special circumstances":** The Applicant has not cited any "very special circumstances" as to why this accommodation is needed, and as a separate annexe rather than for example extending the main house. The garage building is in front of the building line where residential accommodation/annexes would not normally have been permitted. The structure has been modified, without planning permission, and is capable of being used/easily converted to be used as a separate dwelling, which would create a new dwelling in the Green Belt where none would usually be permitted. Permission would set an undesirable precedent in the area. The Parish Council can see no reason why the building should be altered or the Condition varied. The Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application and hereby requests that it should be **refused**. Furthermore, Enforcement action should be considered due to the knowing infringement of two separate planning permission Conditions. However, if GBC are minded to instead give permission: • We suggest that any permission could be time limited and/or made personal to the Applicant.

			• We would also request that strong Conditions are attached preventing the building being used as or converted to a separate dwelling. (Sent 4/10/23) cc to GBC Councillors
20230957	1 Gabriel Gardens Gravesend Kent DA12 4QD	Erection of part two storey and part single storey side, front and rear extension to create a new dwelling; erection of two storey front extension to existing dwelling, formation of one car parking space in the front garden and formation of vehicle access to existing parking area.	This is effectively a re-application following refusal of Application ref 20230459. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal (meaning to add an extra terraced house), subject to there not being any significant valid objection from neighbours, but still has significant concerns about the design and revised layout. The property is an end-of-terrace house on a larger than average plot, which is narrower at the front than the back and is constrained by the garage and driveway belonging to another property. The plot has now been fenced off from the grassed passageway running along its side. The proposal is to build on another house, making the existing dwelling a mid-terrace. The new house is proposed to be built around the constraining garage (belonging to No.3) on two of its sides, leaving inaccessible spaces and so mutually compromising maintenance. The existing house is only 5m wide and is shown in the proposal as having parking space for two cars side-by-side, however the width may be too narrow for this. The proposed new house would have a frontage tapering to less than 4.5m wide, and one parking space for 2.5 bedrooms. This is barely sufficient and could encourage on-street parking, the availability of which is being reduced by the proposal as dropped kerbs are needed for both properties. The upstairs layout has been altered but there is still overlooking to the Judeth Gardens property at the rear. We also now have concerns about the size, layout and available useable space for bedroom 3, which appears substandard. We note that the porches have been increased in depth with a changed door position. We did not comment on this previously but note the arrangement by which the dividing wall of the porches is offset from the line of the current side wall of the existing house so encroaches on its space. The proposed new boundary line will further narrow the parking and access width available for the existing house and causes an imbalance in design. The existing house has a stairwell window on the side elevation, which would be lost. There appears to be a narrow void space between the properties. We disagree with much of the discussion and attempted comparisons in the Planning Statement. On balance, we consider that this Application should also be refused permission unless there are significant improvements made to the proposed design and layout. (Sent 4/10/23)

20230985	Gwendon Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3JT	Prior approval application for a single storey rear extension with a depth of 8.00 metres, maximum height of 3.89 metres and eaves height of 2.90 metres.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this application, subject to there not being any valid objections from neighbours, but has the following comments: • Previous Applications ref 20131134 and 20160470 are noted, among others. • The existing house is small for the size of its true curtilage. • A large amount of glazing is proposed on all sides but the extension is an adequate distance from the boundary and at a lower ground level than the neighbouring property to the south-east, however there could be privacy concerns for that side. • A full height door is shown on the first floor at the rear, which leads to questions about use of the flat roof of the proposed extension as a balcony (no balustrading is shown), but the land drops away to the north-east side where there is no neighbouring property to overlook. However, we note from the aerial view that the Applicant has cleared part of the neighbouring woodland at Court Wood to the north-east of their residential curtilage (land also in their ownership). We believe that this area is part of that subject to the 1998 Court Wood Tree Preservation Order and Article 4 Direction. Some of this land is put to garden use but a very large area of hardstanding has been created, seen to be used for the parking of large number of vehicles. The woodland area needs to be restored and we request that, if considered appropriate, enforcement action should be taken to ensure this. (Sent 4/10/23)
20231003	Little Westwood Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Application for a Lawful Development Certificate in respect of the proposed erection of two single storey rear extensions and an outbuilding.	This property is located in the Thong Conservation Area and is one of the historic “Homes for Heroes”, although unfortunately alteration and extensions have been made to the barn. Previous Application Ref 20220523 for large rear and side extensions, which were refused permission, is noted. This present application is for two, narrowly separated rear extensions and a large outbuilding, so has three sections: <u>Demolition of small non-original rear extension and replacement with wider, approximately 3m deep, rear single-storey extension to the living space:</u> The Parish Council has no concerns about this element. <u>Demolition of existing conservatory addition and replacement with an extended utility room protruding further to the rear:</u> The existing lean-to conservatory has a glass side on the flank wall and extended the rear cats slide roof line whereas the proposed extension is square and flat roofed, and is not subsidiary to the original flank wall. As such it alters the appearance of the house from the road which could be detrimental to the street

			scene. Otherwise, the Parish Council has no concerns about this element. <u>A large pitched-roofed outbuilding on the rear boundary to include a swimming pool, gym and full bathroom/changing facilities:</u> This building is large, being overall approximately 13m wide by 10m deep. The outbuilding has a much larger floor area than the original house so is disproportionately large in comparison. The outbuilding has the capability of being used as residential accommodation and even as a separate dwelling. We therefore have several concerns including considering that this building really needs a full planning application so that Conditions can be attached limiting its use to being an annexe without residential use, that cannot be used as a separate dwelling or to operate a business. We note also that aerial views and November 2022 Streetview appear to show a mobile home located at the rear of the site, without any planning permission being in place. 

			 (Sent 25/10/23)
20221064	Northfleet Harbourside - Land Surrounding Ebbsfleet United Football Club, Stonebridge Road, Northfleet.	Outline planning application with all matters reserved, except for the primary means of access and road layout, for a phased mixed-use redevelopment involving the demolition of existing buildings and structures including site preparation / remediation works, and the development of residential units (Use Class C3), Class E uses including floorspace for retail Class E(a)), food/beverage and drinking establishments (Use Class E(b)), local services (Use Class E(c)), indoor sport/recreation/fitness (use Class E(d)), healthcare	Although this site is the other side of Gravesend from Shorne, the proposals will nevertheless have impacts on Shorne Residents. 1) The current proposals: The proposals as described currently could have some good outcomes for the Northfleet area if delivered. We have concerns though as to whether the entire proposals are in fact deliverable and whether the whole scheme will end up being built. The proposals are at present very conceptual, hoping to emulate design seen elsewhere, but they may not be realistic. The proposals include very tall high-rise elements which will tower over the neighbouring area with resulting detriment to local ambience and will cut off views to the Thames and beyond. The heights of the buildings will also have widespread visual and landscape impact, with very negative effects on views over a considerable distance. This will be particularly detrimental at night. It would be preferable to greatly reduce the heights. 2) Loss of existing businesses: The proposals involve demolition of a large number of existing businesses of types that are not being re-provided on the site. This will result in considerable loss of local employment. It is not clear where else these businesses might be able relocate to or whether they will be completely lost to the area. Many of these businesses are auto trades, retail (some major) and repairs etc, and are presently used by Shorne residents. 3) Sustainability: With both Northfleet, and Ebbsfleet International stations nearby, the proposals in theory offer a very sustainable development, however, experience goes to show that there will still be a considerable increase in car use that will impact adversely on the local road network.

		space (Use Class E(e)), creche/nursery uses (Use Class E(f)), office floorspace (Use Class E(g)(i)), a new multi-use stadium with associated business and leisure facilities (sui generis), hotel (Use Class C1), community uses floorspace (Use Class F2). The phased redevelopment will include other sui generis uses, delivery of open space and significant realignment of the road network including the A226 Galley Hill Road / Stonebridge Road / Lower Road with hard / soft landscaping, car and cycle parking provisions, infrastructure works, ancillary and associated works. |	Facilities like shops, restaurants, offices, sports centres will attract workers and visitors to the area and increase inward car trips for access. It is unclear who the tenants/purchasers of the new properties will be, net inward migration will put additional pressure on schools and healthcare facilities that are already understaffed and overwhelmed. Getting onto trains in the rush hour is already difficult and this development will make it worse. 4) Parking provision is inadequate: Parking provision as proposed is less than standard guidance, arguably to discourage/prevent car ownership however, again in practice that does not happen and overspill parking could result on local roads and at places like Ebbsfleet International station car parks. The referencing to the Kent parking standards has been very selective, and the justifications for low parking provision are not credible. 5) Road access routes and traffic congestion: Because the proposed development is pinned against the river, its road access routes are automatically constrained. The A226 on the west and the B2175 on the east are always congested in each direction. The A226 on the west is currently cut off at Galley Hill following the chalk cliff collapse and it is unknown when it will be reconnected. The only route of access to the strategic road network is by using Thames way and the A2260 past Ebbsfleet International station. The development would greatly increase the traffic on these already busy and congested routes and would particularly impact adversely on rural residents wanting to access Ebbsfleet International station, which effectively requires car use and parking. 6) Construction impacts: A very long, phased construction period is proposed. This will, over the eight years proposed, result in considerably increased congestion on local and approach roads and possible the strategic road network. Summary: In our view, there are a lot of things wrong with this proposal, certainly as presently submitted, and it will have a variety of adverse impacts on existing residents of Gravesham, including those living in Shorne. (Sent 17/10/23)