PLANNING APPLICATIONS representations submitted from 6/7/2025 to 9/9/2025:

Ref	Address	Description	SPC Submission
20250600 Refused	9 Gazelle Glade Gravesend Kent DA12 4PU	Demolition of existing side and rear conservatories. Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of dormers in both sides of the roof slope and alterations to fenestration.	The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal but has the following comments: The property is a detached chalet-bungalow, currently configured with two bedrooms, both on the first floor. The proposal is for a two-storey rear extension which will reduce the available private amenity garden space for the property. The alterations will create 4 bedrooms on the first floor. Parking provision seems adequate for the increased size. Roof dormers are also proposed on both sides – full width on the south side (where there is no neighbouring property) and half-width on the north side. The appearance of these is satisfactory except that the dormer roofs are the same height as the roof ridge, however such a design has previously been permitted by GBC in the immediate area. New windows are proposed: • Bathroom windows should only be openable above 2m height from the floor level and have permanently obscured glass. • The window of Bedroom 3 is a problem as there could be privacy conflict with the neighbouring property, so this window should meet the same standards.
20250606 Certificate Granted	21 Burdett Avenue Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3HP	Application for a Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for a loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front roof elevation.	The Parish Council has concerns about this proposal and has the following comments: The property is a fairly modern-looking house located on the north side of Burdett Avenue, near the far end where properties have a more individual appearance. It must be noted that Application Ref 20250146 (Demolition of attached garage and erection of double storey side extension, infill single storey rear extension with a raised patio and addition of two bay windows to the front elevation) was previously permitted, which increased the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4. It is unclear why this present proposal was not included at that time, however it must be assumed that this application is additional to the previous permission. The present proposal would create another bedroom in the roof space. The front rooflights and rear dormer are satisfactory but taking the two applications together, the house could become 5-bedroomed, which could be overdevelopment. Bathroom facilities will be on the floor below, with only one bathroom shared between 5 bedrooms (although there is a toilet on the ground floor) which is substandard accommodation. Together with 20250146, and with 5 bedrooms, the on-site parking provision (with loss of the garage) would be inadequate. This could cause problems due to spill-over onto the street especially as Burdett Avenue is so narrow and on-street parking is therefore restricted and competitive.

20250617			20250617 Lower Thames Crossing Project Mark Lane Gravesend Kent Application for a correction order. ***Tried with GBC, and also e-mailed to NH on 13/8/2025, asking for documents but nothing further received either from GBC or NH***
20250643	New Green Farm Lower Road Shorne Gravesend Kent	Erection of a cold store building.	The Parish Council has to OBJECT STRONGLY to this application. Previous application ref 20240020 for Prior Approval of a much smaller building is noted, for which it was deemed that Prior Approval was not required. The building previously proposed however had a total built area of only 956sqm and maximum height of 12m. The present proposal is for a total built area more than three and a half times the previous size and taller, having overall 3,595sqm of built floor area (counting in the external electricity substation and two chiller units). In addition, there is a roof overhang along both sides, and four "cat ladders" to the roof voids also increasing the total area. The maximum height will now be 14m. This completely different proposal greatly exceeds what would be reasonably expected in association with an individual small farm unit. We question the actual need and appropriateness of the proposal for the relatively small area of land being farmed, as well as it causing adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the Higham Arable Landscape Area. This is especially as the proposed building will be highly visible in the landscape, particularly from residential dwellings on higher ground close nearby. We consider this to be a disproportionately large, near Industrial Application more suited to an Industrial Estate rather than removing high-grade agricultural land from food production. If permitted, the application would irrevocably alter the nature of the area and could lead to proliferation of additional Industrial buildings being co-located. That aspect needs to be considered at this point in time, as the applicant had previously mentioned additional cold storage buildings and a packing plant despite those facilities already being available at the Company headquarters nearby at Flanders Farm. Plans and documents submitted: • No additional hardstanding is shown or suggested however it seems likely that this would be required to ensure safe vehicle operations, this should be shown on the plans and factored into the extent of the built area being proposed. • No additional contiguous land is shown as being farmed. • Based on previous plans submitted for other applications, the cold store may be being located on tenanted land rather than land in the ownership of the applicant. • It is not made clear on all the plans and extracts that Public Footpath NS156, running south-west to north-east, is immediately west of the suggested location of the cold store building and that

			associated vehicles will be crossing the footpath in a manner likely to result in conflict with members of the public. The KCC Public Rights of Way Team should be asked for their input unless this has already been solicited. • We also note application Ref 20240812 for an agricultural workers dwelling (which was awaiting determination and has recently been permitted). This is not shown on the currently submitted plans or mentioned in the text of the supporting documents. Supporting Planning Statement: • Note this uses both Acres and Hectares (1 Acre = 0.405 Hectare) so the areas quoted are confusing: New Green Farm is stated to be 67.5 hectares owned plus 17.28 hectares tenanted, a total of 84.78 hectares. • At the same time, it is stated that an "Aldi Orchard" of 200 Acres is to be planted "on New Green Farm", that is 81 hectares. It is not clear whether this is additional contiguous land or double counting of existing land as the location is unclear. • The proposed building can store 14,145 apple bins. It is also unclear why the total annual production from the farm would all need to be accommodated in long-term storage. It would not all be picked at exactly the same time and it would be expected that much would be transferred almost immediately for processing and packing then delivery to retail outlets. • Once the apples have been placed into storage bins they could be transported and stored anywhere within a reasonable distance, hence we do not accept that there needs to be any cold storage located on the farm itself, let alone at such a massive scale. • Immediate versus delayed transport makes no difference to the number of bins and vehicle movements that are actually required. • In Point 8.13 the applicant states that the site is currently an unused field, however it was formerly in full arable production. Noise assessment: • The noise assessment has several deficiencies. • The assessment only considers one residential location, at The Red House (incorrectly called "Kennel House" in the documents). While that is the nearest residential property it would be shielded from noise emanating from the refrigeration units/chiller fans by the building itself, however other residential properties that are only 600-700m away, and are more likely to be subjected to noise propagation, have not been considered. • The noise level from two fans working simultaneously has been underestimated. Two 89dBA sources together produce 92dBA, possible causing beating, and the sound would propagate further than shown including due to reflection off the rear wall of the building. • The noise from vehicle reversing beeps can travel long distances and can be particularly intrusive for nearby residents.

			• Accordingly there is concern about ambient noise levels, especially in summer and at night. Biodiversity Gain Plan: • Two bird boxes and an invertebrate feature are proposed, it is considered that more could be done in these respects. • Otherwise the plans are satisfactory and welcome • A planting plan must however also be submitted. Other points: • Public Footpath NS156 – There will be further adverse Impact on the ambience, physical condition and user safety of Public Footpath NS156. • Landscaping – It is considered that more could and should be done to shield the proposed buildings from view and to soften the appearance. • Building access routes - The noise documentation claims that the building would only be accessed from the east side however there are doors on both sides. The access route needs to be clarified and if necessary/appropriate restricted by Condition. • Increased traffic volumes, road access routes - We are opposed to any increase in traffic to and from the site as access, especially for HGV's, along Lower Higham/Gravesend Road is not good. We disagree with the statement in Point 8.3 of the supporting Planning Statement that New Green Farm is "well connected to the surrounding road network". We particularly object to the suggestion that Green Farm Lane, which is mostly single lane and has a 7.5T weight limit, can provide access. Other suggested "Without Prejudice" Conditions: • Hours of working – Working hours, and therefore noise emission, should be restricted, especially in summer months. • Safety of Public Footpath NS156 - Measures are needed to ensure the safety of users of the Public Footpath NS156 and its condition as the applicant is proposing to move further large and heavy machinery across the line of the footpath. The Footpath width (as a previous track) must be maintained and the provision of permanent safety fencing/signage should be considered. • Vehicle movements to and from the site - Vehicle sizes, numbers and permitted access routes, especially as regards HGV's, should be limited and controlled. • Signage and advertising banners – these should all be restricted and controlled. • Only on-site production to be stored – The cold store should only be used to store apples grown in the contiguous New Green Farm orchards, it cannot be used to store fruit transported from another site/sites. • Light pollution – the proposal is for an area that is presently completely dark. A detailed lighting plan needs to be submitted. Any external lighting needs to be minimal, of low light intensity and properly controlled so as to minimise nuisance and disturbance.

20250650 Permitted	10 Court Lodge Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3EQ	Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey side/rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension.	Previous Application Ref 20250420 is noted, which was refused permission for process reasons. This one is a householder planning application for the same proposal, hence we make largely the same comments as follow: The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal. The existing house is 4-bedroom but relatively small for the size of the plot. Internal reconfiguration will reduce the number of bedrooms to three. There will be enough on-site parking remaining. The proposal is for flat-roofed, single storey extensions at the west side (extending back beyond the rear wall) and the rear, however the rear extension is offset, being partly behind the linked garage (link-detached to neighbouring property). The designs are similar to the existing side structures although a little taller. The side extension includes a large storeroom with a garage-type door at the front, which is an unusual feature for a residential property. Conditions restricting business use may be needed. It is noted that several trees are being removed (three each at front and rear), but reasons for this have not been given. A planting plan may be appropriate showing planting of replacement trees and bushes to maintain biodiversity on the site, as well as a lighting plan for any exterior lighting. Due to the amount of the proposed increase in floor area, permitted development rights should be withdrawn.
20250705	11 Ryecroft Gravesend Kent DA12 4QQ	Erection of two storey side extension with residential annexe at ground floor, conversion of garage into store room and formation of vehicle parking area to side/front.	The Parish Council has to OBJECT to this application, which is considered to constitute over-development of the site. The property is a small, 2.5 bedroom, semi-detached house with an originally detached, now corner link-detached garage, and very little private amenity space remaining after a single-storey rear extension had been constructed. It is located on a corner with open grassed areas. It is unknown what covenants or other restrictions to building on these areas are in place. On-site parking provision is two spaces plus the garage (all tandem). On-street parking in the area is difficult and competitive. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension, subsidiary but almost the same width as the original house, plus matching extension. The garage becomes a “store” (accessible from the outside), purpose not specified, but proposed use should be clarified and perhaps restricted. Two parking tandem spaces are retained by being moved sideways, along with the refuse bins. The house becomes 5-bedroomed, in which case the amount of private amenity space and parking provisions are inadequate. The extension and parking spaces will reduce driver sightlines around the corner of Ryecroft.
20250709	11 Court Lodge Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12	Demolition of garage. Erection of a side/rear two storey extension. Erection of a single storey side	Application Ref 20240570 is noted, which was refused permission by GBC and dismissed at Appeal. This present application has some features in common with the previous application and therefore we still have some concerns (see below). Overall, these amount to OBJECTION to the proposal on the grounds of unsuitability of some aspects of the design:

	3EQ	extension. Changes to fenestration and cladding. Installation of solar panels to rear roof slope.	Submitted plans: • The set of plans on the GBC website do not include an existing front elevation, however this can be found with the previous application. This omission is important as the plan shows the current hanging tiles on the left side of the front elevation. • The existing garage doors (up and over type, not as shown) are drawn as still being there on the proposed front elevation plan however they appear on other plans to be being replaced with windows. Matters of concern: • Removal of hanging tiles and vertical cladding: o The two-storey extension is shown with vertical cladding. This extends across the whole back of the house and also onto both sides and part of the front elevation. This is considered both unnecessarily and inappropriately extensive change, seemingly without a valid structural reason. o Red clay (not slate as stated in the Design and Access Statement) hanging tiles are a standard and valued design feature of properties in the area, which should be respected and included in the design as much as possible. o If truly essential, vertical cladding just on the two-storey extension could be acceptable, subject to approval of details of the materials and colour (preferably light). o Otherwise, the property will again be considerably out of character with the area, Court Lodge being a long cul-de-sac of similar, traditionally designed houses. These are large and well-separated, have pitched tiled roofs, and red clay hanging tiles where present. o The proposed rear view of the property will be visually intrusive to neighbours. • Roofline and first floor windows of the two-storey extension: o Due to the window height and design, the eaves roofline of the two-storey extension is again rising above the eaves height of the existing roof, so looks very dominant. o The new windows on the first floor at the front do not connect suitably with the new roof area. o Dormers as already existing on the right-hand side of the roof at the front would be better structurally and more compatible with the local street scene.
20250779	Broadeaves Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA	Erection of single storey front extension with roof terrace. Erection of front and rear dormers and two storey rear extension. Installation of roof lantern to front elevation. Conversion of garage into habitable room.	There have been two previous applications recently for this property: 20220193 (permitted but may have lapsed) and 20231227 (permitted, it appears that the car port element may have been constructed). The property occupies a large plot in the Green Belt. It is located well back (uphill) on the plot. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to the proposals but has the following comments: Application description: • There does not appear to be a roof lantern proposed at the front but two at the rear. Submitted plans and design: • The two rear extensions with roof lanterns, and the garage conversion, are satisfactory.

			• The rooflight in the new southern bedroom should have a sill height at least 2m above the floor level. • All bathroom windows should be non-openable below 2m above the floor level, and have permanently obscured glazing. • The house will become 6-bedroomed, there is plenty of space on the site for parking. • 4 bedrooms will be sharing one small first-floor bathroom/separate WC • Having a terrace/balcony at the front is not usual however distance and intervening structures should ensure that privacy guidelines to neighbouring properties are met.
20250801	Cape Cottage Manor Field Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3DX	Prior approval application for a single storey rear extension with a depth of 7.243 metres, maximum height of 3.587 metres and eaves height of 2.418 metres.	This is a redesigned application following the refusal of the previous Application Ref 20250450 The new design and appearance are a considerable improvement and the Parish Council has no objections in principle. An aspect of concern however is that the proposed new bathroom has a door to the outside and a fully glazed western wall. The glazing (including the door) will need to be permanently obscured in order to protect privacy of users.
20250773	Orchard House Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Application for a Proposed Lawful Development Certificate: erection of a single storey rear extension.	Previous application ref 20250416 is noted, on which the Parish Council submitted comments, but the application was withdrawn by the applicant before determination. However the similar application Ref 20250806 has been submitted subsequently, and should be considered together with this application as both could be implemented. The existing property has 3 bedrooms and is of modest size for the size of the plot it occupies. The site is located in Thong Conservation Area with listed/heritage buildings on 3 sides, where it stands out presently as being of incongruously modern design. The Parish Council has no objection to this present proposal, which enlarges the property at the rear only, in a compatible manner. Brickwork/rendering: The proposal is to match the existing brickwork but if any rendering should be considered needed, this should be white/off-white. Withdrawal of Permitted Development Rights: In view of the overall size of the total proposed extensions to the building, and the forthcoming Lower Thames Crossing landscaping to the rear, we request that PDR's should be withdrawn for this site.
20250806	Orchard House Thong Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 4AD	Erection of a single storey extension to garage and erection of a first floor extension over the garage.	The Parish Council previously commented on Application Ref 20250416 which was withdrawn before determination, and has also commented on Ref 20250773 (a recent LDC for a rear extension). This present application has some similarities to Ref 20250416, hence our comments are also similar. Welcome changes have been made to reduce the increase in bulk, introducing a barn hip and flat roofed dormers but including two of these at the front of the property. The existing property has 3 bedrooms and is of modest size for the size of the plot it occupies. The proposal will add a first floor master suite in the new extension. There will be enough parking on site to

			serve the enlarged house. The site is located in Thong Conservation Area with listed/heritage buildings to 3 sides, where it stands out presently as being of incongruously modern design. The bulk of the property, easily seen from the roadway, is being increased. The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this proposal but has but has some comments about design and colour scheme: • Glazing: The proposal includes over two-storey height glazing at the front entrance, actually extending above the eaves. This will be visually intrusive among mostly period properties. This feature should be modified – more conventional window at first-floor level could be preferable. • Flat-roofed dormers at the front: It is preferable to avoid having these – the design should be reviewed. The flat-roofed dormer above the over two-storey height glazing at the front increases its adverse visual impact. • Proposed black cladding: The colour of the cladding is a difficult call. The property is currently white clad, and is nearly opposite the Listed, currently white clad White Horse Cottage. However, many other properties in the immediate area are at least presently clad with black. • Brickwork/rendering: The proposal is to retain and match the existing brickwork but if any rendering should be considered needed (for example where windows are being moved/blocked up), this should be white/off-white. • Withdrawal of Permitted Development Rights: In view of the overall size of the total proposed extensions to the building, and the forthcoming Lower Thames Crossing landscaping to the rear, we request that PDR's should be withdrawn for this site.