

SHORNE PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Planning & Highways Committee
Meeting held on 16 October 2014 in Shorne Village Hall**

PRESENT Mr R Theobald (Chairman)
Mr J Bugg
Mr D Hart

**ALSO IN
ATTENDANCE** Mr R Dinnis

APOLOGIES for absence were received from Mr M Brett and Mr Cooper

41 Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 August 2014

The minutes were AGREED as a true record.

**42 PLANNING MATTERS
Planning Applications**

The Borough Council had given notice of three applications for planning permission affecting the Parish and it was resolved that the following observations and representations be made:-

GR/2014/752
Mrs Sue Sanger

Erection of a single storey side and rear extension to the existing garage. 3 Gazelle Glade, Shorne West, Kent.

The Council wishes make the following representations:-

The Council would request that conditions are imposed to restrict the use of the building to that of a mortar garage ancillary to the main dwelling.

GR/2014/880
Mr & Mrs R James

Erection of part two storey and part first floor front extension to form entrance porch at ground floor level with enlarged bedroom and dressing room at first floor level. 34 Calderwood, Shorne West, Kent.

The Council wishes make the following representations:-

The Council considers the design would be improved if the roof pitches were combined with a higher ridge.

GR/2014/892
Mr Gill Singh

Construction of a dormer extension in the rear roof slope and a dormer window in the front roof slope involving an increase in the height of the roof to provide two bedrooms and ensuites in the roof space. 12 Crown Green, Shorne, Kent.

The Council wishes to register an OBJECTION to the application on the following grounds:-

- (a) The Council considers the rear dormer to be excessively large and out of proportion with the property. The roof of the dormer is considered to be too high in relation to the ridge of the main roof and too close to the ends of the property.
- (b) The Council considers the construction of a single large flat roofed dormer to be a poor design out character with the area.
- (c) If permitted, the application would set a precedent to permitting similar ill-conceived developments.

**43 Report of Action taken under Standing Order 4(a)(ii)
Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with by the
Chairman in Consultation with Members**

GR/2014/473
Mrs Helen Ansell

Erection of two storey side extension to form kitchen and utility room with bedroom over. Westwood Farm, Thong Lane, Shorne, Kent

NO OBJECTION

GR/2014/581
Mr Paul Mitchell

Installation of extractor fan with ventilation grille. St Katherines, Forge Lane, Shorne, Kent.

NO OBJECTION

GR/2014/777
Mr D South

Demolition of existing detached double garage and erection of a detached triple garage. The Old Parsonage, Butchers Hill, Shorne, Kent

The Council wishes make the following representations.

The Council has NO OBJECTION to the application but comments as follows:-

- (a) The submitted plans are inaccurate in that the land indicated as being in the ownership of the applicant and the boundary of the planning unit include land which is in the ownership of the Parish Council. As a result of this error the Council has not been served with the relevant statutory notices as the owner of land affected by the application.
- (b) The access to the new garage crosses land in the ownership of the Parish Council and the Council would wish to approve the alignment and construction of the access. The application documents essentially deal with the construction of the new building.
- (c) Noting that it is proposed to demolish the existing garage the Parish Council would be interested in the proposed boundary treatment after the existing Garage is removed.

GR/2014/778
Mr D South

Application for Listed Building Consent for the demolition of existing detached double garage and erection of a detached triple garage. The Old Parsonage, Butchers Hill, Shorne, Kent.

The Council wishes make the following representations.

The Council has NO OBJECTION to the application but comments as follows:-

- (a) The submitted plans are inaccurate in that the land indicated as being in the ownership of the applicant and the boundary of the planning unit include land which is in the ownership of the

Parish Council. As a result of this error the Council has not been served with the relevant statutory notices as the owner of land affected by the application.

- (b) The access to the new garage crosses land in the ownership of the Parish Council and the Council would wish to approve the alignment and construction of the access. The application documents essentially deal with the construction of the new building.
- (c) Noting that it is proposed to demolish the existing garage the Parish Council would be interested in the proposed boundary treatment after the existing Garage is removed.

GR/2014/809
Mrs Allison Franks

Erection of a detached three bedroom bungalow fronting Racefield Close with dormer windows in the front and rear roof slopes and rooms in the roof space. Land adjacent to 1 Park Cottages, Tanyard Hill, Shorne, Kent.

The Council wishes to make the following representations:-

- (a) The Council notes this application is similar to that for a two bedroom bungalow to which the Council objected was granted consent under reference GR/2012/0179.
- (b) The Council notes the current application for a 3 bedroom dwelling with rooms in the roof rather than a two bedroom Bungalow i.e. it has habitable rooms on two levels.
- (c) The Council further notes that envelope size of the building has not been materially increased and the Council does not wish to register an objection to the application but would seek modifications to the application as follows.
 - (i) The Council would seek the relocation of the building setting it back further from the Racefield Close frontage. Whilst the hedge is an indistinct boundary it appears the porch is abutting the hedge only a metre from the rear of the footway and it is the Council's view that the building should be set back a metre from

the location shown on drawing CGC/14/01.

This is as far as possible to maintain the open aspect of the area.

- (ii) The Council would also request that the floor level should be set no higher than shown on the submitted plans.

This is as far as possible to maintain the open aspect of the area.

GR/2014/811
Miss Rebecca Slack

Construction of new roof over existing garage incorporating an increase in the height of the of the building, two dormer windows in the front roof slope and a Juliet balcony on the north-west side elevation to provide for gym, games room and wc/changing facilities in the proposed roof space. Shorne Mead, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne, Kent.

The Council wishes to make the following representations:-

- (a) The Council has NO OBJECTION to the application.

The Council notes the site is in an area within which Green Belt policies apply and would request that conditions are imposed to ensure that the building remains ancillary to the main dwelling and cannot be converted to residential use

GR/2014/816
Mr Richard Springhall

Erection of rear extension and a front porch. 6 Wykeham Close, Shorne West, Kent.

The Council wishes make the following representations.

The Council wishes to register an OBJECTION to the application on the following grounds:-

- (a) The Council considers the rear extension to be too large. Occupying the full width of the property and extending some 4m from the rear of the property taking up almost half of a relatively small garden.
- (b) Whilst it is only a single storey extension,

the depth proposed is likely to adversely affect the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

- (c) The Council considers the front porch to be too large extending 1.68m beyond the garage which already projects beyond the main wall of the property. In the Council's view the porch would look incongruous projecting from the front of the property.

GR/2014/840
Mr Jamie Cassidy

Erection of two storey rear extension to form enlarged lounge with bedroom and enlarged bedroom and ensuite over and first floor front extension to form a bedroom and ensuite. 9 Calderwood, Shorne West, Kent.

The Council wishes make the following representations:-

- (a) The Council has NO OBJECTION to the front extension.
- (b) The Council is concerned at the size and bulk of the rear extension being two storeyed and the full width of the property and consider it is and is likely to have an adverse effect on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.
- (c) The Council notes that the introduction of new windows on the west elevation could result in overlooking.

GR/2014/843
Mrs Emma Mitchell

Alterations to existing driveway involving an increase in the width of the crossover onto the highway and alterations to the front wall and gate. Crown Cottage, Gravesend Road, Shorne, Kent.

The Council wishes make the following representations;

- (a) The Council has NO OBJECTION to the application

The Council notes there is an existing wall and gates being replaced.

44 Decisions of the Borough Council

- (a) GR/2014/581- St Katherines, Forge Lane - PERMITTED
- (b) GR/2014/593 - The Maples, Green Farm Lane - PERMITTED
- (c) GR/2014/605 - 4 Gabriel Gardens - PERMITTED
- (d) GR/2014/606 - 34 Calderwood - PERMITTED
- (e) GR/2014/679 - Shamrock, Gravesend Road - PERMITTED
- (f) GR/2014/691- Maynor, Green Farm Lane - PERMITTED
- (g) GR/2014/701 - Orchard Lea Farm, Shorne Ifield Road - PERMITTED
- (h) GR/2014/705 - Lark Rise, Pondfield Lane - PERMITTED
- (i) GR/2014/711 - 56 Marling Way - PERMITTED
- (j) GR/2014/811 - Shorne Mead, Pear Tree Lane - PERMITTED

45 Notices of Appeal

There were no Notices of Appeal.

46 Lower Thames Crossing (34)

It is understood the development of the crossing has been passed from the Department of Transport to the Highway Agency. It is not clear what the implications of this is but it is understood that the Agency is likely carry out further work.

47 Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (formerly the LDF) (13)

Mr Theobald reported at the last Council meeting that the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy is to be presented to the Borough Council at its meeting on 30th September 2014 for formal adoption. The Plan has been amended in accordance with the Government Inspector's directions. There will be a period of six weeks from the adoption of the Plan during which it will be open to legal challenge.

Following adoption, the Borough Council can start to consider developing some of the areas of policy including development control, based on the Core Strategy. The Green Belt review required under the plan is unlikely to commence until after Borough Council election in May 2015.

48 Airport Strategy (36)

A further report is expected from the Airports Commission considering only the Heathrow and Gatwick options.

49 Warren Farm

Mr Theobald reported that he had heard that permission had been granted for a nursery at Warren Farm though this has not happened. He reported further that there had been an application for a 100ft long barn. This would be a large development on a small plot.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

50 Accident Reports

One accident reported on 23 September 2014 in Forge Lane. Mr Theobald reported that as part of the Works the “cats eyes” were removed and the original white lining was covered. In the centre of the carriageway white lining has now been reinstated except for a relatively short section approaching the bend south of Shorne Crossroads and on the bend itself where there is no white lining

In this section of Forge Lane, the width of the carriageway appears to have been reduced by the bank encroaching onto the carriageway. It was agreed to write to Kent Highways advising them that Forge Lane is a bus route and requesting that the bank is cut back to reinstate the minimum width of carriageway so that the white lining can be reinstated.

51 The Ridgeway - Footway Extension (38)

Mr Theobald had now identified the drawing giving details of the County Council’s Land ownership. He will produce a report.

52 Condition of Roads in the Parish (39)

It was noted that the works was have been completed.

53 Matters Raised by Members

- (a) Two letters have been received from David Hughes, the Chief Executive at the Borough Council in reply to the Parish Council’s letter with regard to the landscaping strip off Michael Gardens. In his first letter, he advises that a joint inspection by planning and property officers has confirmed that an adjoining owner to the site, has, with permission from the Borough Council, removed the fence between the garden and the amenity area and erected a large marquee. This is being pursued with the owner by planning officers.

In his second letter, he advises that the Michael Gardens residential development was permitted in 1992 with a s52 agreement which required the developer to maintain the landscaped and play area for 2 years before it was handed over to the Borough Council. The planning condition which required maintenance of the landscaped strip expired in 2002. However, alterations such as removing the boundary fence and inclusion of the landscaping strip within an adjoining owner’s garden would require planning permission for change of use. There is also a restrictive covenant on the land in favour of the original developer restricting the use of the land to open space or amenity area for a period of 80 years. The Senior Planning Enforcement Officer does not consider there to be a breach of planning control at the present time.

As referred to in Mr Miller's letter to the Parish Council of 27 January 2012, the Borough Council did seek advice from the Kent Wildlife Trust on biodiversity issues relating to the land's ongoing management and upkeep. In summary the advice received was "the habitat is not likely to be of great biodiversity value especially considering the close mown amenity grassland adjacent".

Whilst the Borough Council will seek to ensure that adjoining residents comply with planning controls and the restrictive covenant on the land, it does not have the resources (staff or financial) to pursue enforcement/re-establishment of the shelter belt in its original form. As such, the Borough Council considers that working with adjacent residents on a licence basis is the most pragmatic solution as the Borough Council retains a degree of control for minimum expenditure. This also helps with the potential 'conflict' between the 'Michael Gardens' residents some of whom are concerned with the lack of daylight into their gardens/houses because of the landscaping strip and the 'Riverview Park' residents who like the fact that the landscaping strip screens the newer development from view.

He just concludes that he appreciates that this is not the response the Parish Council was seeking but the Borough Council's resources are finite and reducing. There is also the issue of the restricted access to the site for maintenance purposes. However, if the Parish Council has any proposals for the future management of the land which does not involve the Borough Council in additional resources, then he would be pleased to consider them.

- (b) With regard to Marling Way, Mr Hart reported that the noise and vibrations from lorries are still a problem to residents and he felt that the wrong consultation was applied in the traffic calming.
- (c) Mr Theobald reported that he had a telephone call from a resident in Green Farm Lane who advised that the drain overflows and runs into their front gardens damaging their property. This is to be further investigated.
- (d) Mr Hart reported that the flooding in Marling Way to properties on the west side of the road was due to the soakaways and not the drains. He will provide photographs of this.
- (e) Mr Hart reported that about a week and a half ago, a fire hydrant cover broke in Marling Way. He contacted KCC and GBC. It was eventually repaired by Southern Water. The Fire Brigade contacted him to say that the matter should have been reported to them who would then pass the matter onto the Water Authority.
- (f) Mr Dinnis reported that he would be attending the Highways and Transport Seminar on 17 November 2014. He will raise the an item about clarification of the position of flooding on roads where there is no drainage.

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