

Shorne Parish Council

————— Borough of Gravesend —————

Clerk & Responsible Officer
Mrs S Poole
Shorne Village Hall
The Street
Shorne
Nr Gravesend
Kent DA12 3EA



E-mail: clerk@shorneparishcouncil.org

4th December 2023

Application ref 20231171

Chalk Pit Cottages Green Farm Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent

Erection of a new dwellinghouse.

This is a re-application of previously refused Ref 20230438.

The Parish Council has to again **OBJECT** to this proposal, for the following reasons which are significant concerns:

1. New dwelling in the Green Belt: The proposal is for a new dwelling in the Green Belt, which is by definition harmful, and not permitted except in “very special circumstances”, which have not been demonstrated with valid reasons.
2. Negative visual impact: The proposal would have negative impact on openness and the street scene due to being an incongruous, out-of-character design (large detached house) of greater bulk than usual in the immediate area.
3. Not infilling as outside of settlement boundary: The site is outside the boundary of the settlement of Lower Shorne so cannot be described as “infilling”. The open space between the two rows of cottages is very wide, such separation between rows of cottages is a feature of the area. And a new house would create an undesirable continuous ribbon of development.
4. Similar circumstances to other applications that have been refused and dismissed at Appeal: The situation is similar to the Land next to The See-Ho Public House where applications have been refused and Appeals dismissed.
5. Possible unsuitability of the land for building: The piece of land has not been built on previously in part because it is the site of a former chalkpit that was subsequently used for landfill, so it is made ground. Local residents state that large hollow items have been buried there and that they believe that the surface level is still sinking.
6. Lack of previous development/Brownfield classification: The site has not previously or currently been the site of a residential or commercial building, hence it is not a brownfield site.

7. Not a self-build site: Although the Applicant tries to claim that it would be a self-build site, the site was not marketed and purchased with outline planning permission for a self-build house or previously identified as a development site.
8. Biodiversity gain: Reference is made to providing biodiversity gain however we note that the site was bulldozed soon after purchase, which would have had a very detrimental effect on existing biodiversity. Any surveys done subsequently will not represent the site as it was prior to the Applicant's ownership. The potential gains discussed may not be achievable, and in part seem tokenistic (single bat box in a location likely to be subject to disturbance). In the unlikely situation of permission, parking should be strictly confined to the area shown and not encroach on the verge.
9. Pre-app discussion: We note that the applicant had pre-app discussion with GBC (there has not been any discussion requested with the Parish Council). We have not seen the advice given but it is stated in the documentation that GBC indicated that a planning application would not be supported.
10. Current compared to previous plans: There have been very minor changes made but these do not amount to any material difference from the previously refused proposal.

The application does not show any significant differences from the previous proposal. We support the previous refusal and would expect this application to be refused for all the same reasons, some of which are inherent to the site and location.