



JEREMY S. ISHERWOOD

B.Sc. (hons.), B. Arch. (Wales), R.I.B.A.

Chartered Architect

34 Chalky Bank

Gravesend, Kent, DA11 7NY

Telephone / Fax: 01474 - 533793

16 August 2023

My Ref: 543

"Sunnyside", Valley Drive, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 5UE:

Dr S & Mr Chaudhry Ahmad

Planning Statement

This is a planning statement to form part of a Householder planning application for the retention of the recently erected front boundary wall at the above site, together with associated railings and two sliding gates.

I understand that this work was carried out about 9 months ago.

I was initially contacted about this matter on 19 July 2023 to prepare a retrospective planning submission for the retention of the work. My clients found my details from drawings for "Sunnyside" dating back to 2002/2003 which were handed to them by their solicitor.

My clients received a letter from Gravesham Borough Council Planning Enforcement dated 18 May 2023 [REDACTED] The enforcement team had received an enquiry about the walls and gates that had been erected, which may have required planning approval.

Following a visit to the premises by the Council's Enforcement Officer on 14 June 2023, my clients were advised that planning approval was indeed required for the new work, because the scope was outside the confines of Permitted Development allowances. They were further advised to urgently submit a retrospective planning application for the retention of

the work by 14 July 2023 to avoid the possibility of enforcement proceedings taking place or the removal of the unauthorised work.

The Site

“Sunnyside” is a detached property on the east side of Valley Drive at its southern end and near the junction with the A2 trunk road. The site has an area of 0.15 ha (0.38 acre). It slopes steeply across the street frontage from a high point at the south end to a low point at the north end. The amount of drop across the site is about 1.73 metres.

Planning History

My client’s property was substantially rebuilt and extended to my designs for a previous client under planning approval reference GR/20020352, dated 24 June 2002. A further planning approval was granted to the same client for the retention of a front boundary wall which had been built without permission, with pillars varying in height from 1040 to 1048mm, under reference GR/20030159, dated 28 April 2003. My drawing number 248/PL06 was prepared for that submission. This drawing actually shows the garden wall and piers with varying heights ranging from 1040mm to 1448mm, plus a further 293mm for precast concrete ball cappings. A different coping design was actually put on the piers and this is similar to the replacement design which now exists.

Background

My clients purchased this property in 2021.

The existing front boundary wall had piers tight up to the existing crossovers and there were no 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays (*figure 1*).



Figure 1: Front boundary wall as built in 2003.

They wished to renew the front boundary wall and to add gates and railings for security purposes. What they have built is similar in design to the front boundary wall and railings of the immediately adjoining property to the south, known as “Woodside” (*figure 2*). The new gate piers are in similar positions to those of the previous boundary wall. My clients unfortunately, did not realise that this work required planning permission and they sincerely regret this unfortunate and unintentional mistake on their part.



Figure 2: Street elevation showing existing boundary wall to “Woodside” (right) and new boundary wall to “Sunnyside” (left).

The front boundary treatment now incorporates two sliding gates at each end of the site, where there are pre-existing vehicle crossovers (*figure 3*). The opening width between gate posts for both openings is 4 metres.



Figure 3: Street elevation showing the replacement front boundary wall with sliding gates and railings. Gates are shown in the closed position.

The sliding gates are electronically operated and each slide towards each other behind the central front boundary wall (*figure 4*).

Each of the gates has been specially manufactured to take account of the sloping nature of the site.



Figure 4: Street elevation showing the replacement front boundary wall with sliding gates and railings. Gates are shown in the open position.

When fully open, the gates clear the 4 metre wide openings.

My clients have suggested that they would be happy for a planning condition to be attached to a retrospective planning permission requiring the gates to be kept in a permanently open position when cars are entering and exiting the site and to only be closed when such activity has ceased, for example, when my clients are in bed asleep. They would argue that, with this solution, the access to and from the site would be no different in visibility and site safety terms, from that which existed prior to the construction of the replacement boundary wall, gates and railings.

The boundary treatment has been constructed with materials of a high quality, which are similar to those used on neighbouring properties.

For all the above reasons, I respectfully request therefore, that Permission is granted for this application.

**Jeremy S Isherwood BSc (hons), BArch (Wales), RIBA
Chartered Architect
RIBA Chartered Practice**

