

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 30/12/2024 2:55 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To 35 Clarence Place Gravesend Kent DA12 1LB
Proposal:	Erection of a 4 storey building comprising of 4no flats.
Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] clarence place gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Existing trees- I note that some despite being described as good condition, and also having a significant impact on the street scape are only being given a category C. With the loss of these trees, suitable sized species should be replaced- With a loss of this number this is a significant number of tree replacements re BNG. Where is this to be applied? The demolition plan does not indicate all those trees that would be removed unless it is accepted that encroachment and reduced ground levels within the tree root protection areas of the retained trees is acceptable (A slow death and poor stability). Unclear how retention can be achieved Re tree G1, T9 and T6 which are all described as good. But positioned on a higher level than that proposed to the front of the development. How is ground level to veterans being retained to west boundary? Current drawing suggests by timber fence? Existing properties along Clarence Place do not include windows to the side elevation- These widows do not associate with the proportion, style of the sash windows of this conservation area. The front door is at the lower level does not relate to the associated properties. Without the context of the elevation of the proposed it is difficult to access weather windows and associated details correspond or align to adjacent properties. The windows are not Georgian sash to match with the conservation area- Proportions look poorly aligned. The front door elevation with full glazing to either side does not relate to the conservation area vernacular. The detail above the door suggests this is a canopy which again does not relate. The panel fence to the fore is out of keeping, all other properties have had to reinstate with vertical bar to match previous grant funded railings. Why is the front garden nominally raised, this does not align with any properties on Clarence Place. The brick on edge coping of the wall to the front does not correspond to top of wall copings as applied along Clarence Place. The exposed buff brick does not associate with properties on Clarence Place
-----------	--

which are London stock or as with the associated properties being rendered.
The buff colour does not relate to the conservation area. The point of the conservation area designation is to enhance.
The width of the property does not reflect the widths of the adjacent properties.
Conclusion- Provides no positive gain as unsympathetic, only adds to incoherence due to proportion and materials.
Also note no planning notice has been put on Clarence Place with regards this application.

Kind regards