

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/05/2025 4:17 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	40 Cross Lane East Gravesend Kent DA12 5HB
Proposal:	Erection of a Single 2-Bedroom Dwelling
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Portland Avenue Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Development on this site has previously being proposed and has been rejected, appealed and again rejected ref 20240680.

The reasons for original rejection remain valid for this further application, despite its very limited alterations. While removing the second floor will lessen the invasion of privacy to neighbouring residents, the remainder of negative impacts also confirmed by the failed appeal attempt are still present.

- Increased load on already stretched local facilities, including parking, traffic etc
- Increased noise pollution during building works and following completion recreational activities will be damaging to local wildlife. No positive contribution to local bio diversity.
- Building is out of character to neighbouring properties both in appearance and direction of facing onto central avenue.
- Spacious family garden of 40 Cross lane will be halved, damaging biodiversity and limiting outdoor space for enjoyment of current and future inhabitants.
- The restricted space to the side and rear of the proposed property would make it appear cramped and would erode the character of the local area.
- Cramped space of new property provides insufficient recreational and amenity space for use of future residents.
- The site is within 6KM of the Thames Estuary and Marshes and Ramsar site, this development would further damage and risk local wildlife.
- The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of current and future occupants of neighbouring properties.

This is not an application for adequate and high quality housing for current and future generations. It does nothing to improve the quality of life of local people and surroundings and does not improves the local area in any way at all. It will also set a dangerous precedence that housing can be crammed into any tiny space as a money making opportunity and cause decline to our town. It is a greedy, selfish and desperate attempt at quick financial gain at the detriment of the surrounding areas, local residents and wildlife.

This application should again be rejected, in line with the original reasons for

Kind regards