

Our ref - [REDACTED]

Your ref -

Date 23 May 2025

Mr Ethan Bonthron
Case Officer
Planning Department
Gravesham Council
Civic Centre,
Windmill St,
Gravesend DA12 1AU

By email only planning.admin@gravesham.gov.uk; Ethan.Bonthron@gravesham.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

**Planning Objection
20250279**

Erection of single storey rear/side extension including conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and erection of single storey outbuilding within rear garden.

Otarawairere Henley Street Luddesdown Gravesend Kent DA13 0XB

We are instructed by [REDACTED] to the application site to the West, who further object to this proposal for the reasons set out below (this letter should be read alongside our client's online comment).

The agent points to a previous certificate for an outbuilding, inferring this is a mere formality now, but obviously the council will see through this. The proposed house extensions will leave no vehicular access to the rear, consequently the building that was certified for purposes incidental to the dwelling house as such (garage) no longer apply. Policy considerations fully apply. No proper explanation has been given for this large outbuilding, nor is there any engagement with the harm to our clients amenities other than denial at 6.18 of the PDA statement.

It is not unreasonable for the council to conclude that the outbuilding plans are misleading. It shows two garage doors when such would be would not be reasonably necessary for the incidental enjoyment of the dwelling in this proposal. Consequently, the council will be reasonable in concluding that it will be used as habitable space of some kind, which has worse implications for our client's amenities than they had indicated in their online objection.

The council cannot conclude that this could safely be governed by condition, there is a real prospect that its use will unacceptably interfere with our clients amenities, made worse by its particularly close proximity, in addition to its height, scale and mass next to the boundary harming their outlook. It is more than likely that noise, disturbance, odours and light pollution generated by its use will lead to significant harm no condition could satisfactorily mitigate.

In terms of green belt assessment, the agent has not included this substantial outbuilding in the calculations. It would be reasonable for the council to add the additional space into the calculations, which might be concluded to result in an unacceptable increase. Consequently, even if the enlargements to the dwelling might on their own be acceptable, the outbuilding renders the proposal unacceptable, overall.

Furthermore, with parking shown on the plans forward of the principal elevation the proposal begs the question, is the true nature of this application ultimately asking the council to sanction back-land housing development in this highly protected place. Is not merely an unsustainable location for a further dwelling, but it is directly contrary to green belt and national landscape policy imperatives set out in the Framework.

The starting point is the development plan, so far as it is up to date and consistent with the Framework. The Framework sets out green belt and national landscape policy, the LPA needs no assistance there, but at paragraph 131 it sets out the current most up-to-date position/policy test on amenity protection. To the extent that the adopted local plan is inconsistent with the Framework, the Framework prevails.

NPPF 2024 sets a high bar. NPPF requires the *creation of high quality beautiful places which is **fundamental** to what the development process should achieve¹*. As explained above, it does not comply. The Framework states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development creating ***better places in which to live to help make development acceptable to communities***. It fails that test. Nowhere else in the Framework does the word “fundamental” arise, nor the word “better”. The development plan, to be consistent with the Framework, requires development to make the place our clients live their lives, **better** – it falls a long way short. Furthermore, the Framework states that development should *create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing users and not undermine the quality of life²*. The non-compliant scheme for the reasons set about above leads one to NPPF para 139 that states development that is not well designed should be refused.

Pursuant to s38(6) PCPA 2004 planning permission must be refused because it is not in accordance with the adopted development plan policy. This is copper bottomed by the development being unsustainable as defined by the Framework.

Yours faithfully

¹ NPPF 131

² NPPF135

