

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/07/2024 7:04 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Lomas Sole Street Cobham Gravesend Kent DA12 3AX
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 new detached dwellings.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Sole Street Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I have no in-principle objection to the sensitive redevelopment of the existing property at Lomas with a single replacement dwelling, but subdividing the plot and erecting a second dwelling within the rear garden would be inappropriate and contrary to local and national planning policy for the following reasons. Character and appearance Lomas is the northernmost of 4 similarly sized dwellings fronting Sole Street. Its rear garden extends to the rear of Faincroft House and Dromterris and forms an integral part of the corridor of undeveloped garden land to the rear of properties fronting Sole Street. Subdividing the plot and erecting a dwelling within the rear garden would be incongruous and harmful to the distinctive character and appearance, layout and established pattern of the site and surrounding built environment contrary to Policies CS15 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 (LPCS) which requires new development to achieve good design, conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment and integrate well with the local area. The proposed development would also be contrary to para. 135 of the NPPF (2023) which states developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment. Highway safety Currently there is no vehicular access to the rear garden. The proposed site plan shows a narrow access from Sole Street to the rear of the site between two buildings. At 2.3m wide this would be of inadequate width. The Highways Authority note that the intensification of the access requires improvements to pedestrian visibility and raises no objection subject to provision and maintenance of 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays behind the footway on both sides of the access; however the forward location of the adjacent building, the Little Shop, mean it is not possible to comply with this and a condition cannot be applied. Adequate visibility splays are critical owing to the pedestrian footfall, including by
-----------	--

children, accessing the Little Shop. Failure to provide adequate visibility splays would be harmful to pedestrian and highway safety contrary to Policy CS11 (LPCS) which requires new developments to mitigate their impact on the highway and public and paras. 115 and 116 of the NPPF (2023) which states development should be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that development should minimise conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Standard of accommodation

Although the plans are indicative, the proposed block plan shows how subdividing the plot would appear cramped, contrived and visually discordant. The proposals do not provide adequate garden spaces; Plots 1 and 2 would have significantly smaller gardens than the surrounding properties as shown on the sketch perspective. Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 (SPG2) - Residential Layout Guidelines (2020) states that a 3-bedroom dwelling would have a minimum garden area of 60m² and minimum depth of 10m. The proposed site plan shows Plot 1 would fail to provide an adequately sized rear garden or sufficient quality of accommodation for future occupiers contrary to the requirements of SPG2, Policy CS19 (LPCS) and para. 135 of the NPPF (2023) which requires new development to provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers. The proximity and relationship of the proposed vehicular access arrangements would also be harmful to the amenities of future occupiers of Plot 1. These issues are symptomatic of the overdevelopment of the plot.

Impact on neighbour amenity

Erecting a dwelling within the rear garden would be harmful to the amenities of surrounding occupiers. Although in outline, the indicative plans show the front and side elevations of Plot 2 would face directly onto the rear elevation and rear garden of Temperley. Development in the rear garden of Lomas could not be designed to avoid a loss of privacy; Temperley is not currently overlooked and any development in the rear garden of the adjacent plot would result in an unacceptable level of visual intrusion, overlooking and a loss of privacy to the occupants of this property.

The indicative layout also shows the replacement of existing garden land with hardstanding and car parking directly adjacent to the rear garden boundary of Temperley. The proposed development would result in increased noise and disturbance with a harmful and unacceptable impact on the living conditions and amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties, contrary to Policy CS19 (LPCS) and para. 135 of the NPPF which states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users.

The proposed development would fail to comply with the Development Plan and national planning guidance and the application for outline planning permission should therefore be refused.

Kind regards