

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 14/03/2025 1:54 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Milton Place Car Park Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Construction of 76 dwellings and associated infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Milton Place Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I wish to formally object to planning application 20250167. My objection pertains to several issues including relocation of the car park entrance from Ordnance Road to Milton Place, the loss of green recreation space and the inappropriate scale and design of the development. Firstly, the application fails to adequately address or justify the relocation of the site access. During the planning consultation, it was disclosed that this decision was made for financial reasons as the owners of a strip of land from Ordnance Road wanted too high a price. The view of the developer was that the subsequent negative impact on Milton Place residents was an unfortunate consequence that should be dismissed in favour of profits. The relocation of the car park entrance will significantly reduce the number of resident parking spaces, which are already insufficient. There are no adjacent alternatives available for this parking zone (residents permits are not valid in the adjacent car park), exacerbating the existing parking challenges faced by residents. This has not been adequately addressed in the proposal. Moreover, moving the entrance will substantially increase traffic flow along Milton Place, a road that currently experiences relatively low traffic movements. This increase in traffic will have several adverse effects on the residents of Milton Place, particularly given the conservation area restrictions that mandate single glazing for windows. The consequences include increased noise levels, worsening air quality and increased vibrations (window rattle) as vehicles pass. All issues are exacerbated by the very close proximity of the property frontages to the road (in some cases only the width of the pavement away). All issues are avoidable by maintaining the existing access from Ordnance Road they should therefore be considered unacceptable impacts. Overall, the proposal represents an overdevelopment given the scale of the site. This overdevelopment results in the needless encroachment onto valuable recreational green space, which should be protected and enhanced (not sacrificed) in a town centre location. The loss of this green space is detrimental to the community and the environment and, once lost, will never be regained. Furthermore, the proposal will lead to a reduction in car parking spaces in the Milton Place car park. This loss of parking spaces will further strain the already limited parking availability in the area, causing inconvenience to residents and
-----------	---

will deter visitors.

All of the objections mentioned above were raised both in person and online during the public consultation. However, none of these points appear to have been included, considered, or addressed in the application. It seems that only comments supporting the application or comments beneficial to illustrate design changes have been highlighted. Some comments also appear to have been misleadingly conflated to more easily dismiss them, for example, conflating wider concerns over a general loss of recreational green space with misunderstandings over the loss of the skate park or, concerns over loss of residents parking with reduction in public car park size.

The only noticeable design change since the consultation appears to be to make the architecture even less contextually sensitive and more 'generic new build' in style and to increase the size, 'boxiness' and dominance of the block of flats proposed. The block of flats is architecturally appalling and objectively worse than the previous proposal (which was already bad). The scale of the proposed block of flats is completely inappropriate for the area and would be hugely detrimental to the aesthetic of the conservation area. The justification of a residential block this size because 'there used to be a church of a similar height on the plot' is clearly laughable. It would dominate the road and overlook the resident's properties opposite, negatively impacting their privacy and the overall character of the neighbourhood.

It was also concerning to hear reports that, at the public consultation, a local councillor openly expressed a desire for this development to proceed because they "wanted to have a good relationship with this developer." This raises serious concerns about the motivations of our elected public officials and their ability to appropriately represent the wishes of the local community when considering such applications.

An appropriately scaled and contextually sensitive development on the disused BT car park would be welcomed. However, this should not present an opportunity for profiteering by a developer at the expense of residents and green space. The proposal should be rejected, and a more appropriately scaled development put forward.

Considering these points, I urge the planning committee to reject the application in its current form. The proposed changes will have a detrimental impact on the quality of life for local residents and are not justified by the applicant.

Kind regards