

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/12/2025 8:53 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	7 The Turnstones Gravesend Kent DA12 5QD
Proposal:	Application for a Proposed Lawful Development Certificate; Change of use from C3(a) dwellinghouse to C3(b) young people's care home.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED]

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	To Whom It May Concern, We write to formally and unequivocally object to the proposed change of use of the property at [property address] from a private family dwelling to a care home for children aged 8-18 years. This proposal is wholly inappropriate for our road and must be refused on the following substantial and material grounds. 1. Breach of Existing Covenants and Planning Intent The proposal is in direct contradiction of the written covenants governing this road, which explicitly restrict properties to use as private family homes. These covenants were established to preserve the residential character, safety, and amenity of the area. Allowing this change would undermine those protections and set a dangerous precedent for further inappropriate developments. 2. Unsuitable and Unsafe Road Layout (Cul-de-Sac) Our road is a cul-de-sac with no alternative exit routes. This presents a serious safety risk, particularly in emergency situations. Increased vehicle movements associated with staff, visitors, deliveries, and emergency services would significantly compromise access and egress, creating congestion and delays in a confined space not designed for such use. 3. Serious Risk to Children Due to Lack of Pavements
-----------	--

The road has no pavements. Residents' children currently rely on the low traffic nature of the street for safety. The introduction of a care home would lead to a marked increase in vehicular traffic, placing young children at unacceptable risk. This alone should be considered sufficient grounds for refusal.

4. Increased Traffic Near a School

The property is situated close to a school, where traffic safety is already a concern during peak hours. The additional traffic generated by a care facility-including shift changes and service vehicles-would exacerbate existing risks and directly threaten pedestrian safety, particularly for schoolchildren.

5. Building Not Fit for Purpose

The property was designed and built as a single-family home. It is not purpose-built for use as a care facility and cannot safely or appropriately accommodate the operational, safeguarding, and supervision requirements such a setting demands. Retrofitting does not resolve fundamental design shortcomings.

6. Impact on Vulnerable Residents

The proposed use poses safety and welfare concerns not only for the children housed within the facility but also for existing residents of the street, including elderly and young residents. The increase in noise, traffic, activity, and operational disruption is incompatible with a quiet residential cul-de-sac.

7. Loss of Residential Amenity

This proposal would fundamentally alter the character of the road, resulting in loss of privacy, peace, and enjoyment of our homes. The planning system exists to protect established communities from precisely this kind of unsuitable development.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above-namely covenant breaches, severe safety risks, unsuitable infrastructure, increased traffic dangers, and incompatibility with the residential character of the area-we strongly urge the planning authority to reject this application in full.

This proposal is neither safe, appropriate, nor lawful within the context of our road and should not be permitted under any circumstances.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

Kind regards