

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/09/2025 6:00 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	96 Beaumont Drive Northfleet Gravesend Kent DA11 9NW
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage. Erection of two-storey end of terrace dwelling and associated works.
Case Officer:	Mrs Kelly Joyce

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Beaumont Drive Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I wish to object to this proposal on a number of points. The proposal would significantly worsen parking pressures in the area. On-street parking is severely constrained; trades vehicles in addition to residents' vehicles frequently occupy spaces, and residents sometimes have to ask to use private driveways. The suggestion of using rear access via the alleyway between nos. 72 and 74 is not feasible, as the alley is blocked by a concrete slab partway down, preventing vehicular access. The development would therefore force more cars onto the street, with a risk of obstruction and unsafe parking, including on pavements. This conflicts with Saved Policy P3 Vehicle Parking Standards (Gravesham Local Plan First Review) and Policy CS11: Transport of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy, both of which require new development to provide adequate off-street parking and avoid adding undue pressure to the highway network. The proposed dwelling is also out of character with the surrounding built environment. The street is composed of three-bedroom houses of consistent scale, massing, and appearance. Introducing a two-bedroom dwelling of a different architectural style would disrupt the uniformity and overall character of the area. Such inconsistency constitutes overdevelopment, harming the appearance, amenity, and sense of place of the street. This is in conflict with Policy CS19: Development and Design Principles, which expects new development to be of high quality, to respect local character, and to comply with the Design for Gravesham Design Code SPD and the Residential Layout Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG2). In addition, the proposal fails to safeguard residential amenity. Aspects such as daylight, privacy, and outlook for both existing and future occupants would be adversely affected. The Local Plan Core Strategy under Policy CS19 requires new development to preserve the amenity of neighbouring properties, ensuring appropriate standards. The Residential Layout Guidelines SPG2 also sets out important standards for spacing, privacy distances and layout to protect the quality of life for residents, and this scheme falls short of those requirements.
-----------	---

Finally, I am concerned that the consultation process has not been carried out properly. The council's procedures require adequate notification of all properties materially affected by a proposal. In this case, the alleyway and access arrangements would directly impact more than just the few properties immediately adjacent, yet those others have not been properly notified. Furthermore, while I have seen a photograph of a site notice, I did not see one displayed near my property in recent weeks. This inadequate notification undermines the ability of neighbours to engage with the application in a fair and timely manner.

In conclusion, the proposal conflicts with Gravesham's adopted policies, specifically CS11 (Transport), CS19 (Development and Design Principles), Saved Policy P3 (Vehicle Parking Standards), the Residential Layout Guidelines SPG2 and the Design Code SPD. For these reasons, and given its similarity to the previously refused proposal at 112 Beaumont Drive, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards