

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/09/2026 9:06 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	44 Coombe Road Gravesend Kent DA12 5PB
Proposal:	Demolition of existing rear conservatories. Erection of a single-storey rear extension.
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Coombe Road Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Please add to my existing objection.

The developers have now submitted new plans for a 6 bed HMO.

Since reviewing the newly submitted floor plan, I can see that they are still inaccurate. They show the dormer roof as below the apex of the existing house roof. This is not the case. It is clearly visible that the dormer is larger than stated and exceeding the height of the existing roof, and therefore requires full planning permission as this does not fall within permitted development.

Will the council ensure that a planning application is submitted for the loft conversion?

Given this is retrospective planning, I would still like to know what action will be taken against the developers for wilfully submitting fraudulent documents for this planning application in the first instance, and now again regarding the loft conversation/dormer extension.

Regarding document 'Guidance for HMO Amenity Standards', I have concerns relating to the following:

2. Minimum bedroom size requirements

iv) In HMOs without a shared living space, additional shared dining space is

required close to a shared kitchen that is no more than 1 floor distance from any letting room it serves.

2.2 Communal Living and Dining Rooms

The property arrangement is to provide communal living space in addition to any space that is required for shared kitchen and dining facilities.

As a guide, a communal living room, should be at least 13m² for 3 people, plus 1m² for every additional person.

For example: a communal living space for 5 occupants should achieve 15m².

If dining facilities are combined with the living room, the room should be at least 14m² for 3 people, plus 1m² for every additional person.

For example: a combined living & dining room for 5 occupants should achieve 16m².

Where there are no communal living space provision bedrooms are to achieve at least 10m² for single occupancy.

2.3 Communal Outdoor Space

Where the proposed property benefits from a rear garden, all occupants must have direct, unrestricted access to it from within the internal communal area, therefore, access routes must not infringe upon the privacy of individual letting rooms.

The Local Authority prohibits the use of any front curtilage of the premises by any occupants and visitors for use other than entering and exiting the premises (excluding maintenance activities). This action is reasonable and practicable in steps to prevent or reduce anti-social behaviour by persons occupying or visiting the house.

-The house has no living or dining room and a number of bedrooms are under 10m².

-The garden is only accessible via bedrooms 2 and 3. Four residents do not have access to the garden. Does this not also pose a fire/health and safety risk?

-Tenants are using the front curtilage and public path to smoke as they don't seem to occupy the bedrooms that have access to the rear garden. Multiple people smoking at the same time is of course social and accompanied by loud conversations which are already proving disruptive and making people feel uncomfortable. The smoke can also be smelt outside our front door which is really unpleasant and not something we should have to endure. We are not immediate neighbours, so this is likely affecting a number of properties. Access to the rear garden for all residents is an amenity standard that must be achieved or I feel noise/public nuisance complaints are inevitable.

I question where refuse for 6 people will be stored. There's not space for multi bins in the front garden and only 1/3 of residents have access to the back garden to potentially store excess there until bin day. It seems fair to assume 6 adults will generate more waste than can be collected on the current schedule, so foxes and potential smells relating to this are a concern.

I seriously question how suitable an HMO of this size is for Coombe road in general but also it's tenants. Shouldn't there be less bedrooms to allow garden access for all and a living/dining area? It would reduce the inevitable refuse and parking issues also, given there would be less occupants.

I assume they do not have a license to operate yet as a number of HMO Amenity

standards have not been met based on the most recent plans submitted to the council, yet multiple people are living there.

Overlooking is severe due to both extensions and it's making people feel uncomfortable when in their gardens and for some, houses. There's only so much people can do to protect their privacy with a 6ft fence and plants when the extensions are of this scale and incredibly imposing for this area. Self-imposed measure costs money that people often don't really have and plants are not reliable or permanent and can't be considered an adequate solution to the problem.

Please consider the existing residents when reviewing this application (which should include the loft extension). The councils decision regarding the extensions will greatly affect the future impact the HMO has on us all.

Kind regards