

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 20/04/2026 12:10 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To 35 Clarence Place Gravesend Kent DA12 1LB
Proposal:	Erection of a 3 storey building to form 3 flats.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Clarence Place Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

APPLICATION 20260321 - LAND ADJACENT TO 35 CLARENCE PLACE

I would like to object to this application.

My objection reflects a recent appeal decision Ref: APP/K2230/W/25/3368863, dated 24 October 2025 which refused a similar application on the same site. Central to this refusal was the consideration as to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Windmill Hill Conservation Area a designated heritage asset. Please find below my comments which I have supplemented with the Planning Inspector's comments, where relevant, which, as mentioned above, were made in relation to a previous application on the same site which was refused on appeal.

- I do not believe that the proposed development is in keeping with its immediate surroundings. The inspector comments on the position of this proposed development in relation to the properties immediately adjacent to the site "Given that both pairs of villas make a positive contribution to the conservation area the unbalancing of them by the addition of single dwelling will not make a positive contribution"
- The fact that this development will be a modern structure adjacent to dwellings built C1835 can only be construed as having a negative impact on the current conservation area where no recent buildings have been added.
- I note that there is a newly proposed reduction in height but do not consider this to be of any significance when considered in relation to the Planning Inspector's overall comments.
- There is nothing in this new proposal that mitigates the objections set out above by the inspector when he refused the previous proposal on this site.
- The side wall proposed in this application is a significant issue as it will not

blend with the surroundings.

- The proposed development is out of keeping with the wider context of the conservation area as a whole. The Inspector had already addressed attempts to try to copy from the adjacent villas which are pertinent to this new development proposal "The replication of some historic features which are common in the conservation area such as the bay windows and the lower side projections, would not overcome my concerns about the overall proposed design. "

- It should be noted that the application site is one of few spacious green spaces on the south side of Clarence Place. The Inspector notes that these make a positive contribution to the conservation area as does the Conservation Area Appraisal. "The open landscaped grounds around the Veteran's Club, including the appeal site, contributes to the pleasant verdant open and spacious character of the conservation area"

This green space is widely utilised by both the local and wider community. Its loss would have a negative impact on opportunities for socialisation within the community and ultimately have a detrimental impact on well-being.

Indeed the Inspector recognises the positive contribution the undeveloped site makes to the conservation area. The loss of this space can only be considered as having a negative impact.

- The new building would result in an unbroken line of buildings. The tiny remaining gap would remove views of the hill beyond. The Inspector is clear that "the provision of a building on part of the open and undeveloped space which provides a break in built form between 35 Clarence Place and the Veteran's Club would harmfully erode the open, verdant and spacious character of this part of the conservation area"

In addition it would have a negative impact on the adjacent buildings in terms of loss of greenery and openness which is enjoyed at the moment.

- The excavation of a large amount of soil from the front of the site would likely result in significant damage to the remaining tree in the immediate vicinity.

- This application is essentially similar to the previous application about which the Inspector concluded: "I find that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area"

- There is nothing in this application that counters the significant objections set out by the Planning Inspector in October 2025 and his conclusion that "Taking into consideration the great weight that should be given to the heritage assets conservation, the public benefits are limited and do not outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of the heritage asset. As such, clear and convincing justification for this harm has not been identified."

I firmly believe that there will be significant harm caused to the conservation area by the construction of the building outlined in this proposal and that there is no justification in allowing this harm to occur. Indeed, the applicant has not attempted to mitigate this harm in any way.

Kind regards