

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/02/2026 4:06 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Altamirano Sole Street Cobham Gravesend Kent DA12 3AX
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved bar access for the erection of a bungalow to the rear of Altamirano.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] sole street cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Assessment of Access Constraints and Regulatory Non Compliance 1. Incongruous Backland/Infill Development and Overdevelopment of the Site The principle of introducing a new dwelling in a backland/infill position would result in an incongruous, cramped, and inappropriate form of development. The rear dwelling, due to its siting, massing, and relationship with surrounding properties, would constitute overdevelopment and fail to respect the established pattern of spacious, well proportioned residential plots characteristic of this part of Cobham. The proposal would not integrate into its surroundings nor enhance the quality of the area. Instead, it would erode the prevailing character defined by generous gardens, clear building lines, and a coherent layout. This is contrary to: - Policies CS14, CS15, and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), which require high quality design, respect for local character, and development that contributes positively to the built environment. - Paragraphs 128, 129, 131, and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), which emphasise context responsive design, avoidance of overdevelopment, and the need for proposals to enhance rather than diminish local character. 2. Harm to Residential Amenity The siting and layout of the proposed rear dwelling would have a detrimental impact on both existing and future occupiers. Key concerns include: - Overlooking: The positioning of the dwelling risks introducing direct or perceived overlooking into neighbouring gardens and habitable rooms, undermining privacy.
-----------	--

- Overshadowing: The scale and proximity of the structure could lead to unacceptable loss of light to adjoining properties and outdoor amenity areas.
- Unneighbourly development: A substantial dwelling in a rear garden environment would create an oppressive and intrusive relationship with surrounding homes, contrary to the established amenity expectations of the area. These impacts conflict with:
- SPG2 Residential Layout Guidelines (2020), which set out minimum separation distances and amenity standards.
- Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy (2014), requiring development to safeguard the amenity of existing and future residents.
- Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024), which emphasises the need to ensure high standards of amenity for all occupants.

Access, Safety, and Legal Constraints

1. Physical Constraints of the Existing Access Route

- The only vehicular access to the site is a private route measuring approximately 2.7 m between kerbs, narrowing to around 2.5 m due to vegetation.
- This is significantly below the minimum width required for safe two way movement or emergency vehicle access.
- The route narrows further approximately 10 m into the access, creating a pinch point that increases the likelihood of conflict between vehicles entering and exiting.
- Existing homes on the plot-built in 1937 and circa 1970-are large family properties with multiple vehicles, all relying on this single constrained access. Additional dwellings would intensify traffic through a route already operating at its practical limit.

2. Right of Way Limitations

- Any historic or informal access agreement does not automatically extend to new dwellings within the same plot.
- The 2024 Land Registry title deeds confirm that the right of way terminates at the line of the existing garage structure.
- As a result, the proposed new homes would not have a legally established right of vehicular access, which is fundamental for residential development.

3. Non Compliance with Building Regulations (2010) - Approved Document B, Volume 1

- Building Regulations require a minimum access width of 3.7 m between kerbs for fire appliances to reach new dwellings.
- The current access falls 1 m short of this requirement, even before accounting for vegetation.
- The access route exceeds 20 m in length and lacks a turning head or turning circle, which is mandatory where emergency vehicles cannot enter and exit in a forward gear.
- Consequently, the existing access cannot meet statutory emergency access requirements and therefore cannot serve new dwellings under current regulations.

4. Safety and Operational Concerns

The combination of:

- substandard width,
- narrowing pinch points,
- lack of turning facilities, and
- increased traffic from additional homes

creates a material risk of obstruction, particularly during peak times or emergencies. Emergency services may be unable to reach new dwellings, which is a critical planning consideration and a common basis for refusal.

Conclusion

Based on the planning policy conflicts, amenity impacts, physical constraints, legal limitations, and regulatory non compliance, the proposal represents an inappropriate and unsustainable form of development. The existing private access route:

- fails to meet Building Regulations for emergency vehicle access,
- does not provide a legally transferable right of way for new dwellings,
- and is already constrained for existing residents.

Kind regards