

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/10/2025 8:58 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	40 Cross Lane East Gravesend Kent DA12 5HB
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage, erection of a two-storey side extension and conversion of dwelling (Use Class C3) into a 9 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis).
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[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: I wish to strongly object to the above application for the conversion and extension of the existing property into a 9-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

1. Overdevelopment and harm to local character

This proposal represents an overintensification of the site and is entirely out of keeping with the established pattern of development in this part of [insert street name]. The surrounding area consists predominantly of 3- and 4-bedroom terraced houses occupied by families. A 9-bedroom HMO would introduce a scale, intensity, and type of occupation completely at odds with the local character. It would transform a modest end-terrace dwelling into an oversized multi-occupancy unit, effectively operating as a small hostel or apartment block within a terrace designed for family living. This level of overdevelopment would erode the residential character and set a dangerous precedent for similar speculative proposals in the future.

2. Severe parking and highway impact

Parking on this road is already extremely limited, with residents frequently unable to park near their own homes. The potential for up to nine separate adult occupants (and realistically, more given the double occupancy of rooms) means a significant increase in car ownership and on-street parking pressure. The application's proposed "mitigation" - a 9-space bicycle store in the rear garden - is wholly unrealistic and fails to reflect actual transport habits. The result will be greater congestion, obstruction risks for emergency vehicles, and deterioration in road safety and amenity for existing residents.

3. Adverse impact on residential amenity

The conversion of a family home into a high-density HMO will have a direct and harmful effect on the quality of life for neighbouring households. The increase in the number of occupants will inevitably result in greater noise,

more comings and goings, and frequent deliveries and refuse collections. This will disturb the peace and quiet of what is currently a settled, family-oriented environment.

The proposed scale of occupation would also reduce privacy for adjoining residents and cause unacceptable visual and environmental intrusion.

4. Inadequate waste storage and servicing

The application fails to demonstrate how the significant increase in waste and recycling generated by a 9-bedroom HMO will be managed.

The existing arrangements are insufficient, and without appropriate provision, this will result in overflowing bins, unsightly frontages, and potential hygiene issues. This is contrary to Local Plan Core Strategy Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles), which requires that development contributes positively to the local environment.

5. Planning history and repeated attempts to overdevelop

The applicant has already submitted two previous applications for this site - including one proposing the construction of a bungalow containing two self-contained flats - both of which were rightly refused on the grounds of overdevelopment and harm to local character.

This current proposal represents a further escalation of those same issues. It is clear that the intention is to maximise financial return from the site rather than provide suitable or sustainable housing for the community.

6. Community and social impact

While it is acknowledged that planning decisions cannot be based on who might occupy a property, the cumulative effect of losing family housing stock to large-scale HMOs cannot be ignored. It undermines community stability, increases transient occupancy, and changes the social fabric of the neighbourhood.

Gravesham Borough Council has previously recognised the importance of protecting the balance between HMOs and family dwellings. This proposal runs directly counter to that objective.

Conclusion

This application constitutes overdevelopment, is incompatible with the established character of the area, and would have an unacceptable impact on parking, amenity, and local environment.

It conflicts with the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Policies CS14 (Housing Type and Tenure), CS19 (Development and Design Principles), and CS18 (Climate Change and Sustainable Development) due to its unsustainable design and failure to mitigate its impacts.

I therefore strongly urge Gravesham Borough Council to refuse planning permission for this proposal.

The property would be far better suited to remaining - or being restored - as a well-proportioned family home that contributes positively to the community and respects the character of the street.

Kind regards