

Sharon Bickerstaff

From: Richard Hart
Sent: 19 September 2025 10:45
To: Planning Admin
Subject: FW: Ref: Walnut Hill Nursery - Planning Submissions 20250864 (Offices) & 20250876 (9 Dwellings)

Morning,

Neighbour comments for 20250864 (Offices) & 20250876 (9 Dwellings).

Many thanks

Richard Hart BA (Hons) MA TP
Team Leader (Development Management)
Gravesham Borough Council
Tel. 01474 33 77 51
Email: richard.hart@gravesham.gov.uk

Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents including informal design guidance are available at <https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/local-plan-policy>

The Council has adopted a Local List of Validation Requirements (April 1st 2020)

Before you formally submit your application check that you have all the relevant documents, by reading our [Local Validation List](#). Failure to meet these requirements will lead to delays in processing your application, and it may not be registered.

New Supplementary Planning Document - Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD -

The Council has adopted a Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD. A copy of the SPD, is available on our website at <https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/downloads/file/249/householder-extensions-alterations-design-guide-sdp-including-schedule-of-representations>

Gravesham Borough Council - Delivering a Gravesham to be proud of

INVESTORS IN PEOPLE®
We invest in people Gold

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 September 2025 10:12
To: Richard Hart <richard.hart@gravesham.gov.uk>
Subject: Ref: Walnut Hill Nursery - Planning Submissions 20250864 (Offices) & 20250876 (9 Dwellings)

Caution: This email was sent from outside of the organisation. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender.

[REDACTED]
Longfield Avenue
Gravesend

Ref: Walnut Hill Nursery - Planning Submissions 20250864 (Offices) & 20250876 (9 Dwellings)

Dear Mr Richard Hart

I write to you in respect of the two recent submissions by the owners of Walnut Hill Nursery, namely, 20250864 for change of use to Offices and associated hard standing & 20250876 Permission in Principle for the erection of up to 9 Dwellings. I comment as follows:-

20250864 for change of use to Offices

1. As you are fully aware the neighbours and immediate community have been seriously impacted by the operations at Walnut Hill Nursery since the current owners took possession in early 2024. Their commercial activities are now seen as illegal as the Enforcement Notice upheld by the Planning Inspectorate has failed to be complied with. Neither the HGV's were removed on time or the buildings erected on the site without consent dismantled and removed in a controlled manner. I understand court proceedings have been initiated and would appreciate an update in this respect.
2. After much effort from all parties concerned, we are in grave danger of making the Planning Inspectorates decision null and void by any approval for commercial or office activity. The Planning Inspectorate was clear the site shall maintain it's agricultural status across the whole site.
3. The original interim operating licence has NOT been removed by the Traffic Commissioner due to the fact that they have appealed the Traffic Commissioners decision to Upper Tribunal. This will remain the case until such time as the appeal is heard, in the meantime the Traffic Commissioner has granted an additional site. Any approval of commercial / office activities will therefore mean the site is 'available' in the Traffic Commissioners eyes and HGV's could on that basis return to site. Even though Gravesham Planning and the Traffic Commissioner operate in silos, until such time as the Traffic Commissioner system is reformed, I'm confident that neither the Planning Inspectorate, Traffic Commissioner or Gravesham Planning support such commercial, industrial or offices in connection with an HGV operating centre. This use of the site has been judged inappropriate by all parties at two separate public hearings (Traffic Commissioner and Planning Inspectorate). It would be so wrong to open this door again and put everyone through another two years on misery fighting for what is right and appropriate for the neighbourhood.
4. I therefore strongly object to this planning submission and await your update on how you are proceeding with robust criminal proceedings via the courts for a lack of compliance with the enforcement notice, rather than approving this application.

20250876 Permission in Principle for up to 9 Dwellings

1. My first observation is why would the owners want to combine a residential development proposal with a commercial operation planning submission, who would want to live behind or next to a commercial activity in the middle of a greenbelt hamlet. This can only be assumed as a 'smoke screen' for utilising such housing for their own benefit, seeking approval and not building, or some other rationale we are not yet party to.
2. The thought of 9 houses is just not in keeping with the neighbouring properties whom all enjoy large residential plots. Such housing density can only be considered excessive and again Walnut Hill Road, a narrow country lane, cannot accommodate increases in traffic as has been proven with the now illegal operating centre.
3. I must also point out applications that have been rejected for additional houses or development over the years, [REDACTED] two additional properties declined, Sunny Slopes one additional property declined, Sheridan log cabin declined, Three Gables additional stables declined. Clearly other properties in very close proximity have all been declined submissions for additional houses or minor development of their properties. Clearly approval for any additional dwellings would be completely out of sync with planning decisions associated with this immediate area.

4. I would also question the sustainability of such a development in terms of access to local facilities infrastructure, pedestrian access, etc.
5. I therefore strongly object to this planning permission in principle.

The council may wish to consider how best to deal with this nuisance site and consider change of use or demolition of the brick barn and the approval on a SINGLE residential property ONLY, including the removal of all the other unapproved building structures erected by the current owners. This would return the site to how it was some 50 years ago (a single dwelling, residential plot, in totality), would remove the repeated submissions for change of use to commercial, be in keeping with neighbouring properties, align more with planning approvals / refusals given to other properties in close proximity.

I trust you find my comments helpful and I look forward to receiving your favourable refusal of both submissions and an update from you on your Enforcement actions / timings against this now illegal site.

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this communication.

Yours sincerely,

A black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.