

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/12/2025 2:22 PM from [REDACTED]

## Application Summary

Address:	21 Edgehill Gardens Istead Rise Gravesend Kent DA13 9JU
Proposal:	Conversion of the loft space to a annexe ancillary to the main dwellinghouse. Re-pitching of the roof and construction of two dormers on both side elevations with installation of windows on all elevations. Erection of an external staircase and removal of chimney stack.
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[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:	To whom it may concern,

I write to formally object to the planning application submitted for [REDACTED] Edgehill Gardens, Istead Rise, Kent, concerning the erection of an outbuilding containing a residential annexe in the rear garden.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations, all of which have previously been relied upon by the Council when determining similar applications in this immediate area.

### Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity and Visual Intrusion

Due to its size, siting and height, the proposal would be visually intrusive and would be clearly perceptible from neighbouring gardens. This would result in an unacceptable impact on outlook and residential amenity, contrary to the established character of the area and to principles previously applied by the Council when refusing similar developments.

### Residential Use and Future Occupation Concerns

Although described as a residential annexe, the scale of the building and the inclusion of full services raise serious concerns that the structure would function as independent living accommodation. Such concerns have previously been accepted as valid grounds for objection where outbuildings exceed what would

reasonably be considered incidental or ancillary to the main dwelling. The proposal therefore risks intensifying residential use in a manner that is inappropriate for a rear garden setting.

#### Planning Consistency and Precedent

It is particularly important that this application is assessed consistently with previous decisions in the locality. Comparable proposals have previously been refused or subject to enforcement action on grounds including excessive height, dominance, deviation from approved plans, and concerns regarding future residential use. These same issues are clearly present in the current application, and to reach a different conclusion would undermine confidence in the consistency and fairness of the planning process.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal fails to comply with local planning policies relating to scale, design, residential amenity and appropriate use of outbuildings. I therefore respectfully but firmly request that this application be refused.



---

Kind regards