

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/06/2024 2:40 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 65 Pine Avenue Gravesend Kent DA12 1QY

Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension, two storey side extension, single storey side extension and front porch.

Case Officer: Ms Rebecca Harrison

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Pine Avenue, Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: We agree that the neighbouring houses on both sides of the road demonstrate a wide variety of styles, and many have extensions, these being unintrusive with regard to the frontage and impact on the corner. The proposal produces a dominating edifice on a very public site on the inside corner of the road. The house is currently used as an Airbnb, is well reviewed and presents no problems as such. However, it quotes: 'Driveway parking is available for up to 3 cars. Two vans can comfortably park on the driveway. Free street parking is also available'. Whilst this is factually correct, the expanded proposal doubles the accommodation, with no additional parking space. Street parking is already proving problematic and actually dangerous as the road outside the house boundary covers a 90 degree curve on a steep hill, close to a large secondary school, which produces major traffic issues every school day at daily opening and closing times. When on street parking takes place already, the problem is considerable, and the doubling of potential visitors can only create actual danger. If this extension is allowed, the Council can only be culpable. We have studied the other objections relating to the loss of privacy for numbers 67, 69 and 71 Pine Avenue all of which are overlooked by the rear of Number 65 which looks down on all three, and we can only endorse them. The three large security lights which illuminate and pollute the whole area through all the hours of darkness, show a complete lack of consideration for neighbours. At the time of the previous application, Dr Singh told me that no neighbours had objected as he had been assured by them and that the objections were made up by persons to cause him problems. When I challenged him, he changed the story and told me that this was what his agents had reported. I do not believe this to be true and according to other objections this is a common theme. The great tragedy is that if Dr Singh had taken his neighbours into his confidence instead of alienating them then an agreed extension could have been sorted out without recrimination.

Kind regards