

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/10/2024 10:08 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	43 Windsor Road Gravesend Kent DA12 5BW
Proposal:	Demolition part rear summer house and construction of summer house and half submerged indoor pool, erection of a first floor extension to side over existing ground floor, conversion of the attic space by changing valleys to flat tabletop roof and changing gables to hips to create a games room and play area.
Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Windsor Road Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I wish to object to the plans as submitted. As one of the smaller width properties within Windsor Road, the plans as submitted are an over-development in breach of local planning strategy, which will detract from, and devalue other properties in the vicinity including ours. We have consulted a local Estate Agent on this. The supplementary statement is factually incorrect. It states 'the property had some small alterations over the years'. Planning Reference 20060326 was erection of a two storey rear extension and reference 20080520 erection of a side extension. These significant alterations nearly doubled the footprint of the existing house. The plans as currently drawn lack a clear absolute datum's on the heights both of the roof and the side extensions. The plans if approved must have clear height datums not referenced to features that will be removed before construction, and therefore ambiguous and subject to different interpretations. The supplementary statement states 'The roof will be structured to keep the roof as low as possible'. The roof as drawn on the plans and given construction of houses in Windsor Road, is unlikely to provide a habitable space unless the roof height is significantly raised and the dormers at the rear increased in size. This is not reflected accurately in the plans submitted. If the ridge height on drawing DKM/7744/0 (Existing Elevations and GA's), is referenced to pitch roof at front that will remain, and compared to the same elevation on drawing DKM/7744/06 (Proposed Elevations) it shows circa 0.25m increase in roof height. This is highly unlikely to provide a habitable loft space
-----------	---

and our expectation is that roof height will increase significantly from this and visually impact on the property view from the road to the front and from our property to the rear.

We therefore object to the plans as submitted.

Kind regards