

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/03/2024 8:05 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Buildings North Of Hill Farm Taylors Lane Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7JT
Proposal:	Application for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for conversion of existing agricultural storage buildings north of Hill Farm House to 3no. dwellings, including the insertion of windows, glazed doors, first floors and roof lights to ensure all habitable rooms are naturally lit.
Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Bracknell

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the planning application referenced above and to implore you to reconsider approving it due to the significant negative impact it would have on [REDACTED] and the wider community of Higham. This marks the fourth iteration of the proposal, and despite previous concerns raised, the current plan fails to address critical issues, warranting further outright rejection. [REDACTED] holds immense significance to my family, [REDACTED]. The proposed conversion of agricultural storage buildings into three dwellings, accompanied by parking for six cars, poses a myriad of concerns that cannot be overlooked. The adverse effects on privacy, environmental quality, wildlife habitat, and community well-being demand careful consideration and decisive action against this proposal. The lack of clarity and detail in the plans, despite previous criticism, underscores the inadequacy of the current proposal. Introducing three large dwellings to a site that previously accommodated only one home would undoubtedly constitute an invasion of privacy for the current residents of [REDACTED]. Standard guidelines dictate a minimum distance of 21 meters between residential properties to ensure privacy. However, the proposed plan falls short of this requirement, with the distance from the north-facing bedrooms of [REDACTED] to the nearest proposed dwelling being approximately 16 meters. This inadequate spacing would result in intrusive overlooking, significantly impacting the privacy of our home. Furthermore, the proposed parking area, located within 10 meters of [REDACTED] presents a grave concern. The intense light emitted from six parked cars would inundate [REDACTED] living spaces, penetrating into the kitchen, living room, and three bedrooms situated on the north side of [REDACTED]. This intrusion of light, coupled
-----------	--

with the inevitable noise and activity associated with increased vehicular presence, would severely disrupt our daily lives and compromise our well-being.

The absence of provisions for visitor parking exacerbates the issue, as Taylor's Lane lacks adequate public transportation, necessitating private vehicle access for visitors. The influx of additional cars, coupled with the lack of designated parking spaces, would not only exacerbate traffic congestion along the rural lane but also pose logistical challenges for residents and businesses alike. Moreover, the proposed development fails to address the environmental repercussions, including increased pollution levels, noise disruption, and potential damage to the surrounding landscape and wildlife habitat.

Whilst there is the new introduction of three (and only three) electric charging ports in an attempt to lessen pollution, there is no clarity on where the power supply for these charging ports would originate from, nor plans for the installation of such infrastructure and how this would impact [REDACTED]

Furthermore, the proposed installation of a septic tank under the parking area lacks detailed information regarding its implementation, maintenance, and potential health and environmental implications. The absence of clear details on waste management and access raises serious concerns about the suitability of this proposal.

In summary, the fundamental issues with the proposal persist, necessitating its rejection in the best interest of the affected residents and the broader community. The approval of this proposal would have multiple adverse effects, including loss of privacy, environmental degradation, traffic congestion, and harm to the affected residents and wildlife. Therefore, I urge you to carefully consider these concerns and reject Planning Application 20240186.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

[REDACTED]

Kind regards