

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/02/2026 8:41 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Altamirano Sole Street Cobham Gravesend Kent DA12 3AX
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved bar access for the erection of a bungalow to the rear of Altamirano.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Sole Street Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to formally object to the above planning application. Having reviewed the proposals, I believe the development would result in significant harm to the local area and fails to comply with several key policies within the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014). 1. Conflict of Character and Design (Policy CS19) The proposed development represents an intensification of the site that is not in keeping with the established character of the neighborhood. Policy CS19: The proposal fails to "conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment." The height of the proposed structure (approx. 5.8m) significantly exceeds the average height of existing neighboring bungalows (approx. 3.5m to 5m). Visual Dominance: This height disparity creates an overbearing visual dominance and results in a "cramped and contrived" development, similar to the previously refused Lomas planning application in this area, which was rejected for not being in keeping with the surroundings. 2. Residential Amenity: Privacy and Overshadowing The scale and positioning of the new dwelling will lead to a substantial loss of privacy and overshadowing for adjacent properties. Under SPG2 (Residential Layout Guidelines), a minimum distance of 21 meters is typically required between habitable room windows to protect privacy. The proposed 5.8m height at close proximity will overlook private amenity spaces and habitable rooms, infringing on the right to quiet enjoyment of existing homes. 3. Access and Emergency Services Safety The access arrangements for the site are inadequate and pose a safety risk:
-----------	--

Fire Service Access: Current standards require a minimum width of 3.7m for fire service vehicle access (which may be reduced to 2.75m only in specific circumstances at the pinch point). The existing access already fails to meet these minimum requirements, potentially obstructing emergency services.

Traffic Congestion: The access road only has room for one car at a time. This will lead to dangerous "bottlenecks" where cars pulling in or out of the main road must wait or reverse, increasing the risk of collisions.

Parking Abuse: There is a high risk that the two existing parking spaces will be abused by extra vehicles, further encroaching on the limited access route.

4. Environmental Impact and Rights of Way

Erosion of Green Space: The development would result in the loss of valuable green space, conflicting with policies aimed at protecting the borough's green infrastructure.

Legal Right of Way: There are significant concerns regarding whether a legally transferable right of way actually exists for the new dwelling. We request that the Council verifies the legal access rights before proceeding, as any dispute here would render the development site inaccessible.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposal represents over-development that is detrimental to the character of the area, violates privacy standards, and presents clear safety risks regarding vehicle access and emergency services. I urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

Kind regards