

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/07/2025 6:33 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	59 Central Avenue Gravesend Kent DA12 5AN
Proposal:	Part demolition and extension to existing rear garage. Demolition of existing rear extension. Erection of part two storey rear extension. Erection of two storey side extension and additional parking to the rear. Alterations to fenestration.
Case Officer:	Mrs Nina Goodbody

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

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

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Although some modifications have been made to the previous application, my concerns leading to my comments on that largely remain unaltered: Although I acknowledge a precedent has been set for a side extension of this type by the neighbouring property on the other side of Smarts Road (59a Central Avenue), the scale and massing of this proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the existing residential unit and the land, in my view. 59a Central Avenue only has a conservatory on the back, and a side extension which doesn't project further than the original rear building line. Whilst the applicant property has already undergone a small rear extension, this proposal attempts to extend the building line at the rear of the property even further, which will likely cause a loss of light to 57 Central avenue due to the natural path of the sun and the applicant property sitting directly south of it, causing a possible blocking of sunlight at certain times of day. I do acknowledge the applicant has reduced some of the rear extension down to ground floor only (from the previous application), however it still projects further than the rear building line on all floors of the building on the southeast corner of the house. This creates a visual eyesore. 59a Central Avenue's side extension also has a hipped roof to the north elevation facing Smarts Road which makes it look less imposing and provides more of a natural end terrace look to the property. I would argue that if permission is granted on this property, the same should be done for symmetry purposes so the two properties either side of Smarts Road have a more symmetrical/natural end terrace look and are less visually imposing. 59a Central Avenue also has more than a 1m gap between the side of the property and it's northern land boundary bordering Smarts Road. I'd argue that the applicant property should increase the current proposed 1m gap by another 500-1000mm to mirror 59a Central Avenue and minimise the corridor effect to Smarts Road that this proposal will inevitably create, should permission be granted. The supporting documentation talks about family needs but the plans show a 'prayer room' in one of the upstairs rooms... I don't know many family homes that normally have a 'prayer room' which leads one to assume the intended use of this property is communal or as a House of Multiple Occupancy. The communal amenities (e.g. two lounges) and bedroom space proposed in the plans take a
-----------	---

three-bedroom house to a six/seven bedroom house (if you include the loft conversion which has already been granted permission) with a total of three bathrooms/shower rooms. I'm aware it could be argued that this is for somebody wanting to extend a property to create a home for their own family, but the fact the applicant company name is 'J5 property ltd' suggests this application is being submitted as part of a property development project. The company is listed as its nature of business being 'buying and selling of own real estate' and 'other letting and operating of own or leased real estate'.

Central Avenue and the surrounding roads are almost solely comprised of terraced, detached, or semi-detached houses which are used as family homes, and I don't feel this road and surrounding roads are suitable for such a development given the lack of diversity of residential dwellings.

Finally, I am aware this is more of an emotive opinion, but a lot of residents are getting really fed up and disheartened by developers buying up end of terrace properties in the area and trying to radically overdevelop them, whether it is oversized extensions or trying to squash additional dwellings into side gardens or rear gardens. I don't think anyone has any objection to a someone buying a property to live in and extending it to create more space and improve the enjoyment of the property, but some of the recent proposals we are seeing from developers harm the character and appearance of the area and are of detriment to the enjoyment of the area for existing residents, whether through exacerbation of parking issues or the loss of green space and nature/foilage by building more and more on spaces that were initially designed as gardens. The solution to the housing crisis is to build more on undeveloped land further afield, not continue to overdevelop and over urbanise existing areas. I hope the council takes this holistic view into consideration when assessing proposals such as this one.

Kind regards