

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 19/04/2026 3:16 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	13 St Francis Avenue Gravesend Kent DA12 4SJ
Proposal:	Erection of an outbuilding for use as a Study and Gym.
Case Officer:	Mrs Nina Goodbody

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

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

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	1. Inaccurate information on the application form a) Work already started The application form states that no work has commenced without consent. This is factually incorrect. Construction works began several months ago and a corrugated wall has already been erected and other elements. Corrugated wall is approximately 2.72 metres in height and located approximately 30cm from the shared boundary. Photographic evidence can be provided with measurements if required. This raises concerns regarding retrospective development and the accuracy of the application. b) Trees on adjoining land The application states that there are no trees on or adjoining the site within falling distance. This is incorrect. There is a large mature tree on an adjoining property immediately adjacent to the development site, clearly within falling distance. c) Biodiversity Net Gain (10%) The proposal does not appear to deliver any measurable biodiversity net gain. On the contrary, the scale and proximity of the structure will have a negative impact on my garden, which currently supports a range of planting and biodiversity. The height and massing of the structure will reduce sunlight and growing conditions, undermining existing biodiversity rather than enhancing it.
-----------	--

2. I object to the proposed development on the following planning grounds:

Overbearing and dominant impact

The structure is too close to the boundary (approx. 30cm) and already reaches a height of 2.72m, with a supposed proposed height of 3.25m.

This results in an overbearing and oppressive form of development, particularly when viewed from my garden.

Loss of light / overshadowing

Due to its height and proximity, the development will cause loss of light and overshadowing, adversely affecting the use and enjoyment of my garden.

Scale and proximity to boundary

The combination of height and minimal separation from the boundary is inappropriate and harmful to neighbouring amenity.

The development does not respect the relationship between properties.

Out of character / poor design relationship

The height, massing, and corrugated walling create a visually intrusive and incongruous structure that does not integrate appropriately with the surrounding residential context.

Accuracy and reliability of the application

Given the incorrect statements regarding commencement of works and nearby trees, I have concerns about the overall accuracy of the submitted information.

I request that the case officer conducts a site visit to fully understand the scale, proximity, and impact of the development.

Kind regards