

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/11/2024 7:30 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Lomas Sole Street Cobham Gravesend Kent DA12 3AX
Proposal:	Application for Outline application with all/some matters reserved for the demolition of the existing dwelling. Sub division of the plot and erection of 2 new dwellings.
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:	This planning application is for substantially the same development refused permission in July 2024 (ref. 20240331). I have no in-principle objection to the redevelopment of Lomas with a single replacement dwelling, but to subdivide the plot and erect a second dwelling within the rear garden remains inappropriate and contrary to local and national planning policy. Impact on character and appearance Lomas is the northernmost of 4 similarly sized dwellings fronting Sole Street. It is an irregularly shaped plot. The rear garden extends to the rear of Faincroft House and Dromterris forming an important and integral part of the corridor of undeveloped garden land to the rear of properties fronting Sole Street. Subdividing the plot and erecting a dwelling and access within the rear garden would be cramped, contrived and visually discordant. It would be harmful to the distinctive character and appearance, spatial layout and established pattern of the site and surrounding built environment contrary to Policies CS15 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 (LPCS) requiring new development to achieve good design, conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment and integrate well with the surrounding area. The proposed development would also be contrary to paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2023) which states developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment. The principle of subdividing the site and backland siting of a new dwelling was previously assessed to be unacceptable and contrary to the requirements of Policies CS14, CS15, and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and the NPPF. The revised proposal continues to represent overdevelopment and there have been no material changes in circumstance that would indicate a different view should be taken in relation to this application.
-----------	---

Therefore the first reason for refusal equally applies to this proposal.

Impact on neighbour amenity

Although in outline, the indicative plans continue to show that the front elevation of Plot 2 would face onto the rear elevation and rear garden of [REDACTED]. Development in the rear garden of Lomas cannot be designed so as not to cause a loss of privacy; [REDACTED] not currently overlooked and any development in the rear garden of the Lomas plot would result in an unacceptable level of visual intrusion, overlooking and a loss of privacy. The proposed development would also introduce hardstanding and vehicles into the existing garden with an increase in noise and disturbance that would have a harmful and unacceptable impact on the living conditions and amenity of occupiers of adjacent properties, including Plot 1.

Erecting a dwelling within the rear garden was previously assessed to be unneighbourly and to have a detrimental impact on the amenities of existing and future occupiers contrary to the requirements of Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF 2023 which states that planning decisions should aim to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users. There have been no material changes in circumstance that would indicate a different view should be taken in relation to this application and therefore the second reason for refusal equally applies to this proposal.

Highway safety and parking

There is currently no vehicular access to the rear garden. The proposed site plan shows the provision of a very narrow access from Sole Street to the rear of the site. The access would be between two buildings and at 2.3m wide fails to provide adequate width. The Location Plan shows the provision of pedestrian visibility splays; however by reason of the pedestrian footfall, including by children, accessing the Little Shop next door the intensification of the access would be harmful to pedestrian and highway safety.

On-site parking can only be achieved in a tandem arrangement, contrary to the adopted Kent Residential Parking Standards that requires a minimum of two independently accessible parking spaces. The failure to provide adequate on-site parking is a further indication of overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would be contrary to Policy CS11 (LPCS) which requires new developments to mitigate their impact on the highway and public and paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF (2023) which states development should be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety and that development should minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

This application for subdividing the plot and erecting a second dwelling within the rear garden continues to be contrary to the Development Plan and national planning guidance. The previous reasons for refusal have not been addressed and the application for outline planning permission should therefore be refused.

Kind regards