

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/01/2026 10:26 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Garage Block Located At The Russets Strand Close Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0HB
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garages. Erection of a part-two, part-three storey building providing five residential units, with associated car parking, cycle storage, refuse storage, landscaping and all associated works.[cr]
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	The Russets Meopham Meopham, Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I write to formally object to the above planning application. I am a [REDACTED] resident, [REDACTED] the application site, and [REDACTED] directly affected by the proposed development. While I acknowledge the Council's objective to deliver new housing, including affordable housing, the proposed development gives rise to significant planning harms which, when considered cumulatively, demonstrate that the scheme is unacceptable and should be refused. 1. Overdevelopment and Inappropriate Density The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site through the introduction of a part two / part three storey flatted development in a predominantly low-density, two-storey residential context. This conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Policy CS02, which require development to respect local character and density. 2. Design, Scale and Massing The development reads as a single dominant flatted block and fails to reflect the grain of surrounding residential development. This is contrary to Policy CS19 (Design and the Built Environment) and the Design for Gravesham SPD, which require context-led, high-quality design that integrates positively with its surroundings. There are no 3 storey buildings / development nearby to even compare the development too!
-----------	---

3. Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposal would harm neighbouring amenity through increased enclosure, loss of outlook and increased overlooking. While BRE guidance has been referenced, compliance alone does not equate to acceptability. The scheme conflicts with Policy CS02 and paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF, which seek to protect existing residential amenity.

4. Loss of Garages and Resulting Parking Pressure

The proposal results in the loss of 29 existing garages, which, while not generally used for the daily parking of vehicles, are actively used by local residents for storage of personal belongings. The removal of this established storage provision will displace such belongings back into dwellings and, in turn, is likely to contribute indirectly to increased on-street parking demand.

The scheme provides only five on-site parking spaces for five two-bedroom apartments. Two-bedroom units are capable of accommodating up to three occupants per dwelling, and it is therefore reasonable to anticipate a level of car ownership that exceeds the proposed provision. As a result, overspill parking onto The Russets is highly likely.

Of particular concern is the local highway context. The Russets includes a horizontal alignment with a slight bend near its entrance, which already presents a constrained environment for vehicle movements, even with the current limited level of on-street parking. Any increase in parked vehicles along this section of the road would further restrict visibility and manoeuvrability, to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity.

The proposal therefore fails to adequately address the cumulative impact of garage loss and under-provision of parking, and conflicts with Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Policy CS11 (Transport) and the Council's adopted parking standards.

5. Planning Balance

Although the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF makes clear that permission should still be refused where adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In this case, the harms identified are not outweighed by the limited housing benefit.

6. Conclusion

The proposal would result in overdevelopment, harm to character, unacceptable amenity impacts, and increased parking pressure. It therefore conflicts with the NPPF, Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Policies CS02, CS11 and CS19, and the Design for Gravesham SPD. I respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

Summary Objection

The proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site through the introduction of a part two / part three storey flatted building that is out of character with the predominantly two-storey, low-density residential context of The Russets and Strand Close. The scale, massing and design would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and create unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, including increased enclosure, loss of outlook and increased overlooking. The proposal also results in the loss of 29 existing garages used for local storage and provides only five parking spaces for five two-bedroom dwellings, which is insufficient and will inevitably lead to overspill parking onto The Russets, a street that already experiences constrained vehicle movements due to its alignment. When assessed cumulatively, these harms are not outweighed by the limited benefits of the scheme and the proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy Policies CS02, CS11 and CS19. Planning permission should therefore be refused.

Kind regards