

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/08/2025 1:25 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	82 Cross Lane East Gravesend Kent DA12 5HB
Proposal:	Retention of the raised deck, and proposed installation of 1.00m balustrade on the raised deck along with an increase in the height of the boundary fencing.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lucy Hankin

[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:	Formal Objection Re: Planning Application 20250735 - 82 Cross Lane East, Gravesend, Kent DA12 5HB Proposal: Retention of the raised deck with 1.0 m balustrade; increase in height of boundary fencing. Status: Pending consideration. Please treat this as a formal objection on material planning grounds. References in brackets cite the applicant's own documents on the file. 1) Serious and ongoing loss of privacy / overlooking (garden and interior rooms) This is a part-retrospective application for a raised platform that the applicant says "sits a maximum of 1.3 m above the ground level." [REDACTED] 2) Overbearing enclosure and loss of daylight/sunlight from further fence height The boundary fence is already unusually tall and oppressive, the result of earlier permissions/works which, in our view, should not have been granted given the harm now experienced. From the councils own report the fence previously approved already sits at 2.75m above base ground level, the new proposal seeks additional height to the fence along a run of around 2 m (as labelled on the plans and described in the statement). [REDACTED]
-----------	--

against existing harm. Notably, the applicant's own statement refers to the boundary treatment being "2.5 m above the level of the ground" at the pair of semis-well above the typical 2.0 m domestic threshold-while still asserting "no impact," which we contest.

3) Cumulative harm to residential amenity

[REDACTED]

outlook. The applicant's assertion of "compliance" under Policy CS19 and the Householder Guide does not reflect the real effect of a deck 1.3 m above ground level and further fence height [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5) Pre-application advice is not determinative and did not cover the screen

The applicant relies on pre-app advice (17/06/2024) regarding the decking, but their own form confirms "The additional privacy screen was not the subject of this pre-application response." Any weight given to pre-app advice must therefore be limited and cannot justify the fence/screen element now proposed.

Conclusion

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Planning permission should be refused to protect neighbouring amenity.

Kind regards