

[REDACTED]
Ms. Rebecca Harrison,
Planning Services,
Gravesham Borough Council,
Civic Centre,
Windmill Street,
Gravesend
DA12 1AU.

Your Ref. 20250259.
My Ref. 23/0203/Jameson.

Date. 09/04/2025.

Dear Ms. Harrison,

Planning application 20250259. 1 Strand Close, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent DA13 0EG. Part 2 storey side & rear extension & part single storey side and front extension with the excavation of the garden and erection of a new retaining wall.

I am writing further to the above matter, a planning application for an extension to this house following earlier refused applications. This is a note to you emphasising the reasons why I believe this application should be granted permission.

The latest refused application (your ref. 20240545) was taken to appeal and that appeal was dismissed. The application was refused on 3 grounds relating to 1. The character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area 2. Living conditions of the existing occupiers of the property, particularly in regard of outdoor living space and 3. Living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 45 Huntingfield Road. These three issues were considered in detail by the appointed planning inspector in her decision letter dated 17th. February 2025.

This appeal decision is a significant material consideration in the decision-making process taken with regard to the current application before you. I say this as in almost all regards the current application is identical to this recently refused application, with the very significant exception that on the proposed rear (western) elevation the previous blank elevation has been broken up by the insertion of ground and first floor window openings. These

[REDACTED]

window openings are designed with windows that will be permanently fixed shut and fitted with obscured glazing. I suggest those features of the new windows are secured by planning condition.

In paragraphs 5 to 8 of the Inspector's decision letter we find how she felt the only issue at stake regarding the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area was how the earlier application showed a "blank and featureless rear elevation". I find the Inspector's conclusion that the proposed blank rear elevation would be visually harmful astonishing. However her letter is a material consideration in considering this new application and all her remarks must be taken into account. In my view her objection to the appeal regarding the "blank and featureless rear elevation" has been resolved in this new application as the proposed rear elevation will no longer be "blank and featureless". The new ground and first floor rear elevation windows will break up that rear elevation and the window design will be harmonious with the design of the remainder of the host property. No overlooking problem will be caused by this development as long as the appropriate planning condition is applied. I therefore believe the Inspector's objections in her paragraphs 5 to 8 have been overcome.

With regard to the living conditions of the existing occupants of the subject house, relating to the standard of the outside space available to the occupiers, the Inspector agreed with arguments put forward at the appeal stage that the "levelling out the rear garden to make it a more usable space" proposed in the application would be beneficial relative to the existing circumstances at the site (paragraphs 9 to 11). She therefore agreed "the proposed development would not be harmful to the living conditions of the existing occupiers of the property".

With regard to the living conditions of the occupants of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the Inspector agreed with the case argued at appeal that the "Outlook from No. [REDACTED] would be of a rear extension more akin to that of a single storey extension". This was because of "the lower land level and separation between developments". From paragraphs 12 & 13 of her decision letter it

can be seen the proposal “would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property”.

This development is urgently needed for the family, particularly as the applicant’s mother lives alone and is increasingly reliant upon daily help for her living needs, with a worrying tendency to fall over. The other family members also need improved internal accommodation. I therefore do hope this matter can be expedited and permission can be granted for this revised proposal.

Please do not hesitate to get back in touch with either myself or Tony Martin if you have any further queries,

