

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/02/2024 3:32 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: Former St Josephs Convent Preparatory School 46 Old Road East Gravesend Kent DA12 1NR

Proposal: Conversion of existing Victorian building into 6 flats. Demolition of existing outbuildings. Erection of a 3 storey medical centre. Erection of a building containing 7no flats. Erection of 41no houses. Associated works to include; access, public open space and landscaping.

Case Officer: Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Old Road East Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that I have with regard to the above planning application. As a bordering neighbour to the proposed development, I am of the view that the development will have a serious impact on my standard of living. Before advising of my specific concerns, I advise of 2 matters relating to documentation supplied by Galliard supporting their application:

1. The Statement of Community Involvement document submitted was inaccurate and very misleading in that they took no account of the joint feedback letter that 38 neighbours sent Galliard. This naturally skewed numbers considerably in that all 38 neighbours had concerns regarding parking (and many other issues) whereas the document submitted stated only receiving 6 concerns about insufficient parking.
2. The Transport Planning Statement referred to accident statistics which I believe are incorrect. They advised that between Jan 2018 & Dec 2022 there were 10 reported crashes resulting in injury in the close proximity. I am aware of 2 accidents close to my property during this time that resulted in injury and neither are recorded. The above brings into question the reliability of other submitted documents.

Objections (referenced in [] where this is specifically contrary to the GLPCS. Privacy [2.9.3, SO14 & 5,15,4])

The design and location of the medical centre ("mc") will totally compromise mine and neighbouring properties privacy. The mc is 14m from my garden and will be overlooked by more than 30 large windows. In addition, due to the elevated position of existing houses, staff and visitors which will likely be 100's per day will have full viewing access into our homes as they enter the mc. The mc car park is located next to my boundary fence which will result in exposure to both noise and exhaust pollution when in my garden. I believe that much of this could be mitigated if the mc entrance were to be positioned facing south offering a more pleasant view of parkland than my back fence, with windows facing north having

obscured glazing and the height of the building being substantially reduced.

Parking [5.5.39, 5.11.5 & 5.15.14]

The proposed parking provision for both residential and mc is totally unrealistic and will lead to illegal or anti-social parking, noise and exhaust pollution (as cars wait to park in mc) and overspill parking into neighbouring roads, all of which will result in greater traffic congestion, increased road traffic accidents and diminishing air quality. To provide 1.07 spaces per dwelling, 2 visitor spaces and 0.35 spaces per member of staff and likely patients at any one time is totally inadequate. I fully accept that we need to discourage vehicle usage, however, reasonable alternatives need to exist and this is not the case today. [5.5.31]. The proposed mc is to replace an existing mc 25 mins walk away which will likely lead to a greater % of staff and patients not walking to the mc. The Transport Statement is misleading in stating that the site is well located to a large number of bus services. 6 services are listed, however, 3 of these are 2 per day and therefore irrelevant and 2 are more than 10 mins walk away which would not appear to be relevant for patients of a mc. There is therefore only 1 bus that provides a convenient service to the site.

Traffic [2.6.1, 2.7.3, SO17, 5.5.24, 5.5.31 & 5.5.37]

Traffic in the area of Old Road East and Echo Square is often congested and despite what is reported in the collision data statistics is an area where there are often road traffic accidents and I am aware that previous reports have stated that the air quality around Echo Square is already at severe levels. All of this will in my opinion be heightened should the proposed development proceed as submitted. The bulk of increased traffic will be attributable to the mc and thus if this were reduced in size this would likely assist.

Development is out of character with area [3.1.7, SO14, 5.10.9, 5.11.6 & 5.15.14]

The majority of the site border are classic Victorian properties in design and substantial detached and semi-detached family homes on large plots. The proposed residential properties are mainly small, terraced properties and flats on very small plots. The proposed scheme is contrary to Strategic Objective 14.

I am supportive of the redevelopment of the site and would welcome a revised scheme being submitted by Galliard, however, would request that any such proposal takes consideration of the privacy of existing properties, allows for adequate parking and is of a less dense nature. In addition, despite much research I have not been able to establish that the "new mc" will actually provide a new health facility for local residents as it appears that this is to cater for the relocation of 2 merged local practices that may have full lists. I would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at my home to illustrate my objections at first hand.

Kind regards