

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/02/2024 5:50 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] Coombe road Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Document inconsistencies There are multiple inaccuracies regarding our property included in the application. 1.Proposed scale: Our house is missing from the plan. It has been left blank, comparable to a garage/outbuilding, not an existing 2 storey dwelling. 2.Building heights:Our 2nd storey that runs along the boundary has been categorised as a single storey garage/outbuilding. 3.Layout Master plan: The section of garden to the right of the proposed 3 bed house and garage is not labelled as such. 4.Site Location Plan and Block Plan - Existing: Our 2nd storey that runs along the boundary has been categorised like other existing properties' sheds. 5.Site Section Plan EE - Proposed: This plan does not show our property on the first image illustrating the proposed 3 bed house elevation. Galliard have not confirmed that the 3 bed house would not breach overshadowing regulations. The inaccuracies are not conducive to appropriate or fair consideration from Gravesham Borough Council & external bodies. Galliard have not taken due diligence and care with their application or more worryingly, intentionally misrepresented our property to avoid adhering to regulatory standards and policies designed to safeguard our rights as existing property owners sharing the boundary. I suspect the application is in breach of NPPF 5.4.25 Paragraph 140. Privacy I feel the current design does not comply with the following: ·Human Rights Act-protocol 1, article. ·SPG2, Dwelling houses, Table 2: Accommodation with 3 bedrooms,Minimum depth from rear wall of house (metre)-10.0.
-----------	---

SPG2, Private garden area, 10.
SPG2, Privacy distances and overshadowing , 18.

Our bedroom window overlooks the entire garden of the proposed 3 bed property. At its closest proximity, the garden is within 1m from our house and the garage similar from the rear garden boundary wall. Our ground floor is also elevated therefore our conservatory and kitchen have a clear view over the boundary wall. Overlooking is a significant concern. I do not object to the use of trees on the boundary, quite the contrary, but agree with the statement, 'Planting of trees & hedges should not be used to overcome privacy issues, as this is not a long term solution', especially as the proposed species to border my property is deciduous.

Noise

The turning circle is up to our boundary wall, within 1m of our property wall, and therefore bedroom. As this is the only place for all large vehicles and those visiting the southern end of the development to turn, I have concerns over chronic noise levels and the lack of provisions in place to protect the wall from vehicle damage and vandalism. The exposed section of boundary wall also goes against Kent Police advice outlined in the document 'Designing out Crime, Dwelling (House and Flats), 16. Blank walls'.

Coombe road pedestrian access

There is an incomprehensibly low level of parking on the proposed development and despite this being deemed reasonable by Galliard as a means to encourage the new residents to use more public transport, it is inevitable that there will be spillover into surrounding roads with Coombe road, undeniably being the most severely affected if the pedestrian access is granted. Due to most modern families having a minimum of two cars, which was not the case when the original terrace was built, the road struggles to accommodate the current parking requirements of the residents. Coombe road also serves as parking for Whitehill road Residents and ACM Autos clients on a daily basis, resulting in Coombe road residents being forced into parking on Laurel Ave, demonstrating the extent of the pre-existing parking issue in the local area. I do not feel safe as a pedestrian on Whitehill road as people drive too fast and often on the path at peak times when congestion is high, due to the majority of the northbound lane being used for parking. The roads cannot cope with or feasibly provide any additional parking for those living at or visiting the development. I strongly object to the pedestrian access and hope the Council ensures this is not approved.

Finally, it's important to make you aware that other documents submitted by Galliard are known to be inaccurate and pose further concerns surrounding the validity of the application. This includes the number of road traffic accidents reported on Old Road East and air pollution data for Echo Square Junction being excluded, which was close to surpassing acceptable level during the covid pandemic. I'm particularly outraged by the 'Statement of Community involvement' which omitted comments from 38 neighbours, including my husband and I. The name, address and contact details of all involved were included with the comments submitted to Galliard, therefore it is clear the document does not accurately reflect the scale of objection from the surrounding residents.

I kindly request Gravesham Borough Council contact me to discuss my specific concerns.



Kind regards