

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 6:57 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: -Number of Dwellings and Pedestrian access via Coombe Road

The proposed number of dwellings will lead to a large number of cars owned by new residents that do not have nearly adequate parking. The proposed number of parking spaces is far too low for the number of dwellings and is based on unrealistic predictions of the number of cars per household. This will lead to cars being parked in surrounding roads, such as Old Road East and in particular Coombe Road, with new residents using the pedestrian access to then get to their house. This will compound an already challenging parking situation, having a knock on effect into whitehill road and beyond where there are already dangerously parked cars. This situation is not just an issue for current residents who need to find somewhere to park their cars, and have no access to off road parking, but it is a serious safety concern particularly for young children. Cars will inevitably end up parked too close to the end of junctions giving poor visibility and there will be traffic weaving in and out of spaces between parked cars. The additional commuter traffic through the Echo square area from the new residents of the development (especially at peak times), will make this worse. This is an unacceptable aspect of the current plans that the council, who are well aware of the parking situation in the surrounding area, should never allow.

The addition of this many dwellings and associated cars will also cause an increase in air pollution, already found to be at a close to dangerous level in the surrounding area in 2020.

I suggest that the number of dwellings must be reduced, and that realistic adequate parking must be guaranteed for each new house (2 spaces per dwelling).

-Proximity to Current Residents Property

When reviewing the plans it seems clear that for a number of residents the proposed new properties infringe upon The Human Rights Act-protocol 1, article 1 - 'a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes their home and other land.'

Many of these new properties will overlook existing residents' gardens and also give views into residents' windows which will clearly have an impact on their privacy. Given the size of the site, this seems avoidable, especially if the planners were to sensibly reduce the number of dwellings. The suggested distance from a window to another properties garden is 21m as outlined in planning guidelines SPG2,

Privacy distances and overshadowing , 18-' In addition, a minimum distance of 21 metres shall be provided between the windows of habitable rooms and the private garden area of any dwelling. A private garden area is defined as the first five metres of garden adjacent to the rear of the dwelling.'

Yet, in many cases with the current state of the plans for the development this requirement is not met.

The proximity of properties and the height of certain buildings, especially when including land elevation, will also block light for residents and in particular their gardens. Which clearly infringes on their "human right to peaceful enjoyment of their home and other land".

-Unclear, inconsistent plans

There are also many errors and omissions in the plans from Galliard homes that raise concerns. My own property is incorrectly labelled (with one section not highlighted as a dwelling, then on another image highlighted incorrectly as single storey). Which concerns me given that this may mislead anyone considering the plans about how close the new build house should be permitted to be.

The omission of the air pollution survey carried out in 2020 is a serious concern and is a very poor oversight on the behalf of the developers.

There was no mention in the planning application of the 38 residents including myself that wrote letters detailing our objections. This is a serious and potentially deliberate oversight that shows the developer's lack of willingness to compromise with the local community.

-Medical Centre

While I acknowledge that the medical centre may be beneficial for the local community, the proposed size and lack of adequate parking will cause more problems for the local area, where we do not have the infrastructure to support additional traffic and parking of cars. The size of the medical centre will also clearly infringe on the human rights of surrounding residents that will be overlooked and lose access to sunlight from their houses and gardens.

-School spaces and other amenities

With many current Gravesend residents unable to find places for their children in local schools it seems unreasonable for the council to grant planning permission for more housing in an already highly populated area. Building more housing in an outer area of the town where new infrastructure such as schools, shops, doctors surgeries, dentist etc. can be provided seems clearly preferable. I acknowledge that new homes need to be built, but not this many in such a highly populated area.

Kind regards