

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 9:51 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] Laurel Avenue Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	When we built our property in 2018 we were under very strict guidelines on what we could build taking into consideration overlooking neighbours and boundaries. We were told that we had to have 10 metres from the back of the house to the fence, however, from looking at Galliard's plans and speaking to the architect he advised that the distance achieved by their design was 8 metres from the back of the house to the boundary of ours. I would like to hope the same strict rules apply to this development and at least 21 metres from house to house will be required. We will have a 3 bed semi detached backing onto our garden so will be overlooked by at least 2 bedroom window's directly into our bedroom and into our garden. The garage for this proposed property appears to be also no more than a metre away from our boundary. We feel that this would be in breach of the Human Rights Act - Protocol 1, Article 1 to be this closely overlooked. If the houses were positioned differently (sideways on) we would feel that the intrusion upon us and the rest of Laurel Avenue would be significantly less. We would also like to hope that appropriate screening will be all along the boundary wall to increase privacy and not trees that do not serve the correct purpose be planted in gardens where they can be cut down or restrict our sunlight. We do feel that a development is necessary due to the size of the land, however, feel that the amount of houses & flats that they are trying to squeeze in is excessive and they haven't allowed for enough parking for the houses and the doctors surgery. This is going to have a massive impact on the surrounding area. The traffic along Old Road East is very dangerous at the moment and trying to pull out of the Christ Church nursery is always precarious without the significant increase that this development will bring. Not only a nursery with very small children but numerous other groups run from this building. Our children attend Brownies and Rainbows there and we feel the development over the road will be an increase risk to their safety. The traffic along Whitehill Road is outrageous most
-----------	---

of the time with people mounting the pathway and speeding to get through due to the parked cars on one side. This development will only increase the issues on this road, along with parking & safety issues with the other surrounding roads. Especially with the proposed cut through on Coombe Road, people will be parking in Whitehill, Coombe, Canterbury & Laurel and walking through to their house due to the insufficient parking allowance proposed.

During the summer months we see hundreds of bats flying around our garden and roosting in the neighbouring trees. All UK bat species are protected by European and UK legislation: the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and amendments and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. This affords complete legal protection to all bats and their roosts. How can this development go ahead with this in mind? Not to mention the family of foxes that reside within the St Joseph land, as well as badgers & multi species of birds seen there.

We have concerns over boundary fences & walls. Who will maintain these?

A huge concern is our properties safety once the site is opened up and the build is underway. How will our properties be secure from crime?

The doctors surgery does not fit in with the local architecture and a 10 metre high building seems excessive and does not fit in with the Victorian character of the road. The initial proposal from Galliard said that there would be ample parking for the development. This is certainly not the case with only 40 parking spaces allocated for the surgery but there could be approx 100 + people on site at any one time. Will the doctors surgery have enough capacity to take on the new patients in the area?

The parking for the houses is a concern. Most properties have minimum of two vehicles but there is only one space per house allocated. Where will the excess park?

Air quality on Echo Square is already very poor, this will have a detrimental effect and potentially go above the legally safe limit?

Concerns over historical chalk mining within the grounds of St Josephs.

Finally, it appears there have been several inaccuracies on the documents with the application submitted by Galliard. One being the amount of residents that submitted comments. 38 households raised concerns and it appears they had not taken this into account with their numbers of responses. Also the transport planning statement referring to accident statistics in the area which we believe to be incorrect.

Kind regards