

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/02/2024 4:21 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:

I am a resident of Coombe Road and would like my objections to the proposed plans to be considered. They are:

PARKING

Galliard mentions the proposed Medical Centre (MC) has 20 consulting rooms on their plans published on the Council website. However, upon looking at the plan, and counting the actual rooms, there are 22.

The parking in Coombe Road and environs is already at a premium and would be put under increased pressure by not only the MC but also the whole residential development.

From the floor plans provided by Galliard (which incidentally only mention 20 consulting rooms, NOT the 22 shown - not exactly reliable information on which to base our objections) I calculate around 25 rooms which would be occupied by at least ONE member of staff at any given time. I think it's fair to assume that each of these staff would drive to work and thus require a parking space at the MC. 40 are provided (allegedly) so that would leave 15 for patients.

However, the admin areas will no doubt have more than one member of staff, and I have not included any cleaning staff (as to be fair these would most likely be out of hours although we don't yet know what the hours of operation would be). What measures would be taken to prevent residents of the development parking in the MC? Thus forcing patients to park in the surrounding areas? Particularly Coombe Road, if there is a walkthrough?!

The residential area allows for 54 units, each (except for one 4-bed which has an integral garage) being allocated ONE parking space, no matter the number of bedrooms. KCC policy states 1 space per bedroom. The residential site is only proposed to have 60 spaces and this INCLUDES the TWO visitor spaces. Quite frankly, this is NOT adequate

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS THROUGH COOMBE ROAD

It was not made clear in the notification leaflet, nor the website that this was proposed, such a huge change should have been better published. and it is something to which I STRONGLY object. We are entitled to the peaceful and quiet enjoyment of our home, and this would adversely affect that - the volume of pedestrians passing my front window would be unacceptable. The CGI mockup, also, appears to have said access encroaching on our property. Hopefully this is an error.

COOMBE Road has no turning circle, and so cars use our drop kerb (and on occasion our actual driveway) to turn round to exit the road. This increases the risk of damage to our property as more vehicles would be doing this due to the parking previously mentioned.

HEALTH AND POLLUTION

I suffer from asthma, which seems to be worsening, and I am concerned that the increased traffic will exacerbate my condition. The area will need to be well lit in accordance with Kent Police's Designing Out Crime, which will increase light pollution - literally at our front and back doors. The MC will also be lit, and with three floors, this will cast more light pollution out, for longer periods. There is also the matter of the noise pollution - more vehicles starting up, driving off, people talking.

GALLIARD TRANSPARENCY, OPERATION AND FACT FINDING

There have been to date a few discrepancies in information provided by Galliard:

-

Their statement of Community Involvement neglected to include 38 neighbour comments;

The mention of 20 consulting rooms other floor plan, when a count reveals 22;

The planned walkthrough from Coombe Road not being well published and residents being made aware;

Galliard failed to deliver notification leaflets to some households.

Whilst we may not always like what Galliard are telling us, we have to be able to at least believe them and not have to doublecheck their information. At worst, it smacks of underhandedness, at best it does not instill confidence in their plans.

SPORT ENGLAND state in the response dated 13th Feb, that Galliard failed to follow their recommended methodology in assessing the usefulness of the playing Fields, and that they failed to consult the relevant sports associations. The Chilmark Consultants document states that the playing fields were used (to the best of their and Galliard's knowledge) solely by the school. This is not true, and had they followed the correct methodology they would have discovered this. It also states it has not been used since the school's closure - again, not true - it has, by a disability charity.

BOUNDARIES

There has been no communication as to what is to happen with existing boundary fences/walls and who will be responsible for their upkeep once the project is complete.

CRIME AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

Any walkthrough would open the opportunity for e-scooters, e-bikes and the like to easily access the development and Coombe Road. Most of these are ridden on the pavement, this would cause an unacceptable increase in noise and danger to pedestrians. It would also offer anyone engaging in criminal activity an ideal opportunity to evade police.

Kind regards