

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/03/2025 11:23 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	5 Forge Lane Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7AS
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension and rear dormer; Conversion of loft space into habitable rooms; Erection of outbuilding in rear garden; Formation of frontage parking space and vehicle crossover.
Case Officer:	Mrs Kelly Joyce

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	The Braes Higham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Thank you for consulting me on the above application and affording me the opportunity to raise my objections to this application. My objection focuses on the following material matters:

1. Over development of the property resulting in a loss of original form/proportions of the bungalow.
2. Overlooking - specifically from the East facing dormer window.
3. Lack of clarity from application drawings as to the use, roof form, elevations, height and function of the outbuilding.

The application proposes a significant and substantial extension to 5 Forge Lane Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7AS which originally formed a small bungalow forming part of a uniform streetscene of 4 similar dwellings. Whilst I accept care has been taken regarding the street facing elevation of the property, this appears to be at the cost of an unbalanced and oversized additions to the rear both at ground floor level and at roof level extending also over an earlier ground floor rear extension. Specifically of concern is the extent of the depth of the roof extension and the vertical end wall. The extension absorbs the full roofspace of the earlier addition and would be more sympathetically scaled should it be set back to or just behind the existing ridge of the established ground floor extension. This would allow a sizeable extension at roof level but also preserve some elements of subservience to the existing built form and scale/proportionality of the original dwelling.

My second (but principal) concern is overlooking. Whilst it is accepted there is a distance rear-to-rear between my property and 5 Forge Lane Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7AS, the lie of the land would present immediate overlooking into my garden, kitchen, dining room and conservatory. It is simply not acceptable in this case to rely on the separation distance between properties as the mitigating factor. Currently my garden (in this rural village location) enjoys a good level of privacy with no direct overlooking from neighbouring properties to the rear. The

neighbouring property at 7 Forge Lane Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7AS has a window the the rear elevation at first floor level but this comprises of an obscure glazed bathroom window. The impact of this overlooking will directly result in harmful overlooking to directly impinging on Human Rights Act Article 8: Right to privacy in that 'Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home'

Finally, the application lacks application drawings as to the roof form, elevations and height of the outbuilding and it remains unclear how an assessment of the acceptability of an outbuilding of unknown dimensions can be approved. A planning condition restricting height would be arbitrary and not sensible given the significant footprint of the outbuilding. Like my neighbours, I also share significant concerns as to the use of the outbuilding. The accompanying explanations within the covering submission are at best poorly informed. It cannot be reasonable to suggest a bathroom is necessary for the growing of plants between seasons - perhaps a small greenhouse and a hose pipe would be more appropriate in the context? Further that an additional kitchen affords ready access to food or liquid refreshments is completely unnecessary given the substantial enlargement to the kitchen proposed which one could argue is better placed (and closer) to access. It latterly suggests 'additional kitchen facilities in the 'ANNEX' will also be an improvement to current facilities in the home'. The application description also refers to the term 'ANNEX'. I strongly object to the construction of an outbuilding to provide an annex with internal fitments and facilities to permits a residential use to be undertaken from the outbuilding (irrespective if this is incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling or otherwise). This will introduce a residential element significantly out of character and position with prevailing development. No weight should be afforded to any fallback permitted development position given the use of the term 'annex' within the application description. I have concerns with regards to the height of the building, will this be above the 6ft fence? Will the building be soundproofed and what noise will be created using it as gym, will it be used for gatherings and with a kitchen in such a large building will it be used for someone to live/sleep in? The suggested 'annex' may well be a good distance from 5 Forge Lane, but it is not from The Braes as the gardens are far shorter.

Whilst not a matter of objection, I would like to draw the case officers attention to the fact that works to the front of the dwelling to facilitate additional parking have already been undertaken in advance of this application being considered. Whilst I appreciate fewer cars being parked on the already very busy road, these works do little to positively contribute to the streetscene.

Kind regards