

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/05/2024 9:07 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 65 Pine Avenue Gravesend Kent DA12 1QY

Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension, two storey side extension, single storey side extension and front porch.

Case Officer: Ms Rebecca Harrison

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Pine Avenue Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Ref. No: 20240310

The proposed plan should be refused for the following reasons:

The letter presumably written by Paul Howard (reference PRH/24) states that "Neighbours adjacent on both sides (North and South numbers 63 and 67) and opposite (East numbers 58/60/62) have all been advised and have NO objections to the proposals. It should be noted that none of these neighbours are aware of objecting to the previous application despite their names and addresses appearing on submitted papers".

This statement is wrong on at least two counts.

Firstly, the owners of number [REDACTED] tell me that the statement that they had no objections is a lie and that they are considering court action to correct this statement to the planning officer.

Secondly, I am certain from the meetings that I have had with the owners of number [REDACTED] that they had substantial objections to the original scheme, even attending meetings with one of the local councillors to express their concerns - meetings at which I was present.

Furthermore, the property is not being used as a residential property and is likely never to be so utilised given that for much of the past year, it has been used as an Airbnb <https://www.airbnb.co.uk/rooms/937047227170625462>

From the Airbnb website you will see that the host states that the property has "Driveway parking for up to 3 cars. Two vans can comfortably park on the driveway. Free street parking is also available".

It is clear that the owner intends to encourage on-street parking of vehicles on a blind bend, half-way up a hill - a problem at any time but particularly so at school

commencement and leaving times.

In addition, the listing states that the property has "Three spacious bedrooms including two SuperKing and one KingSize". It could not be concluded that the property will house no more than 5 people. Indeed it is more likely that the owner intends to create a House of Multiple Occupancy via an underhand route, especially as the Airbnb listing refers to the property as it presently stands, not the enhanced property of the proposed development, which will clearly sleep at least six people.

By agreeing to the development, you will be complicit in changing the residential nature of the street. I shall also be interested to understand how the proposal will sit with council tax bandings and the impact it will have upon the purely residential houses within Pine Avenue.

I can only conclude that the application has been drafted to circumvent any proposals by any incoming Labour government to increase regulation of Airbnb properties - for example
<https://www.westminsterlabour.org.uk/issues/2022/03/23/karen-buck-mp-and-westminster-labour-call-for-action-on-airbnb/>

Furthermore, the owners of number 65 have shown themselves to be poor neighbours - not trimming the boundary hedge to the required height of no more than two metres and placing on the South and East corners of the building (these compass points based upon the letter referenced PRH/24 that number [REDACTED] sits to the South of number 65) bright lights that are on all the time from early evening until the following morning, that disrupt the sleep of the neighbours in numbers 62,64 and 66 Pine Avenue - even though the two planning applications state that no lights will be involved.

Along with the demolition of the garage before planning approval, this shows the plans to be no more than lip-service to planning regulations with little likelihood of any proposal being followed to the letter.

[REDACTED]

26 May 2024

Kind regards