

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/01/2025 5:18 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	59 Central Avenue Gravesend Kent DA12 5AN
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing rear extension and erection a of a two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lucy Hankin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] central avenue Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Although I acknowledge a precedent has been set for a side extension of this type by the neighbouring property on the other side of Smarts Road, 61 Central Avenue, the scale and massing of this proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the existing residential unit and the land, in my view. 61 Central Avenue has no rear extension, only a side extension. Whilst the applicant property has already undergone a small rear extension, this proposal attempts to extend the building line at the rear of the property even further, which will likely cause a loss of light to 57 Central avenue due to the natural path of the sun and the applicant property sitting directly south of it, causing a possible blocking of sunlight at certain times of day. Furthermore, the size of both the proposed side and rear extensions combined seems to be of a larger footprint than the original property, which seems excessive. There is no design and access statement or planning statement within the planning documents, and therefore no demonstration from the applicant as to how they would mitigate any negative externalities of the development. What allowances have been made for parking? An increase in bedroom and accommodation space to the scale proposed here is surely going to increase the number of residents in the property with cars - no information has been submitted about how the impact of these potential extra vehicles will be mitigated, i.e. through off street parking at the rear for example. The lack of design and access statement leaves us to guess the future intended use of the property, but given the scale of development I don't think it would be unreasonable to assume the intended use of this property is as a House of Multiple Occupancy. The communal amenities (e.g. two lounges) and bedroom space proposed in the plans take a three-bedroom house to a six-bedroom house with a total of three bathrooms/shower rooms. I'm aware it could be argued that this is for somebody wanting to extend a property to create a home for their own family, but the fact the applicant company name is 'J5 property ltd' suggests this application is being submitted as part of a property development project. The company is listed as its nature of business being 'buying and selling
-----------	--

of own real estate' and 'other letting and operating of own or leased real estate'. Central Avenue and the surrounding roads are almost solely comprised of terraced, detached, or semi-detached houses which are used as family homes, and I don't feel this road and surrounding roads are suitable for such a development given the lack of diversity of residential dwellings.

Finally, I am aware this is more of an emotive opinion, but a lot of residents are getting really fed up and disheartened by developers buying up end of terrace properties in the area and trying to radically overdevelop them, whether it is oversized extensions or trying to squash additional dwellings into side gardens or rear gardens. I don't think anyone has any objection to a someone buying a property to live in and extending it to create more space and improve the enjoyment of the property, but some of the recent proposals we are seeing from developers harm the character and appearance of the area and are of detriment to the enjoyment of the area for existing residents, whether through exacerbation of parking issues or the loss of green space and nature/foilage by building more and more on spaces that were initially designed as gardens. The solution to the housing crisis is to build more on undeveloped land further afield, not continue to overdevelop and over urbanise existing areas. I hope the council takes this holistic view into consideration when assessing proposals such as this one. It is for this and the reasons above that I object to this application in its current form.

Kind regards