

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/05/2025 3:20 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	24 Dover Road Northfleet Gravesend Kent DA11 9QD
Proposal:	Erection of a first floor side and rear extension.
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	Dover Road Northfleet Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Sorry for late comment because I was away from 2 May to 23 May.

I write to formally object to the proposed development, comprising a ground-floor and first-floor rear extension, on the basis of significant amenity harm, specifically relating to:

- Loss of natural daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms and garden
- Overbearing visual impact and sense of enclosure
- Cumulative massing amounting to overdevelopment

This objection draws on policies from the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide SPD, and the BRE Guidance: Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (2022).

1. Loss of Light to Habitable Rooms and Garden (SPD 9.5 / BRE Guidelines)

The proposed development, particularly the proposed first-floor element projecting over the already disruptive ground-floor extension, poses a clear risk of overshadowing and reduction in daylight to our rear-facing habitable rooms and private garden. While the applicant asserts compliance with the 45-degree rule, they have not submitted any formal daylight/sunlight assessment, such as a BRE-compliant Vertical Sky Component (VSC) or Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) analysis.

Given the scale, massing, and proximity of the proposed extension, the lack of evidence is a serious omission and contrary to best practice outlined in the BRE Guide (2022). Paragraph 9.5 of the SPD is explicit that developments should "not create an unreasonable amount of overshadowing of neighbouring properties." We therefore request that no decision be made until a qualified daylight/sunlight report is provided and independently verified.

2. Overbearing Impact and Sense of Enclosure (SPD 9.6 and 10.3)

The extension's scale and proximity - regarding the first-floor element - will result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure to our rear windows and garden area.

This conflicts directly with:

- SPD 9.6, which requires careful consideration of outlook from neighbouring properties

- SPD 10.3, which discourages two-storey rear extensions close to garden boundaries due to the potential for overbearing form and loss of openness
- The proposed extension, by virtue of its depth and height, would materially reduce the visual openness currently enjoyed from our property and dominate the rear boundary in a way that is inconsistent with guidance.

3. Overshadowing of Rear Garden (SPD 9.5 / BRE Guidelines)

No overshadowing diagrams or sun-path analysis have been provided with the application. As my rear garden lies adjacent to the proposed development, we are concerned that it will receive significantly reduced levels of sunlight in the morning and afternoon not in the evening because rear garden is facing North East/East. The BRE Guide (2022) recommends that at least 50% of a garden should receive two hours of sunlight on 21st March. Without any technical assessment, there is no assurance this test will be met, nor any evidence to support the applicant's claim that there is no adverse impact.

4. Cumulative Bulk and Overdevelopment (SPD 10.3 / CS19)

The proposal involves a deep, considerable-width single-storey rear extension, topped with a first-floor extension addition which was originally proposed with considerable extensions and was rejected. While the ground floor may benefit from extant permission, the two combined represent a substantial mass of development to the rear. Paragraph 10.3 of the SPD cautions against "extensions to extensions" and warns that these create a sense of visual clutter and can result in dark, tunnel-like internal spaces and bulky, disproportionate forms. The proposed development clearly represents cumulative overdevelopment, contrary to the design principles of Policy CS19 and the SPD.

Conclusion

The proposed extension represents a significant intensification of the site that would unacceptably impact the amenity of neighbouring occupiers through: Loss of natural daylight and sunlight (BRE Guidelines / SPD 9.5) / Unacceptable visual enclosure and loss of outlook (SPD 9.6, 10.3) / Overbearing bulk and cumulative overdevelopment (SPD 10.3 / CS19). I respectfully request that the Council refuse the application unless the applicant can fully evidence that the proposed development complies with local and national policy - particularly through an independent daylight and sunlight assessment in accordance with BRE guidance.

Kind regards