

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 11/07/2024 10:11 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 173 Singlewell Road Gravesend Kent DA11 7QA

Proposal: Erection of an attached self build dwelling house. Erection of a single storey rear extension with two roof lights to existing dwelling house. Erection of double garage to rear of site.

Case Officer: Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Whilst it's hard to believe anyone would object to development and improvement of the original property, the concern is that approval of this scheme creates a 'land grab' precedent whereby developers are encouraged to buy up end of terrace or semi-detached houses with a bit of a side garden and think they can squash another dwelling on the end to sell on for a profit. You can see this in action by the applicant agent's frequent reference to the development at 155 Singlewell Road... a scheme that, in my view, also shouldn't have been allowed. It has permanently altered the street scene on that junction and contributed to a cluttered corridor effect on The Fairway. There is however a marked difference between that scheme and the one proposed here in the sense that 155a Singlewell road was an addition to a terrace of 11 houses, this scheme proposes to add another dwelling onto a pair of semi-detached houses, thus changing a pair of semis to 'terraced' and 'end of terrace'. Surrounding properties, i.e. 157 Singlewell Road, had also already been extended so the open and suburban feel to that junction had already been compromised and a corridor effect already partly created.

All four properties that corner the crossroads of Singlewell Road/Dennis Road/Ascot Road have side gardens, this development will disrupt that symmetry and open nature of the street scene at that junction, and will then set a precedent for a future owner of 175 Singlewell Road to undertake a similar development, thus creating a corridor effect to Dennis Road and damaging the green and open suburban appeal of that locality.

I understand there is a need for housing, but developments like this don't create affordable homes for people, if anything they exasperate the problem. The new government plan to build estates of new housing in undeveloped areas ('grey belt'), surely this a much better approach to the housing shortage rather than over-cluttering and over-urbanising existing residential areas.

Loss of greenery. Any developments which comprise loss of garden space result in loss of greenery and can be detrimental to the suburban and leafy appeal an area may have. This exasperated by people converting front gardens to

driveways and Kent county council not replacing roadside trees that they take out. If permission is granted, could it not be made a condition that trees and shrubbery need to be planted in the front and back gardens to replace what is lost at the side when the new property is built?
Furthermore this application was rejected by both the council and the planning inspectorate, granted the current application incorporates some changes but the principle of the application is broadly the same as what was rejected.

Kind regards