

## Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 17/12/2025 3:11 PM from [REDACTED]

### Application Summary

Address: 40 Cross Lane East Gravesend Kent DA12 5HB

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, conversion of loft space into habitable rooms and construction of rear dormer to facilitate the conversion of the dwelling into three self-contained flats.

Case Officer: Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

### Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Objection:

How many applications will this property owner continue to make? It is clear that this is once again an attempt at financial gain.

The owner of this property has already attempted three planning applications and appeals for separated dwellings at the bottom of the garden which have being rejected and also a 9 Bedroom HMO. Again, this new application is not for sustainable and high quality housing, its sole objective is to cram more people into what is probably already an overcrowded HMO for additional financial gain.

I do appreciate HMO have a place within our county and provide housing for those that require it, but this property is not a suitable foundation or location for such dense population requirements. Application for HMO conversion was refused but this application is trying to queueze in just as many people but under a different layout. This property is not a vast mansion, it is an average sized family house and even with an extension it is not an appropriate size for the number of bedrooms proposed. Potential occupancy of multiple couples, perhaps with children could result in 20+ people crammed into a standard sized house which would usually have 4 - 6 occupants?

Many of the concerns from previous planning applications are still valid:

- Increased load on already stretched local facilities and amenities. Particularly

parking is a premium and existing neighbours struggle to park in an evening. Removing the existing garage and replacing with multiple bedrooms for new occupants will stress this further and add numerous additional cars to the area. This has already been impacted recently with additional double yellow lines being added all along central avenue junctions towards Ascot Road. Current drive way is already frequently full, where will all the additional new cars park ?

- The site is within 6KM of the Thames Estuary and Marshes and Ramsar site and appears to add no environmental benefits.
  - Increased noise pollution during building works and following by occupants will have detriment to local wildlife and neighbours.
  - The design and appearance of the proposed development would fail to conserve and enhance the character of the local built environment and would not integrate well with the local surrounding area.
  - The proposal is also considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site which would result in a cramped form of development out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and the wider locality contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Design for Gravesham (2024).
  - The development fails to safeguard biodiversity by failing to provide any biodiversity net gain or mitigate harm caused to the Special Protection Areas. Therefore, the development fails to comply with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations and fails to offset biodiversity loss contrary to Section 15 (specifically paragraphs 193 and 194) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Policy CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).
- This application once again is not for high quality sustainable housing which improves conditions within our town, its primary focus in my opinion is for personal financial gain of the landlord at detriment of the current and future occupants, surrounding area and neighbours. This application should be rejected
- 

Kind regards