

Dear Ms Fisher,

I am writing to you as the case officer for planning application 20251108 because I have had difficulty submitting my comments objecting to the proposed site development at 32 Lewis Road.

The online platform indicates that comments of up to 5,000 characters can be submitted, however when I tried to submit my comment it truncated it at 780 characters. This makes it impossible for me to make a comment at the appropriate level of detail to cover my concerns about the proposed development.

The deadline for submissions is 16th December, so I have attempted to submit a comment via the online platform however I am concerned that the enforced brevity does not relay the full detail of my objection. **I am therefore including below** the full text of my objection (which is within the 5,000 character limit) in this email, for inclusion in the responses to planning application 20251108. I would appreciate your confirmation that my full comment/objection as per this email will be recorded in the Council's recorded responses to planning application 20251108.

Thank you for your assistance

Planning Application Ref: 20251108

Site Address: 32 Lewis Road, Istead Rise, Gravesham, Kent

Objector Address: [REDACTED]

Objection 1: Representation Regarding Impact on Residential Amenity

I am an owner occupier [REDACTED] and I wish to make representations in respect of the above application. I do not object in principle to the demolition of the existing dwelling at No. 32 or to the construction of two new dwellings on the site. However, I do object to the proposal in its current form due to the unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of [REDACTED]

The Proposed Topographical Site Plan (drawing no. 1325.WD.04B) shows that the proposed two-storey dwelling on Plot A is positioned only 1 metre from the shared side boundary with [REDACTED] and is also set several metres forward of the existing building line. This forward siting brings the full two-storey mass of the building directly opposite the side section of our kitchen-dining room, which is a principal habitable room within our home. The positioning of a two-storey dwelling at such close proximity, and forward of the existing building line, would therefore result in a significant loss of daylight to our own kitchen-dining room and would create an overbearing and enclosing impact when compared with the existing situation.

The combined effect of the two-storey height, minimal 1 metre boundary separation, and forward projection represents an overdevelopment of the plot and does not respect the established pattern of spacing and building lines that characterise Istead Rise.

The proposal does not adequately safeguard neighbouring amenity and is contrary to the Gravesham Local Plan requirement that development should avoid unacceptable harm through loss of light, outlook and sense of enclosure to adjoining occupiers.

I do not consider that the proposal has demonstrated that reasonable steps have been taken to mitigate these impacts. No daylight or overshadowing assessment has been provided to show that the development would not result in harm to neighbouring habitable rooms.

In order to allow the principle of redevelopment to proceed without causing unacceptable harm, I respectfully request that planning permission is refused and the scheme be revised so that the proposed dwelling on plot A is:

1. Set back at least a further 5 metres from the front boundary, and
2. Set back a minimum of 2 metres from the side boundary adjoining No. 34.

These revised setbacks would materially reduce the loss of daylight to our kitchen-dining room and would result in a more appropriate relationship with our adjoining property, in accordance with the Local Plan's design and residential amenity objectives.

Objection 2: Inaccuracy in Submitted Site Plan and Baseline Assessment

I would also like to draw attention to an inaccuracy in the submitted drawings which materially affects the assessment of impact on neighbouring amenity. The Existing Site Plan (Drawing 1325.WD.01) and the Proposed Site Plan (Drawing 1325.WD.02B) depicts the existing garage at No. 34 as a fully built structure extending along the length of the shared boundary, giving the impression of a continuous brick wall. This does not reflect the actual situation on site.

As correctly shown on the Proposed Topographical Site Plan (Drawing 1325.WD.04B), the existing garage occupies only the rear half of the footprint shown on drawings 1325.WD.01 & 1325.WD.02B, with the front half being an open car port on the boundary side. This open element allows daylight to pass through to our property from the shared boundary with No. 32, including light entering through our glazed front door and dining room window. This existing openness is an important component of the current light environment and contributes to the level of daylight enjoyed by our habitable rooms.

By incorrectly representing both the garage and car port as a solid built form, the site plan artificially reduces the apparent contrast between the existing situation and the

proposed development, thereby understating the true impact of the proposed two-storey dwelling at [REDACTED] The proposal would in reality introduce a new, continuous two-storey built mass in a location where there is currently openness, resulting in a materially greater loss of daylight than the drawings suggest.

In the interests of a fair and accurate assessment, I respectfully request that the submitted site plan be corrected to accurately reflect the existing garage and open car port, and that the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring residential amenity be re-evaluated on the basis of the true existing conditions.

For the reasons set out above, I request that planning permission be refused unless amended to address the identified harm to residential amenity.