

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/06/2025 3:12 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Garage Site Adjacent To 33 Empress Road Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Erection of a new residential building comprising of 5x 1 bed flats, 4x 2 bed flats and 1x 3 bed flats contained within a terraced style block.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Lower Range Road Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>The application form (PP-13892850) the applicant has significant errors. "Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site? And/or: Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character?" No.</p> <p>Incorrect. There are a number of tall sycamore trees (6/7, 10m estimate) at the rear of the property as well as bushes and undergrowth that would require removal to reach the rear boundary of the development.</p> <p>Not only are these important to the local landscaping (they screen the houses in Lower Range Road from the view of the current flats) and a refuge for wildlife, but failing to declare them is an unforgivable oversight. The developers/surveyors could hardly not notice them, so they must have intentionally been left off the application in order to gain approval.</p> <p>In the submitted 'Design and access statement', the applicant states "There are residential properties to the rear (south-east) of the site as well, separated by a distance and by gardens; by keeping the new block's footprint relatively compact and central to the site, the design maintains reasonable separation so that those rear properties will continue to receive ample daylight and not experience undue overshadowing of their gardens." Construction of a huge wall topped with a tall fence 1.5m from gardens in Lower Range Road WILL NOT allow us 'ample' daylight and WILL cause undue overshadowing.</p> <p>There are tall trees currently, but they allow ample light, especially in Winter, when there is no foliage. A tall wall topped with a fence would not.</p> <p>Furthermore they state: "The majority of windows are on the front (toward the street) and rear (over the site's own area), which are directions that pose minimal privacy concerns." The rear windows are NOT just over the site's own area - they overlook OUR properties and are not distant from them. This is clearly misleading.</p>

Similarly, "the proposal ensures that no undue overlooking or loss of privacy will occur to existing residents" - this is nonsense, even by their own document "primary living room windows are oriented to the front or rear, whereas any side-facing elements are kept to secondary spaces, further reducing potential overlooking." If the primary living rooms are at the rear of the property, they will be looking directly into and down on ours.

The document further claims: "the relationship of the new building with its surroundings has been designed to be comfortable and proportional, such that it will not be overbearing or unduly dominate the outlook from nearby dwellings." As the top floor will effectively be 5 storeys above ground level from OUR rear ground floors, the building WILL DOMINATE our outlook.

The same document also states "the site access was scrutinised to avoid headlights shining into neighbours' windows at night – the alignment is such that headlights will primarily shine down the access within the site or onto Empress Road, not directly into adjacent houses." This is not correct - WE are [REDACTED] The headlights from vehicles will face directly into the top rear floor windows of residents.

Regarding the communal area of the property - "will be used by residents for passive recreation; these are not expected to generate significant noise, but their presence in the rear also means that any late-night gatherings would be effectively self-policed by the residents (who have a stake in keeping noise reasonable)."

I fail to see what the evidence is that the residents would be any more likely to 'self-police' than any other citizens. The planners also fail to specify what 'self-policing' actually means, or 'passive recreation'. Are residents expected to kindly ask other residents to be respectful and keep noise down on our behalf? Who is responsible? What recourse do we - non-residents - have if there is a noise problem if the 'self-policing' doesn't work to our satisfaction?

"Specifically, overshadowing and overbearing effects have been avoided through sensitive scaling and siting; overlooking has been mitigated via thoughtful orientation and screening; and noise/disturbance will be negligible with the planned safeguards." Even a cursory glance at the received objections show these are a major concern to local residents. How does this align with the developer's statement: "The layout and form mitigate potential negative impacts, ensuring no undue harm to the privacy, light, or tranquility of adjoining properties. This careful balancing of development needs with neighbourly respect reflects good planning practice" How does a 2m boundary fence mitigate the sight of a 3 storey block of flats, or a car park and outdoor social area adjacent to our bedrooms?

The application makes no mention or brushes over any overlooking, privacy, light and noise issues for residents of Lower Range Road. It is also factually incorrect, and should be denied.

Kind regards