

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/11/2025 7:39 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	42 Cambria Crescent Gravesend Kent DA12 4NH
Proposal:	Retention of outbuilding containing shower room, WC, Kitchen, Office and Gym.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lucy Hankin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] GRAVESEND

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

My first objection rejected- so I have resubmitted. The server didnt work?? I submit this objection in the strongest possible terms.

My original support for the outbuilding was based solely on an application describing a simple, incidental gym/outbuilding with clearly specified materials and finishes. What has been constructed bears no resemblance to the approved drawings and represents a significant departure from what was presented to both myself and the planning authority. I agreed to a brick-faced structure, not the poorly rendered exterior now in place, and certainly not a building containing a WC, kitchen, or services that were not shown during consultation. Have the installations been inspected via building control?? Have utilities companies i.e water board been consulted for connections; as is a requirement??

I am also unsure of the foul waste and water from the "kitchenette" , shower & WC being connected correctly unless they have been inspected by building control. But as the applicants stated they didn't apply for a kitchen I am most concerned that these alterations have not been quality inspected.

The applicant has not adhered to the approved plans, including external appearance, internal layout, and stated purpose. The installation of a WC, kitchen facilities, plumbing, and drainage-none of which were indicated or approved-represents a clear and material breach of the planning permission. These additions remove any reasonable claim that the structure is incidental and instead render it suitable for independent occupation, which was never applied for or approved.

The applicants state on the supplementary statement that "family members" could freshen up and that "meal preparation for the applicant's family" would be in the outbuilding. They already have a fully contained annex in the garage that contains a shower and WC alongside a kitchenette. I therefore do not understand the urgency in which to add an ADDITIONAL shower and kitchen area.

As for comment on other applicants in the vicinity, Number 34 applied correctly and adhered to their plans, whilst I cannot see Number [REDACTED] having applied for a Permitted Development Certificate for their outbuilding, as it is not on the Gravesham Planning Portal. I therefore leave the council to see if this is built correctly and within Permitted Development rights. Also people have been living in number [REDACTED] outbuilding.

As the applicants are Directors of a property investment company, surely they

would know what permissions would be required?

Indeed [REDACTED] when challenged by my husband, said he had no intentions to let the building "at this point in time". When further challenged about the renter in the garage he said my husband had given him "his blessing" to have someone live in their garage. THIS IS UNTRUE. He also said no one was living in there and at the time of the conversation that was a lie because the lady was living in there and we saw her every day with various others coming and going at night. The garage annex was advertised on the internet for £600 per month.

[REDACTED] I
CANNOT AND WILL NOT support this application.

Kind regards