

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/07/2026 12:38 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 27 Edwin Street Gravesend Kent

Proposal: Retention of rear outbuilding

Case Officer: Adeoye Lawal

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED] Parrock Street, Gravesend, Kent Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I write on behalf of [REDACTED] neighbouring premises, to formally object to the retrospective planning application for the retention of the rear outbuilding at 27 Edwin Street.

Unauthorised Development

This building was constructed without planning permission. During construction it was reported to Gravesham Borough Council's Planning Enforcement Team with photographic evidence. The Council had the opportunity to investigate the breach and take enforcement action before completion but unfortunately took no action, allowing the unauthorised structure to be fully built.

Whilst retrospective applications are permitted, completion of the building should not justify its retention. The application must be determined solely on its planning merits.

Private Access Rights

The outbuilding has no direct frontage or independent access from Edwin Street and relies entirely on the narrow rear alley. The alley is a private accessway, not a public highway. Title deeds grant access rights to only four adjoining properties and it was never intended to serve an additional standalone building.

Allowing this development would fundamentally alter the character and intensity of use of the private accessway by introducing a building wholly dependent on it for access, occupation, servicing and maintenance.

Security Concerns

Increased reliance on this private alley raises significant security concerns for neighbouring occupiers. The alley is extremely narrow, enclosed and runs adjacent to our office premises. Increased pedestrian movements would create additional opportunities for unauthorised access, anti-social behaviour and compromise the security of neighbouring commercial premises. This represents a material deterioration in security and amenity for neighbouring occupiers.

Fire Safety and Emergency Access

We have serious concerns regarding fire safety and emergency access. The outbuilding has no direct access from the public highway and relies wholly on the narrow private alley. Given its restricted width, we question whether appropriate emergency access can be achieved in the event of fire, medical emergency or other incident.

These concerns are not speculative. Kent Fire and Rescue Service has previously assessed access arrangements for development at our neighbouring premises, showing emergency access is an established issue in this location. We respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority consult Kent Fire and Rescue Service before determining the application to ensure suitable emergency access arrangements exist and that the building would not prejudice the safety of its occupants or neighbours.

Intensification of Use

The proposal represents an inappropriate intensification of use in a constrained backland location. A building wholly dependent on a narrow private alley introduces additional movements, servicing and activity never envisaged for the access arrangements. This places extra pressure on the restricted route and adversely affects neighbours through increased activity, reduced security and loss of amenity.

Retrospective Nature of the Application

Although retrospective applications are lawful, granting permission after unauthorised development risks undermining confidence in the planning system. Developments should not be built first and permission sought afterwards. Each application must be assessed objectively against planning policy regardless of construction status.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, the proposal is an unacceptable form of backland development that:

- was constructed without planning permission;
 - was reported to Enforcement during construction with no action taken;
 - relies entirely on a narrow private accessway intended for only four properties;
 - causes unacceptable intensification of that access;
 - gives rise to significant security concerns;
 - raises serious fire safety and emergency access issues; and
- adversely affects the amenity of neighbouring premises.

We respectfully request that Gravesham Borough Council refuses retrospective planning permission for this unauthorised outbuilding.

Should the Council be minded to approve, we request it first consults Kent Fire and Rescue Service and other relevant consultees to confirm the access arrangements are suitable, lawful and provide safe emergency access and

evacuation for all. We also request full consideration of the private nature of the rear accessway and the limited rights benefiting lawful users.

Kind regards