

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/10/2025 5:50 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	232 Singlewell Road Gravesend Kent DA11 7RE
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the retention of the existing outbuilding.
Case Officer:	Mrs Sharon Sahota

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to object to the retrospective planning application for the outbuilding at 232 Singlewell Road. This application must be viewed in the context of the site's full planning history. The applicant's repeated changes to the approved plans, and their ongoing attempts to reintroduce previously rejected elements, demonstrate a clear disregard for the planning process. Originally, a large outbuilding formed part of a proposal that was refused numerous times due to its excessive scale, overbearing nature, and negative impact on neighbouring amenity. It was later removed from the approved scheme, which retained green space to the front and rear in order to gain planning consent. Despite this, the applicant has since constructed an outbuilding, in breach of lawful development certificate, and is now seeking retrospective approval for a structure that was specifically excluded from the initial approved plans. The retrospective application should be refused for the following reasons: Overbearing and Dominant Impact The outbuilding, planned to be 4m in height and positioned extremely close to the boundary, is visually imposing and overbearing. It negatively affects the outlook and privacy of neighbouring gardens which we also believe will impact the value of their property. Loss of Green Buffer All greenery between the boundary fence and the outbuilding has been removed, which would have provided natural barrier between the properties. Given the minimal remaining space, there is no realistic opportunity to plant trees or large shrubs to soften the visual impact. The result is a stark, hard-edged structure with no landscaping mitigation which would completely dominate the eye line. False and Misleading Representation of Proximity to Boundaries The outbuilding, in the current state, has been built unlawfully, significantly closer
-----------	--

to the boundaries than shown in the previously accepted lawful development certificate. That certificate indicated distances of approximately 2.3 metres from side boundaries and 2.03-4.02 metres from the rear boundary. The current retrospective drawings now show only 1.8 metres on one side, 5.1 metres on the other, and 1.5-2.3 metres from the rear boundary-a substantial and unexplained deviation. To place the outbuilding more than 2m in different position than in drawings, in various places, cannot be considered as simple mistake. It would imply to be an intentional decision.

Furthermore, in the planning permission the measurements from the end of pitched roof will be between 1.5-2.3m from the back boundary. Firstly, this is already too close to the boundary for such a tall building. Secondly, I would also ask the council to check these distances on site, as I believe the submitted plans are yet again incorrect. It appears that the brick wall is already closer than 1.5m in parts to some of the boundaries, therefore the planning application does not reflect the true position of the outbuilding, because once the pitched roof is added, it will almost overhang the boundary of the neighbours.

Disregard for Planning Conditions and Decisions

The applicant has repeatedly sought to introduce elements of previously refused schemes through incremental and misleading applications, including this unauthorised outbuilding. Even when they had permissions granted, they have repeatedly not stuck to the agreed plans, hence this new planning applications has been submitted. And even now, the drawings submitted do not reflect the true state. This shows utter disrespect to the council and local community. Granting retrospective permission would reward this behaviour and undermine confidence in the council's planning process.

Cumulative Overdevelopment

Together with the previously approved house and the hard landscaping to the front, this outbuilding contributes to a level of overdevelopment that erodes the site's character and harms neighbouring amenity.

Conclusion

The outbuilding is contrary to the principles and conditions that underpinned the approved development. Its scale, proximity to the boundaries, and removal of green space make it unacceptable in both design and impact. Approving this retrospective application would legitimise unauthorised works and set a damaging precedent for others to bypass planning controls.

Given these concerns, and particularly the outbuilding's proximity to the boundary, I believe it would only be fair to neighbouring residents and would uphold respect for the council's previous decisions if this application were refused outright, or if the height of the outbuilding were restricted to no more than 2.5 metres to minimise its overbearing impact.

Kind regards