

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/01/2026 4:01 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	31 Manor Road Cobham Gravesend Kent DA13 9BW
Proposal:	Erection of a single self build detached dwelling, and summerhouse on land to the rear of numbers 29 & 31 Manor Road, Sole Street.
Case Officer:	Adeoye Lawal

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Baker Close Sole Street Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I am writing to object to the proposed development at 31 Manor Road App No. 20251300. I am disappointed that this has been resubmitted following the rejection of the last application, which was for 2 detached dwellings App No. 20250199, this application is for 1 detached dwelling covering almost the same area as the 2 detached dwellings, so not sure what the difference is. All the problems and concerns are exactly the same, as was highlighted by your planning officer, Ethan Bonthron following his visit on 29th May 2025, and in his summing up of the rejection he said: 'The applicant put forward an option to reduce the number of dwellings and remove the chimney stack on no. 31 Manor Road to increase the width of the access. These changes were considered by the Local Planning Authority but were not found to statutorily mitigate the impact and the access is unsuitable. As such, the proposed development is contrary to local or national planning policy requirements, and the application cannot be supported'. He went on to say: The application has been fully considered and is contrary to local and national planning policy. The development is constrained by a narrow access road between 2 existing residential dwellings, with no scope for mitigation and a resultant direct impact on habitable rooms through noise disturbance and odour from passing vehicles accessing the proposed dwellings. Therefore, the proposal is an unneighbourly form of development, harmful to amenity by virtue of the unsuitable access road and contrary to Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) as well as Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). Therefore, it is recommended that planning permission is refused. As per the

Design and Access Statement submitted by DAC Architects, dated 22nd December 2025, we understand that an application was submitted for a Certificate of Proposed Lawful Use or Development for the: Erection of a garage and creation of a driveway - App No. 20250941. Let me highlight some of the glaring errors in this application for you, the first being that the assumption made is that the driveway, hardstanding and garage are existing. This is not the case. Neither the garage nor the driveway exist, and when I saw this application initially, I was surprised why No 31 required a new drive and garage when they have extensive driveway parking and garage facilities at the front of their house. It then became clear that this was a precursor to a new application, to build an enormous house attached to said non-existent garage!! Please can GBC advise on what basis this application was approved, as it forms the basis of the application to build this enormous house! As your officer said above, the width of the driveway is much too narrow to accommodate emergency vehicles (and in this application made narrower by the addition of acoustic fencing on both sides), and it does not alter the windows of both houses that are situated on, and open onto that driveway. I see the provision of a fire hydrant on site?

Firstly, any gated access has to have a "Fire Key" to enable access - this is still a gated access but too narrow for a fire engine, so how are the service personnel supposed to access if there is no-one to let them in to use the hydrant?

Secondly, and as highlighted in my last letter of objection, the occupiers of 31 Manor Road do not maintain their property very well. Fences falling down, overgrown and dead trees etc.

I live in the development [REDACTED] that was also formed in what were once back gardens, so, I have no objection to the principle of building in back gardens, but there needs to be the room to do so! None of the houses in our development overlook either each other or our immediate neighbours in Manor Road. We also have a wide gated access (with a fire key), which again is not overlooked or runs sufficiently close to a neighbour as to cause problems with fumes etc. In my opinion, this application is an attempt to get this exceptionally large house through planning by the back door, and I hope that your planning officer realises this. None of the objections that were raised by GBC Delegated Report, dated 26th August 2025, Case Officer Ethan Bonthron following his site visit on 29th May 2025 have been addressed, and still apply here. As stated above, this application is based on the presumption that the driveway and garage actually exist, which they do not, so it is very misleading and factually incorrect. To conclude, I object very strongly to this development for the reasons that I have highlighted above - ultimately it is an unneighbourly form of development with a very narrow, unsuitable access. I would like to remind GBC that I and other residents of Baker Close, have the legal right to peace, comfort and privacy. We feel that a development of this scale so close to our properties will undoubtedly infringe this legal right.

Kind regards