

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/10/2025 6:08 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 objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I have strong objections to the works ongoing at site.

Our primary concern is that this retrospective application for an outbuilding at the rear of the garden completely disregards the site's full planning history. The applicant has a pattern of continually trying to reintroduce elements that were previously refused, showing a clear disrespect for the planning process. The current structure was built without authorisation and was explicitly excluded from the initially approved plans, which required retaining green space to gain consent. Granting retrospective approval for this now-unauthorised structure would reward this non-compliant behaviour and undermine public confidence in the council's planning decisions. The site was purchased, never lived in by the now owners and always had the agenda of creating this huge outbuilding / arguably another dwelling with water and electrics hooked up!

We object to this retrospective application for several specific reasons. The outbuilding, at its proposed 4m height is built extremely close to boundaries, is visually overbearing and dominant, negatively impacting our outlook and privacy.

The applicant has also removed all natural green buffers, leaving a stark, hard-edged structure with no mitigating landscaping. Crucially, we believe the submitted drawings contain false and misleading representations of proximity to boundaries. The outbuilding has been built unlawfully and significantly closer to the boundaries than indicated in previous accepted plans, with drawings now showing distances as close as 1.5 metres in parts, which we believe is an intentional deviation and disregard.

We ask the council to verify these distances on-site and see for themselves.

For these reasons, the application should be refused outright, or the height should be restricted to a maximum of 2.5 metres to minimise the harmful impact. It feels the applicants just want to force this through and the fact brick and mortar are now down feel they have the upper hand.

Kind regards