

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/06/2025 12:10 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	256 Singlewell Road Gravesend Kent DA11 7RE
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey front extension to an existing outbuilding with roof lights.
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Singlewell Road, Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I would very much appreciate your consideration of my concerns pertaining to planning proposal 20250557. I have added my comments below each relevant planning statement for your consideration. Planning statement 6.2 6.2 The Applicant has been misinformed by a previous Planning Agent in suggesting that the existing canopy is of temporary nature, so they believed they were well within their right to retain the canopy. Unfortunately, this is not the case, and the subject application seeks to resolve such issue with the erection of a single storey front extension to the building. The canopy is in the process of being removed at the time of this application. My comments: I refer to page 7 of GSPlanning.uk application 20250557 under the heading "Extension of outbuilding to enclose existing canopy" which reads: Ref. No: 20250152 Status: Application Refused on the basis the extension would be excessive in bulk and mass. Furthermore, the canopy has been erected unlawfully. I further refer to the "notification of refusal of permission to develop land (plan number 20250152)" which reads: "Your application dated 24th February 2025 is refused on the following grounds:- The proposed increase in depth of the built form along the northern boundary will result in a development out of scale and appearance with the surrounding properties and outbuildings therefore introducing a dominant building with a non-domestic appearance detrimental to the enjoyment of the gardens of neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 and para. 135f of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024". "The applicant is reminded that the existing canopy on the building does not have planning permission and therefore should be remove"
-----------	---

The resolving of "the temporary nature of the canopy necessitates the complete removal of the temporary structure.

Planning statement 6.6

6.6 Furthermore, the Householder Extension SPD makes clear that outbuildings should: - not deprive the existing property of adequate private garden space. - be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling. - not detract from the character of the area. - not have an adverse impact on the amenity.

My comments:

The aggregate affect of the addition of yet another outbuilding, will not be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling and will detract from the character of the area and will have an adverse impact on the amenity. Please reference again to the "notification of refusal of permission to develop land (plan number 20250152) (quoted above in my comments beneath planning statement 6.2)

Planning statement 6.8

6.8 Furthermore, the building is considered to be subordinate to the existing dwelling which has been established as part of the previous approvals for the outbuilding.

My comments:

My understanding is that the Gravesham planning department granted temporary permission on 03/12/2021 for planning application 20211246 (to effect a business from his garden). This appears to have morphed into full permission without any public consultation.

My concern is that this current planning request will lead to a further expansion of this business in our residential area. Ref planning application 20250547.

I agree with Planning department's previous comments (20250152) which still stand true and are further exacerbated when the aggregate outbuildings plot size (the total of all outbuilding developments along the boundary) is considered.

Planning statement 6.10

6.10 Finally, the proposed extension will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties. This is further detailed in a later section of the statement.

My comments:

I believe it will adversely impact the direct neighbours. That is why it was declined in planning application 20250152.

Planning statement 6.11

6.11 Overall, previous extensions to the outbuilding have been accepted by GBC and it is respectfully requested that this extension is viewed in a similar manner by the Officer as it is not considered to be contrary to any of the guidance provided by GBC in relation to outbuildings.

My comments:

- 1) Only "one years temporary permission was granted" (Dec 2021) to run a business.
- 2) The existing canopy structure was also meant to be of temporary nature".

To my knowledge GBC have not accepted or granted permanent usage or permission for another permanent outbuilding. How could they without public consultation.

Planning statement 6.12

6.12 As previously mentioned, the front extension has been designed to respond to the reasons for refusal in 20250152. The Officer made clear that the size and character would be out of keeping with the domestic scale of the area.

My comments:

If the "existing canopy is of a temporary nature" and should be removed, it should

not be replaced with an even bigger permanent building !

Planning statement 6.26

6.26 In relation to overshadowing, the proposed extension is smaller than that of what was refused in 20250152 and therefore is considered to have less impact on daylight than the original proposal.

My comments:

An acknowledgement that daylight will be impacted is not good enough. This will adversely affect the neighbourhood.

Planning statement 6.27

6.27 The same principle applies to 258 Singlewell Road as the proposal would be on the opposite side of the garden to the dwelling and therefore would have no impact on privacy, daylight or outlook.

My comments:

Another admission is given, that "privacy, daylight and outlook" will be adversely impacted for the neighbour on the same side of the garden to the dwelling.

Planning statement 6.28

6.28 The main concern which was highlighted as part of 20250152 was that 248 would experience a significant level of built form along their shared boundary with the subject site.

My comments:

I agree with Planning department's previous comments (20250152) which still stand true and are further exacerbated when the aggregate outbuildings plot size (the total of all outbuilding developments along the boundary) is considered.

Planning statement 6.29

6.29 In order to combat this, the proposed extension has been reduced in height from 3.8m to 3.08m as well as the materials being changed to be of a similar design to a conservatory to reduce the amount of hard development along the boundary.

My comments:

This will not reduce the length of the aggregate buildings plot size. Too big overall for the residential neighbourhood.

Planning statement 6.30

6.30 Overall, it is considered that the proposed front extension will not result in any harm to neighbouring amenity which was established in 20250152 for a larger extension. The proposal has addressed potential causes for concern and therefore adheres to Policy CS19 of the CS.

My comments:

This will not reduce the length of the aggregate buildings plot size. That is why it was declined in planning application 20250152. Too big overall for the residential neighbourhood.

Planning statement 7.4

7.4 In consideration of all relevant Development Plan Policies and material considerations, this application should be viewed positively by the Authority, and it is respectfully requested that this submission is approved.

My comments:

The proposal has already been declined in planning application 20250152. This application (20250557) does not address the material reasons for the previous refusal of permission. Garden space is not infinite, new developments must be of an appropriate scale for the neighbourhood and the associated interests of neighbours must be protected.

In consideration of the aggregate affect of another building appended to the existing outbuildings and the negative affect to the neighbourhood interests, I respectfully request that this submission is declined.

Kind regards