

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 06/04/2025 5:21 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Furzy Lea Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent DA12 3LA
Proposal:	Retention of engineering and landscaping works with modifications and retention of gymnasium and summer house buildings with modifications.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Bowesden Lane Shorne Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I submit this objection in the strongest possible terms. The scale of unlawful development on this Green Belt site is outrageous. The applicant has demonstrated a persistent, intentional disregard for planning law, environmental protection, and community accountability. What has occurred is a textbook case of development by stealth. The applicant began major works while planning permission was still pending, continued after multiple refusals, and is now attempting to silence public opposition by submitting a householder application, knowing this limits third-party rights in any future appeal. This should not be tolerated under any circumstances. The works include significant engineering alterations to the land involving excavation, the removal of natural greenery and trees, and the construction of massive concrete retaining walls (approximately 2 metres high), all in a protected Green Belt area next to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). These hard landscaping works were not minor adjustments they have fundamentally altered the shape, appearance, and openness of the land, replacing a gently sloped garden with a multi-level concrete platform. This is a major intervention, entirely inconsistent with both the spirit and letter of local and national Green Belt policy. The building now referred to as a "gym" was not built lower, as claimed. This is a blatant falsehood. The land around it was excavated and the base was artificially raised on a concrete platform, increasing its visual impact and prominence. The architect's description of the gym being "dropped" into the ground is factually untrue and demonstrably misleading. Prior property listings and photographic records show the original slope of the garden. The council's own earlier report correctly noted that the bulk and scale of this development are wholly out of keeping with the character of the area and harmful to the landscape that assessment remains valid. Simultaneously, a second structure described as a "summer house" was constructed but it is anything but incidental. The original application falsely claimed it was timber-framed, but council photographs confirm it is built from solid brick, with a pitched roof, chimney, WC, kitchen, and living area. The
-----------	--

structure is within 2 metres of the boundary and exceeds the 2.5m height limit, breaching permitted development rights under Class E. The council rightly rejected this under the LDC route, stating it could not be considered incidental or subordinate to the main house. These facts have not changed.

What is worse, the applicant was seen physically moving the boundary fence after reading the previous refusal, presumably to try and mislead the planning authority into believing the outbuilding now complies. The latest application does not acknowledge this, nor does it provide accurate measurements or updated floor plans. These omissions are intentional and designed to obscure the truth. There is also strong local evidence including direct statements by the applicant that the "summer house" is being used or intended as a self-contained bungalow for a relative. This is not permitted development. This is a concealed attempt at residential intensification, and it must be treated as such.

The applicant has also extended their driveway significantly and constructed a second driveway using hard core, causing even more loss of greenery and openness again, without permission. The cumulative impact of these developments is staggering. The Green Belt designation exists to prevent exactly this kind of piecemeal erosion. Planting 389 trees in the future does not undo the environmental damage already done, nor should it be accepted as a bargaining chip for retrospective approval.

The use of a householder application in this case is a strategic abuse of process. It allows the applicant to shut out legitimate community voices at appeal. This is undemocratic and deliberate, and the council should reclassify this as a full planning application, given the scale and complexity of the unauthorised works. There has been no transparency, no compliance with policy, and no good faith shown at any stage.

In conclusion, I urge the council to see this application for what it is a calculated, dishonest, and harmful attempt to force through development that has already been found to be unacceptable. The works should be refused in full, followed by appropriate enforcement action and a full site inspection to verify boundary positions, building heights, and land levels. Any approval would send a message that unlawful development in the Green Belt can simply be normalised after the fact a precedent that must be avoided at all costs.

Kind regards