

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 5:29 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:	The harm caused by these unauthorised developments is not just physical it is procedural, social, and environmental. The applicant has repeatedly shown contempt for the planning process, and the community is now expected to simply accept the damage done because "it's already built." That cannot be allowed. The applicant's architects have now invoked the December 2024 revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), attempting to justify this development by citing the new wording around previously developed land. This is both misleading and irrelevant. Firstly, the garden area in question is not previously developed land under the NPPF. It was undeveloped Green Belt garden space, not brownfield land or a former industrial site. Secondly, the revised policy still requires that development must not cause substantial harm to openness. In this case, the works have not only harmed openness they have obliterated it. The claim that this development contributes to a "strong, responsive, and competitive economy" is frankly absurd. There is no reasonable basis for asserting that a private gym and a so-called "summer house for entertaining" deliver economic productivity. This is a personal project for private benefit it does not generate employment, infrastructure, or public use. To attempt to justify this under national policy aimed at infrastructure and housing delivery is a gross misrepresentation. The proposal to plant 389 trees is also being used as an attempted distraction. Where is the detailed landscaping plan? Where is the commitment to ongoing care and maintenance? There is no guarantee this will happen, nor is there any way to enforce it once planning permission is granted. Tree planting, no matter how numerous, does not mitigate the unlawful construction, ecological loss, or landscape scarring that has already occurred. The applicant has proven repeatedly that they do not follow through on planning conditions and cannot be trusted to do so in the future. The omission of internal floor plans from this application is deeply alarming. In
-----------	--

earlier submissions, the internal layout of the "summer house" clearly indicated it was a fully habitable space. To now submit new plans without any floor plans is a deliberate strategy to obscure the building's intended use. It is a calculated effort to reduce scrutiny. Given the owner's track record and the fact he has been openly referring to this structure as a "bungalow" there is no doubt in the minds of many local residents that this is intended to be a self-contained residential dwelling, not an incidental outbuilding.

The impact on the community has been severe. Nearly every neighbouring property has raised objections. The Parish Council and Gravesham Borough Council have previously refused these developments. The applicant has not engaged with neighbours in good faith instead, he has been confrontational, evasive, and, in several instances aggressive. Local confidence in the integrity of the process has been eroded. Residents feel helpless as significant, irreversible changes to a protected landscape are carried out without warning, with enforcement only happening long after the damage is done.

This is not an isolated or accidental breach it is part of a sustained pattern of misconduct. The applicant has built without permission, altered boundary lines after refusals, submitted misleading documents, and continued to carry out work during the planning process. That conduct should be taken into account as a material consideration when assessing this application. Planning is about more than buildings it is about fairness, public trust, and the rule of law.

I urge the council to take the following actions without delay. First, this application must be refused in full. Second, it must be reclassified as a full planning application, given its scope and complexity. Third, the council must conduct a site visit to verify the true boundary positions, building heights, internal layout, and all works carried out. Fourth, enforcement action should be seriously considered not just for the original breaches, but for the ongoing attempts to mislead and manipulate the process.

There is no reasonable justification for allowing these developments to be retrospectively approved. The applicant's behaviour throughout has been calculated and disrespectful to policy, people, and place. To approve this application would reward unlawful behaviour, damage the credibility of planning enforcement, and set a precedent that Green Belt protection can be ignored if a structure is built fast enough.

The planning system must not be hijacked by those who believe they are above it. I call on the Council to stand by its earlier findings, defend the Green Belt, uphold the rights of the local community, and take robust action to prevent this type of manipulation from being repeated.

Kind regards