

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/10/2025 1:34 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	80 Cross Lane East Gravesend Kent DA12 5HB
Proposal:	Retrospective application for retention of a single-storey timber outbuilding in the rear garden.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[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:	Although building regulations are separate from the planning system, they are highly relevant in this case given that the existing structure fails to comply with basic fire safety requirements. This raises serious concerns about the safety, usability, and overall suitability of the development. The planning system should not endorse or regularise a scheme that presents a clear risk to occupants or neighbouring properties. Granting retrospective approval in such circumstances would set a concerning precedent and conflict with planning policies aimed at ensuring safe and sustainable development. Furthermore, any structure - such as a log cabin - that is constructed using predominantly combustible materials and has an internal floor area exceeding 15 square metres must be sited at least 1 metre from any third-party boundary. This requirement, derived from Part B of the Building Regulations (Fire Safety), is in place to limit the risk of fire spreading between properties. In this case, the development breaches this minimum separation distance - the closest point of the structure being 0.4m away from the boundary fence (not the distance stated on the application), posing an unacceptable fire risk to neighbouring land and buildings. The failure to maintain this critical buffer further highlights the unsuitability of the structure in planning and safety terms, and reinforces the case for refusing retrospective permission. To achieve an acceptable level of fire safety, the position of the log cabin would need to be revised to meet the legal minimum 1 metre separation distance from the boundary, or alternatively, the external walls would need to meet Class 0 fire resistance standards. This can sometimes be achieved through the use of certified fire-resistant cladding or surface treatments specifically designed to reduce combustibility, both of which would result in a significantly different development to that shown in submitted plans. However, such measures do not appear to be proposed in the current application, and without them, the development remains non-compliant with essential fire safety principles and is unsuitable for approval in its present form.
-----------	---

In addition, the log cabin is understood to have its own independent heating and

cooling system in place, which makes compliance with Part L of the Building Regulations - Conservation of Fuel and Power - even more critical. Where a standalone structure is intended for regular, climate-controlled use, it must meet the required thermal performance standards, including adequate insulation in the roof, floor, walls, and glazing. These measures are essential to ensure the building operates efficiently and does not result in excessive energy consumption. No evidence has been provided to confirm that the cabin meets these standards. Without this, the development falls short of basic sustainability expectations and adds to the case for refusing retrospective permission.

Compliance with Part N of the Building Regulations is also relevant, as it requires safety glazing in doors, side panels, and windows below 800mm from floor level. There is no evidence this has been provided, which raises further concerns about occupant safety and the building's overall compliance.

Kind regards