

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/01/2026 12:46 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	31 Manor Road Cobham Gravesend Kent DA13 9BW
Proposal:	Erection of a single self build detached dwelling, and summerhouse on land to the rear of numbers 29 & 31 Manor Road, Sole Street.
Case Officer:	Adeoye Lawal

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	Baker Close Sole Street Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I write to formally object to the resubmitted planning application at 31 Manor Road, Sole Street (Application No. 20251300).

This application follows the recent refusal of Application No. 20250199, which proposed two detached dwellings on the site. Although the current proposal reduces the number of dwellings to one, the overall scale, footprint and access arrangements remain materially similar. As such, the principal reasons for refusal identified by the Local Planning Authority continue to apply and have not been satisfactorily addressed.

The earlier application was refused following a site visit and detailed assessment by the Council's case officer. The officer concluded that the development was constrained by an inherently narrow access road between two existing residential dwellings, with no realistic scope for mitigation. It was found that this resulted in direct and unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity through noise, disturbance and odour from vehicular movements, and that the access was unsuitable in planning terms. The proposal was therefore considered contrary to Policy CS19 (Development and Design Principles) of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.

The current application does not overcome these findings. The access remains narrow, now further constrained by the introduction of acoustic fencing, and continues to run immediately adjacent to habitable room windows of neighbouring dwellings. This represents an unneighbourly form of development

and fails to demonstrate that acceptable living conditions can be maintained for existing residents, contrary to both local and national planning policy. In addition, the application relies heavily on the assumption that a driveway, hardstanding and garage accessed from Manor Road are existing features. This assumption is incorrect. These elements do not exist on site, yet they form the basis of the Design and Access Statement and underpin the overall acceptability of the scheme. The proposal is therefore founded on a misleading and factually inaccurate baseline, which undermines the robustness of the submitted assessment.

The reliance on the previously granted Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development (Application No. 20250941) is also of concern. That certificate now appears to be used as a mechanism to justify a substantial residential development which, when considered in the round, has significant amenity and access implications. The lawful use certificate does not negate the need for full planning consideration of these impacts, nor does it resolve the fundamental access constraints identified in the refusal of the earlier application.

The access arrangements also raise serious concerns in relation to emergency servicing. The width of the access is inadequate to accommodate emergency vehicles, and the presence of gated access further complicates matters. The provision of a fire hydrant within the site does not mitigate this issue, as the physical constraints of the access would still prevent a fire appliance from reaching the dwelling. This represents poor and unsustainable design and is inconsistent with the requirements of Policy CS19, which seeks safe, functional and inclusive development layouts.

do not object in principle to residential development within former garden land. However, the development benefits from a suitably wide access, appropriate separation distances, and an absence of overlooking or unacceptable proximity to neighbouring habitable rooms. The proposal at 31 Manor Road demonstrably fails to meet these standards.

The proposed dwelling is also excessive in scale relative to its context and would result in significant overlooking and overshadowing of neighbouring properties, particularly those in Baker Close. The proximity of the building to No. 1 Baker Close, at approximately 12 feet, would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy and residential amenity, further reinforcing conflict with Policy CS19 and the amenity objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

In summary, the application fails to address the reasons for refusal of the earlier scheme, is based on an inaccurate understanding of existing site conditions, and continues to rely on an unsuitable and unmitigable access arrangement. The proposal would result in material harm to the character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring residents and is contrary to adopted local plan policy and national planning guidance.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards