
SUMMARY REPORT

Application Ref:	20250557
Site Address:	256 Singlewell Road Gravesend Kent DA11 7RE
Application Description:	Erection of a single storey front extension to an existing outbuilding with roof lights.
Applicant:	Mr Munvinder Dhariwal
Agent:	Mr Ollie Neary, Graham Simpkin Planning Ltd
Ward:	Woodlands
Parish:	Non-Parish Area
Decision due date:	31 July 2025
Publicity expiry date:	30 June 2025
Decision Level:	Planning Committee
Reason for referral:	Councillor Call-in
Recommendation:	Refusal

Summary of Reasons for Recommendations

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.

MAIN REPORT

1. Members' Site Inspection

- 1.1 The application was reported to Planning Committee on 12th November 2025, when it was deferred for a site inspection. Members visited the site on Saturday 29th November 2025.

Present

Richard Hart (Team Leader, Development Management)
Paul Nicholls (Planning Agent, Graham Simpkin Planning)

Cllr Lee Croxton (Planning Committee Chair)
Cllr Narinderjit Singh Thandi (Planning Committee Vice Chair)
Cllr Lyn Milner (Planning Committee Member)
Cllr Gurdip Bungar (Planning Committee Member)

Cllr Frank Wardle (Planning Committee Member)
Cllr Leslie Pearton (Planning Committee Member)
Cllr Samir Jassal (Planning Committee Member)

Cllr Benjamin Sizer (Ward Councillor)
Cllr David Beattie (Ward Councillor)

Apologies received from:

Cllr Aaron Elliott (Planning Committee Member)
Cllr Peter Scollard (Planning Committee Member)

- 1.2 Cllr Croxton opened the meeting and asked Mr Hart to summarise the issues of the proposed development. Mr Hart outlined the issues raised within 12th November 2025 Planning Committee Report.
- 1.3 Members then moved to the rear of the property and inspected the area subject to the planning application. Mr Hart reminded Members that the canopy cannot be taken into account as it does not have the benefit of planning permission.
- 1.4 Various Members asked for clarification on the size of the proposed development. Mr Hart directed Members to the committee report and confirmed that the dimensions of the development are set out in 3.1 of the report. He confirmed those dimensions are 7.2m deep, 5.5m wide with a height of 3.08m. To aid Members Mr Hart produced a copy of the plans which were circulated to those present at the meeting.
- 1.5 Mr Nicholls confirmed to Members that the eaves height of the development is 2.45m.
- 1.6 Cllr Milner and Cllr Wardle asked for clarification on how the existing building would be entered. Mr Hart explained that the existing building would be accessed by removing a window on the southern elevation and replacing it with a door.
- 1.7 Cllr Croxton asked how the building would be used and Mr Hart explained it would be used as a garden room for existing occupiers and would not be linked to the commercial gym. Mr Hart explained that if Members were minded to approve the development, the use could be conditioned.
- 1.8 Cllr Jassal asked about various outbuildings and extensions in the surrounding area and if these should be taken into account. Mr Hart explained that he did not have the planning history available of surrounding properties and reminded Members they can only consider the application before them.
- 1.9 Cllr Pearton asked if Human Rights were applicable to this development and Mr Hart confirmed they did apply and advised Members this is set out in 6.12 of the committee report.
- 1.10 Cllr Jassal asked what the impact of the development would be on the adjacent property to the north and Mr Hart explained there would be no adverse impact on any surrounding properties and directed Members to the neighbouring amenity section of the committee report.
- 1.11 For clarity Mr Hart read out the grounds of refusal as set out in committee report which explained to the Members why officers recommended that the application be refused.
- 1.12 The planning agent Mr Nicholls pointed out to Members that the fence along the north boundary is less than the permitted development height of 2m and this proposed

development is 0.4m higher (to the eaves) than the maximum height a fence can be constructed under permitted development.

- 1.13 Mr Hart advised Members that the above was correct, but notwithstanding this it is the view of officers that the development as proposed is out of keeping with the character of the area and represents over development of the site.
- 1.14 Members had no further questions and Cllr Croxton thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

Recommendation

Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

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.