

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/09/2025 12:08 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of White Post Lane White Post Lane Cobham Gravesend Kent DA13 9AX
Proposal:	Change of use of the land for the stationing of 8 mobile homes for gypsy and traveller use, erection of associated day rooms, soft landscaping and laying of hardstanding (part retrospective).
Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Longfield Road Meopham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Dear Sir or Madam, I write to formally object to the above application. My objection is based on material planning considerations and relevant national and local policy frameworks that the Council must consider. _____ 1) Conflict with Gravesham's Local Plan & Countryside Protection - The proposal is inconsistent with the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (Policy CS02 & CS19), which seeks to protect the rural character of areas like Cobham and restrict inappropriate development outside settlement boundaries. - The site is undeveloped countryside. Approving 8 mobile homes plus associated hardstanding would erode openness and alter the character of this landscape. _____ 2) Non-Compliance with National Planning Policy (NPPF) - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023), Paragraphs 149-152, establishes a strong presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances exist. - The applicant has not demonstrated such circumstances, nor proven that alternative, allocated or previously developed sites are unavailable. - Paragraph 174 of the NPPF also requires councils to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and to refuse applications that would cause lasting harm. _____
-----------	---

3) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)

Under the PPTS (DCLG, 2015), which carries statutory weight:

- Policy B states that Traveller sites should respect the scale and character of the area and avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure.
 - Policy H warns councils against approving sites that dominate the nearest settled community or harm the local environment.
- This application fails both tests.
-

4) Housing Need and the Gravesham GTAA

- The Council's Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies the local pitch requirement and existing provision.
 - Eight additional pitches here would exceed the identified shortfall, creating overconcentration in a single rural location rather than following a balanced distribution approach across the borough.
-

5) Highway Safety and Access (NPPF, Section 9)

- White Post Lane is narrow, with poor visibility and limited capacity for increased large-vehicle traffic.
 - NPPF Paragraph 111 allows refusal where development would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
 - No adequate transport statement, swept-path analysis, or risk mitigation has been submitted.
-

6) Infrastructure, Drainage and Services Capacity

- No clear evidence has been provided regarding foul drainage, sustainable surface water management, or connection to mains utilities.
 - Under NPPF Paragraph 105, planning authorities must ensure that development does not place unacceptable strain on local services including GPs, schools, and utilities.
-

7) Environmental and Biodiversity Impact

- The Environment Act 2021 mandates a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for new developments.
 - No baseline habitat assessment or biodiversity strategy has been submitted, meaning the application fails compliance.
-

8) Part-Retrospective Nature & Enforcement Concerns

- Granting permission for works already carried out undermines effective planning control.
 - The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 171A) gives local authorities enforcement powers to prevent unauthorised development. Approving this would weaken those protections and encourage further retrospective applications.
-

9) Cumulative Impact and Precedent

- Allowing this scale of development risks setting a dangerous precedent for similar proposals along rural lanes near Cobham.
 - NPPF Paragraph 120 supports refusal where cumulative impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits.
-

Conclusion

This proposal conflicts with the Gravesham Local Plan, the NPPF, the PPTS, and obligations under the Environment Act 2021. It would harm the openness of the countryside, place unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure, and undermine

the settled character of Cobham.

I respectfully urge the Council to refuse planning permission on these grounds.

Yours faithfully,



Key Legislation & Policies Cited

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) - Paragraphs 105, 111, 120, 149-152, 174
 - Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS, 2015) - Policies B & H
 - Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy - Policies CS02, CS19
 - Environment Act 2021 - Biodiversity Net Gain
 - Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 171A - Enforcement powers
-

Kind regards