

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 19/02/2025 11:10 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of White Post Lane Cobham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Change of Use of Land to form a Gypsy/Traveller site comprising the siting of 1 Mobile Home, 1 Touring Caravan, and 1 Dayroom.
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Nursery Road Meopham Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Dear Sir,

I am objecting to the use of the land in Whitepost Lane being developed as a traveller site.

The reasons that were valid twenty years ago are still valid now. The lane is too narrow and not designed for the increase in traffic that would be involved. The loss of the green belt and wildlife habitat is also to be avoided in such an unsuitable site.

I used to use the lane occasionally to walk my dog, being a quiet area I never had any problems. This has now changed to the extent that it is no longer safe to use it as a regular walking route. Not only is there a noticeable increase in traffic, the type of vehicle has also changed.

Instead of private vehicles, the travellers tend to have large vans and pick up trucks as they are running businesses from the sites. Also there are several new entrances along the lane, none of which have I seen any planning applications for. The blind bend on the hill to the East of Nurstead Church is a particular hazard, along with more blind corners further along the lane. An increase in the size and number of vehicles will make accidents inevitable.

Many local families would love to be able to afford property in the area, my own children included. However they have had to move elsewhere due to the house prices locally. This makes it totally unfair and immoral to allow people with absolutely no connection to the area to just ignore the planning regulations that apply to the rest of us. It is the worst kind of discrimination and by no stretch of the imagination is it local housing for local people.

This is in addition to the fact that allowing this application to go ahead would be rewarding illegality. The destruction of the mature trees and hedgerow in the lane by the travellers plus the clearing of about an acre of woodland from the actual

site without permission was and is against the law.

The original High Court Injunction against having caravans on the site should be rigidly enforced, otherwise history will keep on repeating itself and the ratepayers will continually be footing the bill.

The Injunction was obtained at a cost of tens of thousands of pounds if I remember correctly, and then someone naively allowed a "Security" caravan to be positioned there. It came as no surprise to anyone (except maybe the Council) when a bungalow appeared a few months later and the Council seem powerless to do anything about it. This was soon followed by another bungalow (they are not "mobile homes", once in position they do not move!) , along with several touring caravans and large areas being tarmaced over.

There is no reason for any sort of residential planning permission for this field. Any "Security" concerns are just invented by the travellers themselves. Having gone to the time and (ratepayers) expense to get the injunction in the first place, I hope the Council will now ensure it is enforced and refuse this application along with removing the "Security" caravan(s), the gates, walls and hardstandings and ensure the field is restored to its original condition as it was in about 2004.

Kind regards