

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/12/2025 1:19 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of White Post Lane Cobham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Part retrospective change of use of land to Gypsy/Traveller site comprising 2 individual pitches with the siting of a total of 3 Mobile Homes, 2 Touring Caravans, and 2 Dayrooms.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[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: I object to this application.

The previous application that this one refers to (20241164) was initially rejected, then allowed on appeal under very specific circumstances.

This application appears to make the case that the application granted on appeal was erroneous, in that it was made for the wrong site. The Inspector raised concerns about whether the correct site being considered at the time, and recorded them in the Appeal Decision:

"In light of concerns I had during the site visit, I asked the main parties to comment in writing as to whether the red line boundary of the site location plan encompassed the entirety of the land to which the appeal should relate. Both main parties replied that the appeal should progress based on the plans provided. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis."

Given the comment above by the Inspector, it would appear that attempting to 'transplant' the approval on appeal to this application (as suggested in the applicant's supplementary documents) cannot happen, as the appeal was determined and allowed on the basis of the site specifically queried and confirmed at the time.

Therefore, the issues raised in the Appeal Decision remain. These are, as set out

by the Inspector in the Appeal Decision:

- 1) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- 2) The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
- 3) The effect of the proposal on the landscape character;
- 4) Whether the site is suitably located to encourage sustainable travel;
- 5) Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

To take each of these in turn, it is clear that the Inspector's appeal decision provides the reasons for not allowing this application to go ahead.

1) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
o Appeal Decision: "In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would not meet all the criteria of paragraph 155 (of Policy CS02 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014) and would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt."

2) The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
o Appeal Decision: "I find there would be a limited adverse impact to the openness of the Green Belt, given the scale and location of the development." This statement is now in question as the scale and location of the development are not as per the appeal.

3) The effect of the proposal on the landscape character;
o Appeal Decision: "In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effects on the landscape character. It would comply with policies CS12 and CS19 of the CS, which together seek to conserve the landscape character and integrate development into the surrounding area. Neither do I find conflict with Policy CS18 in respect of this main issue." This statement is now in question as the scale and location of the development are not as per the appeal. In addition, the Inspector "observed those works (removal of trees) have altered the character of part of White Post Lane and the works are of course regrettable."

The Inspector also comments on lighting from the site and states "A condition could reasonably be used to control external lighting on the site, given it could otherwise draw undue attention to the development and detract from the rural character". The current lighting from the site is significant, and at night it is extremely visible, for example, from Norwood Lane & Green Lane. It is light pollution and without doubt draws 'undue attention to the development and detract(s) from the rural character'.

4) Whether the site is suitably located to encourage sustainable travel;
o Appeal Decision: "The site is not in a sustainable location and the proposal would conflict with Policy CS19 of the CS which requires new development to encourage sustainable living and choice, being well connected to services, facilities and public transport, and encouraging sustainable travel. In turn this gives rise to conflict with Policy CS02 insofar as it requires development in rural areas to be compatible with policies in the Plan."

5) Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

o Appeal Decision: The Inspector states "best interests of the children" as having significant weight and this appears to be the primary reason for the appeal being allowed. I have no issue with this and believe it is the only point of merit of the entire application. All children's rights and welfare should always be a primary consideration. However, permission has already been granted based on the best interests of the children, so this 'new' application is unnecessary.

It is for these reasons I object.

Kind regards