

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/11/2025 3:22 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] Sole Street Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I object to the application. It is inappropriate development of the Green Belt and it is clear from the environmental damage already sustained in White Post Lane and Nurstead Church Lane that the highway is not suitable for the type of traffic that the currently unauthorised development of the site has engendered. When the Planning Inspector was considering the appeal against refusal of planning permission in relation to the applicant's previous application she noted that the damage to the lane was 'regrettable'. Unfortunately her words have been completely disregarded as further damage to the lane has subsequently taken place with the arrival of yet more unauthorised mobile homes. It is barely credible that both the applicant and his professional advisers were mistaken as to the plot of land which formed the subject of the previous application. The siting of the land is quite clear on the planning application and appeal and the Inspector specifically asked the parties to confirm that it was the correct site. Since the applicant already has the benefit of planning consent granted by the Inspector on a piece of land which she considered suitable for his needs and those of his family can there be no basis in this application for considering any 'special needs' that would override the presumption against development of the Green Belt.
-----------	---

Kind regards