

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/02/2026 8:23 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of Cherry Trees Ridge Lane Meopham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Retrospective change of use for the siting of 4 pitches for Gypsy / Traveller occupation to include one static, one touring caravan and one amenity building on each pitch. Associated changes in land levels and hard / soft landscaping.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Valley Lane Culverstone Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to formally object to the retrospective planning application for the change of use of land to provide four Gypsy/Traveller pitches, each comprising one static caravan, one touring caravan, one amenity building, together with associated land regrading, hardstanding and landscaping works.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations:

1. Harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The site lies within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), where national policy requires that great weight be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty.

The introduction of four residential pitches, each containing permanent structures, hardstanding and associated domestic activity, represents a substantial and urbanising form of development. The cumulative impact of static caravans, touring caravans, amenity buildings, vehicle parking, engineered land levels and domestic paraphernalia would materially erode the rural character, tranquillity and openness of the protected landscape.

The proposal fails to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and

therefore conflicts with national planning policy and local development plan policies relating to landscape protection.

2. Urbanisation and Engineering Operations

The associated land regrading and hard landscaping constitute significant engineering operations that alter the natural landform. These works further intensify the visual impact of the development and contribute to the domestication of what is currently rural land.

The permanent siting of multiple caravans and buildings, combined with hardstanding and infrastructure, changes the character of the site from rural to residential, which is inappropriate within a nationally protected landscape.

3. Highway Safety and Unsuitable Rural Roads

The local road network serving the site is narrow and rural in nature, with limited width and capacity. These roads are not designed to accommodate regular traffic associated with four permanent residential pitches, particularly where touring caravans and larger service vehicles are involved.

The development would increase vehicle movements, including cars, vans, caravans and delivery vehicles. This intensification of use would:

- Increase the likelihood of vehicle conflict on constrained sections of road
- Exacerbate wear and deterioration of already substandard road surfaces
- Create additional safety risks for other road users
- Place unsustainable pressure on infrastructure that is not fit for this level of use

The surrounding highway network does not appear suitable to safely accommodate the scale and nature of this development.

4. Impact on Residential Amenity (if applicable)

The scale and intensity of four pitches, each with associated activity and vehicle movements, may result in noise, disturbance and loss of rural tranquillity. The cumulative impact should be carefully assessed, particularly given the sensitive landscape designation.

5. Retrospective Nature of the Application

The fact that this is a retrospective application indicates that the development has already been carried out without planning permission. While retrospective applications must be considered on their planning merits, this weighs against the proposal and undermines public confidence in the planning system, particularly within a protected landscape.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal represents inappropriate and harmful development within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It fails to conserve or enhance landscape character, places undue pressure on unsuitable

rural roads, and results in the urbanisation of protected countryside.

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

Kind regards