

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/02/2026 2:46 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 Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

I am writing to formally object to the retrospective planning application for the installation of 4 caravan pitches at the above address. This development represents an inappropriate use of land and a significant detriment to the local area for the following reasons:

1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt
The site is situated within the Green Belt. Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there is a strong presumption against "inappropriate development" which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.
Openness: The placement of four caravans, along with the associated hardstanding and domestic paraphernalia, permanently diminishes the openness of the Green Belt.
Availability of Alternative Sites: It is important to note that several designated sites have recently been made available within the district, one of which is set in Heron Hill Lane towards STDavid street. Therefore, there is no "demonstrable need" or "very special circumstances" that would justify encroaching upon protected Green Belt land in this instance.
Whilst respecting the right that travellers have under facilities and protections made for minorities, it is important to consider the difference and potential generational feuds between different families, ancestry or place of origin.

2. Infrastructure and Access Concerns
The site is served by a single-track road that is neither unmaintained by the Council.
Capacity: The road is structurally and geographically unsuitable for the increased

traffic volume associated with four residential pitches, including the delivery and movement of large caravans.

Safety: The lack of formal maintenance and passing places creates a hazard for existing residents and emergency service vehicles. Granting permission would place an unsustainable burden on a private/unadopted infrastructure.

3. Environmental Damage and Lack of Biodiversity Assessment

Work on this site commenced in early December without planning consent.

During this time, several large, mature trees were felled at the entrance and within the site.

Retrospective Loss: This work was carried out without a prior Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) or a biodiversity net gain plan. The removal of mature canopy cover has a direct negative impact on local wildlife corridors.

Reparations: I strongly urge the Council to investigate this unauthorised destruction. If the application is refused (as it should be), the Council should seek full restoration and reparations, requiring the applicant to replant native mature species to compensate for the ecological damage caused.

Conclusion

The retrospective nature of this application suggests a disregard for the planning process. Given the availability of alternative sites, the unsuitability of the access road, and the environmental damage already sustained, I request that this application be refused and enforcement action be taken to restore the land to its original state.

Kind regards