

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 28/11/2025 8:17 AM 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] The Russets Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	1. Loss of Greenfield Land and Impact on the Countryside The proposed development would result in the loss of valuable greenfield land that contributes to the rural character and biodiversity of the area. Local and national planning policies generally prioritise the protection of undeveloped land and encourage the use of brownfield sites wherever possible. Developing this site would cause irreversible harm to the natural landscape. 2. Environmental and Ecological Concerns The land supports local wildlife and serves as an important ecological buffer. There has been no adequate ecological assessment demonstrating that the development would avoid negative impacts on habitats, protected species, or local biodiversity networks. Until a full ecological impact survey is conducted and reviewed, the application should not be approved. 3. Inadequate Infrastructure and Access The access roads to the site are narrow, rural, and not designed for increased traffic. The development risks creating highway safety issues, including limited visibility, insufficient passing space, and potential congestion. The current infrastructure cannot sustainably support additional vehicle movements associated with daily living, service vehicles, and emergency access. 4. Pressure on Local Services No clear evidence has been provided that local services-such as healthcare, schools, utilities, and waste management-can accommodate the additional demand. Planning decisions must consider the capacity of existing infrastructure and whether it can safely support the proposed development. 5. Inconsistency With Local Planning Policy The proposal appears inconsistent with the local development plan, which sets out criteria for new residential or Traveller-accommodation sites. In particular, it conflicts with policies designed to protect open countryside, require sustainable locations, and prioritise development on previously used land.
-----------	--

6. Lack of Justification for Site Selection

The application does not demonstrate that alternative, more suitable sites have been adequately considered. Good planning requires evidence that locations with less environmental sensitivity or better infrastructure have been exhausted before turning to greenfield areas.

Kind regards