

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/11/2025 10:57 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of White Post Lane Cobham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Application for the approval of condition 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11 attached to planning reference number 20241164 and appeal decision APP/K2230/W/25/3363212 dated 14 July 2025 relating to details of its external finishes and materials (4), details of a strategy to deal with cr foul water drainage (6), details of a strategy for surface water drainage (7), details of ecological enhancements for the site (8), details of soft landscaping for the site (9) and external lighting (11).
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[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:	Objection to Planning Application: Traveller Site on Greenbelt Land I wish to formally object to this application. My concerns remain unchanged from previous objections, as no amendments have been made to address the issues raised. Grounds for Objection (with Supporting References): 1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt Traveller sites are classified as "inappropriate development" within the green belt. According to the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), "very special circumstances" are required to justify any development in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) reinforces that such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances, and substantial weight must be given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Recent reforms have clarified that unless the site meets specific exceptions (such as being on "grey belt" land or addressing a demonstrable unmet need), permission should generally be refused. [gov.uk], [gypsy-traveller.org], [assets.pub...ice.gov.uk] References: Planning policy for traveller sites - GOV.UK [gov.uk] National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK [assets.pub...ice.gov.uk] PPTS 2024 branded SR AK 19Dec_updated version (1) [gypsy-traveller.org] 2. Harm to Local Character, Wildlife, and Openness The proposed development would reduce the openness of the green belt, contrary to its intended purpose. There is evidence of unlawful destruction of trees in the area to facilitate lorry access, which has had a significant negative
-----------	--

impact on local wildlife and the surrounding environment. The NPPF and PPTS both require that plan-making and decision-taking protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development and have due regard to the protection of local amenity and environment. [gov.uk]

References:

Planning policy for traveller sites - GOV.UK [gov.uk]

3. Environmental and Ecological Harm

Traveller sites on green belt land can pose risks to the local ecosystem and natural habitats. Research shows that many traveller sites are located near major pollutants, which can have significant health and environmental impacts. The NPPF requires that planning decisions contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. [theconversation.com]

References:

Most Gypsy and Traveller sites in Great Britain are located within 100 metres of major pollutants, shows research [theconversation.com]

4. Contamination and Flood Risk

There are concerns regarding potential contamination and flood risk arising from the development. The NPPF requires that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the potential risk from contamination and flooding. [assets.pub...ice.gov.uk]

References:

National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK [assets.pub...ice.gov.uk]

5. Unlawful Works and Utilities

There have been instances of unauthorised works and connections to utilities across public land, raising further concerns about the suitability of the development. Case law has shown that deliberate breaches of planning control, such as unauthorised site clearance and development, are material considerations that weigh against granting permission. [cornerston...isters.com]

References:

Inspector refuses planning permission for gypsy and traveller site due to deliberate breach of planning control [cornerston...isters.com]

Summary

In summary, the proposed traveller site constitutes inappropriate development in the green belt, would harm local character and wildlife, poses environmental and flood risks, and involves unauthorised works. These objections are supported by national planning policy, recent case law, and environmental research. Unless the application can demonstrate that it meets the strict exceptions set out in the NPPF and PPTS, it should be refused.

If you need this objection formatted as a formal letter or require further references, please let me know.

Kind regards