

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/03/2026 3:59 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] Rhododendron Avenue Meopham Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I am strongly against the planning application for the retrospective siting of 4 or any Gypsy/Traveller pitches to Land North of Cherry Trees, Ridge Lane, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent.

There are a number of reasons to my objection:

1. The site in question is located within the Culverstone Valley, which is designated as part of the Green Belt. It is also deemed as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Historically, the area consisted of 250 acres and had been split into 500 plots. I believe in the 1980's, following the uncontrolled, and in some cases unlawful establishment of permanent residences on a host of plots, the Council invited landowners to register their plots and whether they would want these to remain as woodland, or whether they would like to have the right to build on them at some stage in the future in an official capacity.

The council subsequently allocated individual plots as either authorised (allowed to build, subject to planning permission, and no time limit) or unauthorised (whereby all building requests would be rejected).

I believe this site in question falls into the unauthorised category, and therefore any planning application should be denied. Should planning be granted however, then this would lead to all other "unauthorised" sites suddenly becoming suitable

for further housing development and consequently lead to the detriment of the entire valley.

The area is not suitable to support more housing on this basis.

2 The site in question was previously woodland, and full of mature trees, scrubs, flora and protected wildlife, including badger sets, birds including owls, reptiles, slow-worms, grass snakes, newts and lizards, all protected species. The applicant has begun work on the site ahead of any planning application and often under the cover of darkness, with threats of violence to those who speak up! They have totally ignored legal protocol in seeking a tree-felling licence for the felling of a considerable amount of mature trees. They have also failed to conduct any professional wildlife and woodland surveys. As a result, they have shown no respect to The Green Belt, the valley or to its residents.

3. The applicant has also unlawfully fenced off areas with an 8ft wooden fence in Rhododendron Avenue opposite Little Horseshoes across to the southern end of The Ravens, and appears to be planning to extend this back up the hill on both sides to Ridge Lane. To the North of this land more 6ft/8ft wooden fencing has been erected along Ridge Lane (opposite Tanglewood).

This large plot of land forms part of Village Green Registration Number 99 as laid down in the Kent County Council Registration Authority dated 16 Aug 1968. The fencing off of these areas to the public is in breach of the Commons Registration Act 1965.

Furthermore, I recall during the past 16 years that I have lived in Rhododendron Avenue, that a path led from Rhododendron Avenue up to Ridge Lane across this Village Green No 99. I am sure other residents who have lived here longer can verify this path was in situ for at least 20 years. The applicant seems therefore to have breached further Rights of Way access across this piece of land by blocking this long-established path to the public.

4. There are also other concerns surrounding drainage and increased flooding potential to the residents in the Rhododendron Avenue / Heron Hill Lane area following the removal of the trees from this hillside plot - less trees equals less water absorption. This needs to be remedied immediately to prevent serious harm.

5. I note that many supporting submissions refer to a child (I assume the applicant's child), needing a settled base, and quoting Article 8 of the ECHR. I should point out the monies already spent on the unlawful clearing of this site and the costs for preparing the site for occupancy, which has already been occupied by a couple of mobile homes, could, together with any value from the sale of the land, have been used as a considerable deposit to purchase a suitable fixed home currently available on the housing market. It is therefore obvious this is not about filling local authorities PPTS' requirements, but rather a ruse to acquire a cheap route into housing development. If all citizens were to do as this applicant has done, then as a country we would be in a very poor state.

6. I therefore trust the application will be rejected accordingly and the applicant is issued with enforcement to remove all fencing and return the site as it was previously at their cost.

Kind regards