

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/02/2026 9:06 AM 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 ave Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application - Retrospective Change of Use for 4 Gypsy/Traveller Pitches

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to formally object to the above retrospective planning application for the change of use of land to provide four Gypsy/Traveller pitches, including static caravans, touring caravans, amenity buildings, associated land regrading and landscaping.

My objection is based on the following material planning grounds:

- 1. Inappropriate Development / Harm to the Character of the Area**
The proposal represents a significant change in land use which materially alters the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. The introduction of multiple pitches, static units, touring caravans and amenity buildings, together with hardstanding and engineered changes in land levels, results in a more intensive and visually intrusive form of development. This is out of keeping with the established character of the surrounding area.
- 2. Retrospective Nature of the Application**
The development has been undertaken without prior planning permission. This undermines confidence in the planning process and limits the ability of residents

to engage meaningfully before development occurred. Retrospective applications should not be treated more favourably simply because works have already been carried out.

3. Impact on Highway Safety and Traffic Generation

The intensification of use to four separate pitches will increase vehicle movements, including larger vehicles, vans and towing vehicles. Depending on the road width, visibility splays and existing traffic conditions, this may result in increased highway safety risks. If access is substandard or visibility is restricted, this would conflict with highway safety policies.

4. Impact on Residential Amenity

The number of pitches proposed creates potential for noise, general activity, vehicle movements and domestic paraphernalia that could adversely affect neighbouring occupiers. The cumulative impact of four pitches on a single site must be carefully assessed, particularly in a quieter rural or semi-rural setting.

5. Landscape and Visual Impact

The proposal includes changes to land levels and hard landscaping. Such engineering operations can significantly alter the natural topography and visual openness of the land. The presence of static caravans and associated structures is inherently more prominent than traditional low-intensity uses of open land.

6. Precedent and Incremental Expansion

Approval of four pitches may set a precedent for further intensification or expansion on the site in the future. This risk should be given weight, particularly if the site lies outside defined settlement boundaries or within protected countryside.

7. Drainage and Infrastructure Capacity

Hardstanding and additional development increase surface water runoff. The adequacy of drainage arrangements and foul water disposal should be fully assessed to ensure there is no increased flood risk or strain on local infrastructure.

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuse this application.

Kind regards