

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 06/10/2026 10:30 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Cobb Tree Court Wrotham Road Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0AU
Proposal:	Removal of existing timber shed and erection of a replacement single storey garden building for incidental domestic use, including storage, gym and family recreation space, with associated tree removal and replacement planting.
Case Officer:	Adeoye Lawal

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Cricketers Drive Meopham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Monday, 05 October 2026
Objection to Application 20260937
Site Address: Cobb Tree Court, Wrotham Road, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent, DA13 0AU
Description: Erection of garden building to replace existing timber shed. The site sits within the Meopham Green Conservation Area.

Having taken into account changes made to the original planning application 2024071 which was refused in 2024, I would like to make objections to this current application with reference mainly to the removal of trees and the height of the proposed building. I will quote from the reports from the original refusal and the documents for the new application.

Trees.

This is from the Heritage Statement of the new application.

"The Heritage Statement references the existing trees which form a boundary between Cobb Tree Court and the houses in Cricketers Drive (nos 27,29,31, 33) Heritage Statement Page 3 of 5 Trees and Replacement Planting The revised proposal reduces the intended tree removals from nine to four, identified on the earlier design information as T04, T05, T06 and existing T11. Trees T01-T03 and T07-T09 are retained, with other existing garden vegetation shown on the plans. Three new boundary trees are indicatively shown on the revised drawings, labelled T11-T13. The officer's objection to removal of protected trees remains outstanding and should be resolved through that evidence and the

application process. This statement does not assert that any affected tree is unprotected or that the indicated planting has been agreed."

My concern here is that the phrase "indicatively shown" means that the illustrated details are shown for guidance, illustration or conceptual purposes only and are not legally binding or finalised.

In the Floor plans and Elevation doc trees T11, 12 and 13 are to be replaced. Picture 03 shows trees "indicatively shown" and forming a full barrier established once they are replaced. However picture 06 in the same doc shows a gap between T09 and the new trees. The tree that is shown in this gap T10 is the one set further into the existing garden.

From this it would appear that when the trees are removed there will be a significant loss of privacy, particularly from the garden of 29 Cricketers Drive, until the new replacement trees are established (if indeed they are, since only indicatively shown).

I would add that this not only effects the privacy of Cricketers Drive but also the occupants of Cobb Tree Courts, as, when these trees were cut right back before, the view from Cricketers Drive was right into bedrooms of the Cobb Tree Court Dwelling.

Regarding the trees I will quote from the Delegated Report from the original application refusal, [REDACTED] 18 September 2024.

"The GBC Conservation Officer considers that the excessive size of the proposal and the loss of trees would result in harm to the appearance of the conservation area. He states that trees and hedges contribute to the conservation area, providing a green foil that reflects its semi-rural character. He also states that the trees offer a screen to the housing beyond when glimpsing views from Wrotham Road and are an important component of the original approved dwelling at the application site.. Therefore, it should be noted that due to their conservation area location, all the trees at the application site are subject to protection.

In addition, the existing trees on the north western site boundary provide a pleasant green aspect and are visible from between the surrounding dwellings in Cricketers Drive and Wrotham Road;

On Wrotham Road, the trees help to screen the modern dwellings in Cricketers Drive from view from within the Meopham Green Conservation Area and are an important green feature in their own right. Due to the loss of existing trees and vegetation at the application site, the proposed development would also undermine the verdant, green nature of the surrounding Meopham Downs LCA environment, which would be harmful to landscape character.

Height of the proposed building

Whilst it is noted that the overall height of the new building has been reduced from 4m in the original application to 3m, and the gap between the boundary and the new building increased to 2.2m it would seem that this is still higher than the existing building. The height of the existing building is not shown on the Existing floor plan and Elevation doc but I assume it is more like 2.5m.

Again I quote from the original application refusal doc: (taking into account the reduction in size of the new proposal to 3m and the increased gap)

Whilst it is noted that the existing trees on the site boundary are taller than the proposed outbuilding and already cause some overshadowing, it is acknowledged that this impact would reduce in winter months and that the impact of a permanent building would be greater. With a height of 4 metres and a location only 0.7 metres from the site boundary, it is considered that the adverse overshadowing and overbearing impacts would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers of nos. 27 to 31 Cricketers Drive.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of its height and proximity to the boundary with nos. 27 to 31 Cricketers Drive, would be severely oppressive and overbearing, causing overshadowing and curtailing outlook for the occupants of those dwellings. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to residential amenity and be contrary to Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 and to Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF (2023).

Conclusion

In summary the objections are primarily concerning the removal of protected trees and, as a consequence, privacy, and the fact that replacement of these is only indicatively shown and any way would take a while to establish. Secondly, the height of the proposed building is significantly higher than the existing building.
Thank you for your attention.

Kind regards