

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 10:01 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] Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Conflict with the Rural Character, Green Belt and Countryside Policies

The site lies within open countryside where development is strictly controlled. The introduction of multiple mobile homes, caravans and dayrooms represents a harmful encroachment into the rural landscape, conflicting with national and local planning policy that seeks to:

- Prevent urban sprawl,
- Safeguard the openness of the countryside, and
- Protect the landscape character of rural villages such as Cobham.

The scale and intensity of the proposed use significantly erode the openness of the surrounding area, resulting in clear visual harm.

2. Part-Retrospective Nature of the Application

The application is part retrospective, indicating that development has taken place without prior planning permission. Allowing retrospective approval risks setting a negative precedent and undermines public confidence in the planning process. Planning decisions should not reward unauthorised development, especially in sensitive rural locations.

3. Highway Safety and Unsuitable Access

White Post Lane is a narrow rural lane with limited passing places and restricted visibility. The additional traffic associated with the proposed site-towing vehicles, service vehicles, and visitor movements-would worsen existing safety concerns. The lane is unsuitable for increased vehicular intensity, putting road users, pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders at risk.

4. Over-Development of the Site

The proposal seeks two pitches but includes three mobile homes, multiple touring caravans, and associated dayrooms. This concentration of accommodation represents an over-intensive use of the land and is not in keeping with the scale or density of surrounding development. The site layout and level of built form appear excessive for a rural plot.

5. Harm to Residential Amenity and Village Setting

The introduction of a multi-unit residential site in this location is likely to result in:

- Increased noise and activity,
- More vehicle movements at unsocial hours, and
- Loss of tranquillity associated with this part of the countryside.

This has a detrimental impact on nearby residents, rural amenity, and the historic village character of Cobham.

6. Insufficient Justification and Lack of Need Evidence

The application does not appear to demonstrate:

- A specific local need for additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in this location, nor
- Why this countryside site is appropriate or the least harmful alternative.

Without a robust needs assessment or evidence demonstrating a lack of alternative sites, the proposal fails to justify development in a sensitive rural setting.

7. Environmental and Infrastructure Concerns

There is insufficient detail on:

- Wastewater and foul drainage arrangements,
- Surface water management,
- Landscaping and screening proposals, and
- Impact on local biodiversity and protected species.

In a countryside location, such omissions are significant and create risk of

environmental harm.

Conclusion

For the reasons above-harm to rural character, overdevelopment, highway safety concerns, insufficient justification, environmental risks, and the inappropriate part-retrospective nature of the proposal-I respectfully request that the Council refuses this planning application.



Kind regards