

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 5:34 PM 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] Sallows Shaw, Sole Street, Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Planning Objection: Traveller Pitches and Associated Access I wish to register my objection to the proposed development for traveller pitches, including caravans, mobile homes and day rooms, at this location. My concerns relate to policy conflicts, environmental harm, highway safety, and the suitability of the access route, all of which are legitimate planning considerations. 1. Conflict with Green Belt Policy The site lies within designated Green Belt, and this status is confirmed in the adopted Local Plan. The application does not put forward the "very special circumstances" required to justify new development in the Green Belt. National and local policy make clear that: Openness should be preserved. Development should only be permitted in exceptional cases, backed by robust evidence. None of this is provided here. If approved, the proposal would weaken the purpose of the Green Belt, diminish the rural setting, and contribute to the gradual loss of countryside. These areas also play a vital environmental role, including carbon storage and natural flood management. Eroding them increases the risk of flooding and wider ecological harm. 2. Environmental Impact and Loss of Mature Trees
-----------	---

The existing access is a narrow, tree-lined track that forms part of the area's landscape character.

There are clear signs that trees have already been removed or damaged, apparently to force access for mobile homes. This raises concerns both about environmental harm and about whether future planning conditions would be respected.

The regular movement of large caravans, plant, and delivery vehicles along such a constrained route would inevitably lead to further damage, soil erosion, and loss of habitat. The proposal would permanently alter the nature of the lane and the surrounding environment.

3. Unsafe and Inadequate Access

The access route is fundamentally unsuitable for the intensity of use proposed. It is:

A single-track lane

Without passing points

Without pavements

With restricted visibility in several places

Introducing large towed vehicles and service traffic into this setting would create serious safety risks.

Blockages would be unavoidable, and emergency service access would be compromised.

Nearby roads already suffer from congestion as they are used as cut-throughs to the A2 and M20. Added traffic from this development would worsen conditions for local residents, pedestrians and children walking to the nearby primary school. The existing layout simply cannot accommodate the level of movement required.

4. Overdevelopment and Lack of Demonstrated Need

No evidence has been presented to justify additional traveller pitches at this location.

The scale and density of the proposal represent overdevelopment on a sensitive plot, with consequences for:

Traffic and parking

Neighbouring amenity

The rural appearance of the area

The site is too constrained to absorb this level of development without causing harm.

5. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

Local services-including healthcare, education and transport-are already stretched.

Introducing additional households, particularly where there is no clarity on utilities and drainage arrangements, places further strain on systems already operating at or beyond their limits. The application offers no mitigation or justification in relation to infrastructure capacity.

6. Risk of Urban Encroachment

This part of the borough retains a strong rural identity and forms an important buffer between villages and built-up areas.

Allowing this scheme would contribute to creeping urbanisation, blurring the boundaries between settlements and undermining the very purpose of Green Belt designation.

7. Combined Environmental and Residential Impacts

The proposal would result in multiple forms of harm, including:

Additional vehicle movements and congestion

Noise and general disturbance

Artificial lighting in an otherwise dark area

Air quality impacts

Further pressure on drainage and surface water run-off

These cumulative harms significantly outweigh any perceived benefit.

Conclusion

The application is fundamentally at odds with both national and local planning policy. The unsuitable access, loss of trees, environmental damage, highway risks and conflict with Green Belt objectives provide strong grounds for refusal.

I respectfully request that the planning authority refuse this application in full.

Kind regards