Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/03/2026 7:48 PM from [redacted]

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of White Post Lane Cobham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Change of use of land to form a Gypsy/Traveller site comprising the siting of 1 mobile home, 1 touring caravan, and 1 dayroom.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	[redacted]
Email:	
Address:	[redacted] White Post Lane Cobham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Further to this Planning Application I find it totally inappropriate for additional development on this Green Belt site. The previous Appeal found there were personal circumstances for the "one" family positioned on a relatively hidden area, offering the least detrimental effect on this area. The new application is completely different in nature, easily viewed from White Post Lane and local footpaths and severely affecting the openness and character especially the new extra positions, and high perimeter fence. Previously a land area in keeping with similar adjacent Grade 2 agricultural land and fields. This is no longer the case with high walling, fencing and gates, concrete bases with numerous buildings and 20+ mobiles covering the area. Surely this constitutes serious, inappropriate development affecting the openness and landscape character. and persistent disregard to the Authorities notifications and the known existing Injunction over the area. As well as offering nothing towards sustainability or regarding biodiversity of this area after destroying so many hedgerows, trees and habitats of birds, bats and Badgers, previously regularly seen. There is yet more "intentional unauthorised development" [Appeal document term] and continuing damage to the surrounding properties and lane, please see Google Maps pictures 2009/2016 as reference to the damage to this area. All

actions to date, especially since 2020, have aimed at destroying an open, Green Belt area, then applying for Retrospective Planning.

I note there are other ongoing applications for this same area of land, 20251123, 20260214, 20260180. If the applicants felt these additional mobiles were needed, surely they should have been requested in the original application/Appeal, that referenced 1 family. Additionally, is it appropriate to apply for such large areas for relatively small dwellings, (2500 and 5476sq m) where the average housing sits on an average of 300-500sqm.

Being yet another application now numbering more than 20 caravans this is overwhelming the small local Hamlet/village of Sole Street. After many years of complete disregard to the established local homeowners, amenities, as well as the Local Authority, again this is inappropriate and unbalanced. Additionally numerous reports of frightened stray cats and dogs on White Post Lane, adjacent to this field, and continuous barking Day and Night.

The lane is narrow and now regularly blocked with the added potential danger of obstructing the natural route for emergency vehicles to Sole Street. There is a dramatic increase in speeding, large and commercial vehicles, especially when approaching the estate end of White Post Lane where several children live in housing with small open gardens leading directly onto this previously tranquil lane.

In addition, at this point there are 3 footpaths emerging onto the Lane, some part of the popular 'Weald Way' and in regular use and another by Nurstead all using the Lane as part of the footpath link. The Lane is constantly used by organized Gravesend school events, Ramblers, cyclists, many horse riders, there are many areas with dangerous bends or reduced vision.

I am saddened by the damage sustained to this area, especially recent years all caused by the numerous applicants from the stated Traveler group that appear to be able to destroy areas, and others land at will, while not showing any interest in integration into the local village life.

For these most recent applications 20251125, and now 20260180, 20260214, suggesting the wrong area having been given permission "by mistake" I note the "Still incorrect Plan Drawings" showing different areas (and duplicated) in the applications and different entrances. Should not the previous decision be reversed before any further applications are considered as this area is obviously not required. (I notice this is not the case with this application). Or the Applicant should remove all Mobiles from the current area into the area previously granted with the appropriate restoration work. There appear to have been too many mistakes previously and total confusion as to the area in the applications. This is despite my reporting this issue, prior to the previous decision, to Gravesham Planning.

I would also ask for all Comments previously submitted by way of the too numerous individual applications but affecting the whole larger area as per the original Injunction and earlier Appeal APP/K2230/W/20/3271514 (Application 20200554) are taken into account.

These, along with all other historical and current applications and Appeals (20250764), should be considered together as they now constitute a Development.

As regarding the above applications, there is no mention of the end triangle of land effectively blocked off and currently used almost daily for storage and to burn rubbish, as seen from the local footpath bridge. There is also no mention of nonexistent services to this area.

Kind regards