

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/02/2025 5:48 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:	Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Sallows Shaw Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Subject: Objection to Planning Proposal PP-13654220 - Change of Use to Gypsy/Traveller Site

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to planning application PP-13654220 regarding the proposed Change of Use of Land to form a Gypsy/Traveller site at Land on the south side of White Post Lane, Cobham, Gravesend (DA13 9AU).

Grounds for Objection

1. Legal Prohibition - High Court Injunction HQ09X02792

This land is subject to a High Court Injunction (HQ09X02792), which legally prohibits its use for unauthorised development, including occupation by Gypsy and Traveller sites. The approval of this application would be in direct conflict with legally binding court orders, potentially setting a dangerous precedent that undermines judicial authority.

The High Court Injunction was granted to prevent inappropriate development that would have a detrimental impact on the area. Any breach of this injunction will lead to further legal enforcement action and unnecessary costs for both the local authority and the community.

2. Conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The proposal contradicts key principles of the NPPF, particularly in relation to sustainable development, local character, and environmental protection.

- Paragraph 174 states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. This proposal fails to protect the countryside and risks irreversible harm to the rural character of the area.

- Paragraph 110 requires safe and suitable access for all users. However, the narrow nature of White Post Lane and its limited capacity for additional traffic pose significant highway safety concerns.

3. Conflict with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) (December 2024)
The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) outlines specific criteria for the allocation of Gypsy/Traveller sites. According to the updated December 2024 guidance, local planning authorities must ensure that:

- Sites are sustainable economically, socially, and environmentally.
- Proposals do not create unacceptable levels of tension with the local community.
- Developments respect the interests of the settled community.

The proposal fails to meet these policy requirements, as it introduces an unsustainable development that would negatively impact local residents, road networks, and environmental assets.

4. Environmental & Ecological Impact

The site contains existing hedgerows, trees, and biodiversity features, which are crucial to the local ecosystem. The NPPF (Paragraph 180) states that:

- If significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

The development site may contain existing hedgerows, trees, and biodiversity features that contribute to the local ecosystem. The potential removal (and removals of trees and hedgerows that have already been made) could adversely affect local wildlife, including protected species that may inhabit the area. The Environment Act 2021 requires a mandatory "Biodiversity Net Gain" (BNG) for all planning applications, which has not been properly addressed in this proposal.

5. Drainage, Flood Risk & Waste Management Concerns

The application lacks a comprehensive flood risk assessment and drainage strategy, despite the fact that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided (NPPF, Paragraph 159). Furthermore, the lack of clear waste management plans raises concerns about environmental contamination and public health.

6. Highway Safety & Traffic Impact

White Post Lane is not designed to accommodate additional vehicular movements, particularly larger vehicles associated with a Traveller site. The increased traffic flow could lead to congestion and safety risks, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 110, which requires safe and suitable access.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly urge the local planning authority to REFUSE this application on the grounds of:

1. Conflict with High Court Injunction (HQ09X02792)
2. Non-compliance with the NPPF & PPTS policies
3. Significant environmental impact
4. Highway safety risks and traffic congestion
5. Drainage and waste management concerns

I request that my objection is taken into full consideration, and a formal response addressing the issues raised.

Kind regards