

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 14/03/2025 11:47 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land South Of Pear Tree Lane Pear Tree Lane Shorne Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Change of use of the land for the stationing of 2 static homes, 2 touring caravans and shared day room for Gypsy/Traveller occupation. Associated hard and soft landscaping.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Shorne

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	This site is in the Green Belt, outside the settlement of Shorne Ridgeway and has been declared by 4 Appeal Inspectors as not to be built on as the harm that would be done outweighs all other considerations. It is by definition inappropriate development which would harm the area in the interest of the applicants, who have no connection to the area, rather than to preserve and enhance for the sake of the lives and environment of longstanding local residents. The proposal is not appropriate for either the site or the intended purpose and is also not in line with the latest guidance on locations for Traveller sites. Reading the application carefully there are some aspects that are vague, like the number of actual pitches being applied for, which causes concerns for future use of the site should the application somehow be permitted. There should not be any need for a "day room" as the proposed static caravans are fully fitted and the parked touring caravans are supposed to be just stored. It is good that the previous application was refused (as this one should also be) but the previous Officer's report was not adequate. The report missed out some critical guidance and made a number of disappointing and under-researched assumptions and errors, one of them being trying to say that the site is "grey belt", something that can only officially be decided through undertaking a proper Green Belt review with public consultation. As a result, the Decision Notice was not adequate either as it omitted many other reasons why the proposal was not viable. I support the submissions from the Parish Council against this proposal, they at least clearly have the interests of local residents at heart in trying to defend the Parish from inappropriate development and damage. The application should go to the regulatory board this time so that the Council as a whole directs what is in the Decision notice.
-----------	--

Kind regards

