

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/12/2025 1:23 PM from [REDACTED]

## Application Summary

Address:	Land At Wrotham Road Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0AA
Proposal:	Outline application for the erection of up to 350 residential dwellings , public open space and associated works. Approval is sought for the principal means of vehicular access from Wrotham Road and all other matters are reserved.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Foxendown Lane Meopham

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I strongly object to this application on the grounds of highway safety, drainage and flood risk, loss of wildlife habitat, air quality impacts, over-capacity local services. The scale of 350 dwellings is wholly inappropriate for a village of this size and would cause significant, long-term harm.

### 1. Drainage, Flooding and Pollution

My lane adjacent to the neighbouring field does not have access to services i.e. mains drainage or gas; my lane and the surrounding lanes are known to flood regularly. The development site currently provides essential natural drainage. Its loss would greatly increase surface-water run-off into already compromised lanes.

The application does not present a robust or sustainable solution to:  
surface water management  
and cumulative drainage pressure from nearby applications

### 2. Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking

The road network is already at breaking point. Our lane, again adjacent to this site is frequently gridlocked, as are other local lanes, and so unsafe for increased volumes of cars, delivery vans and service vehicles. A development of 350 homes could mean 700-1,000+ additional vehicle movements daily, which the roads cannot absorb.

Parking at local shops is already extremely difficult, and increasing car dependency conflicts with sustainable development principles

### 3. Wildlife, Biodiversity Loss, Arable land loss, Greenbelt infringement

The site and surrounding area support extensive wildlife, including:

badgers

hedgehogs

owls and bats

amphibians and small mammals

The scale of this proposal would fundamentally reduce habitat connectivity. The ecological assessment does not adequately account for cumulative loss created by several simultaneous applications.

### 4. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

Local GP surgeries and Darent Valley Hospital are already at capacity, with long waiting times and no funded expansion. Already at breaking point, Schools, buses and local facilities would also be overwhelmed. The application provides no credible mitigation.

### 5. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This proposal sits alongside an additional 150-home application almost opposite it, plus a further 120-home proposal in the village, as well as other impending applications. Assessing it in isolation is misleading; the combined impact is severe and unacceptable.

#### Conclusion

For reasons of drainage risk, highways unsuitability, ecological harm, greenbelt loss, and insufficient infrastructure capacity, I respectfully request that this application be refused.

---

Kind regards