

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/12/2025 7:33 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]

## Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>Highways, Traffic Capacity and Road Safety</p> <p>Kent Highways has raised serious objections to the scheme, and these must be fully acknowledged. The existing road network is already under strain and the proposed development would inject a significant volume of additional traffic into a route that is known to be difficult, with restricted visibility and a history of near-miss incidents. Adding up to 350 dwellings would push the network beyond its safe operating capacity, creating gridlock on narrow rural lanes that were never designed to accommodate such flows.</p> <p>The anticipated rise in congestion, junction pressure, and collision risk is wholly unacceptable. The current infrastructure simply cannot cope with the level of traffic this development would generate. The danger to current residents, pedestrians, and future occupants is clear. Furthermore, the surrounding roads are largely unlit and unsuitable for cycling, making any suggestion of increased cycling as a viable alternative entirely unrealistic.</p> <p>Drainage and Flood Risk</p> <p>The field currently acts as a natural drainage area and plays an important role in managing surface water. Replacing open land with housing, roads, and impermeable surfaces will significantly increase runoff. The drainage network in this location already performs poorly in heavy rainfall, and adding further</p>
-----------	---

pressure will heighten the risk of flooding both on and off the site. No convincing evidence has been provided to demonstrate that these risks can be effectively managed or mitigated.

#### Loss of Green Belt and Local Character

This proposal constitutes an unnecessary and harmful loss of Green Belt land. The Green Belt exists to curb sprawl, safeguard the openness of the countryside, and maintain the unique character of local villages and settlements. Introducing 350 homes would fundamentally change the area's landscape, overwhelm nearby communities, and erode its rural identity. There are no "very special circumstances" to justify this level of harm, and therefore the development directly conflicts with the core aims of Green Belt policy.

#### Biodiversity and Wildlife Impact

The site supports a diverse range of wildlife, including protected species such as badgers, hedgehogs, bats and owls. A confirmed badger sett is located within or close to the development boundary, and any disturbance or destruction of this sett is strictly prohibited under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Construction activity, lighting, noise, and habitat loss will fragment ecological corridors and severely compromise the ability of these species to survive. The mitigation measures proposed are wholly inadequate and disregard legal protections and local biodiversity priorities.

#### Pollution

The substantial increase in vehicle movements would worsen local air quality, posing particular risk to children attending nearby schools. Placing a large traffic-generating development adjacent to educational settings is irresponsible and contrary to public-health objectives. Noise and light pollution from both construction and long-term residential occupation will further degrade the environment for residents and wildlife alike.

#### Cumulative Overdevelopment

This application must be assessed in the context of multiple other developments already planned or approved in the area. Each new scheme adds pressure to the same road network, drainage systems, public services, and countryside. Taken together, the cumulative impact represents significant overdevelopment that far exceeds the environmental and infrastructural capacity of this locality. The piecemeal nature of these proposals undermines strategic planning and places unsustainable burden on the community.

#### Pressure on Local Services

Essential services-GP surgeries, schools, emergency services, utilities, and public transport-are already under considerable strain. There is no realistic prospect that these services can accommodate the population increase associated with 350 additional homes. The proposal risks overloading critical infrastructure and reducing the quality and availability of services for existing residents as well as new households.

#### Sustainability and Lack of Local Facilities

This is not a sustainable location for development of this scale. There are limited local amenities, poor public transport links, and no realistic alternatives to private car use for most daily needs. The proposal conflicts with both national and local policies that seek to promote genuinely sustainable, well-connected development. Without adequate facilities and infrastructure, the scheme is inherently unsustainable.

Considering the major shortcomings identified - unsafe road impact, increased flood risk, loss of Green Belt, significant harm to wildlife, worsening pollution, cumulative overdevelopment, pressure on services, and the absence of sustainable infrastructure - this application is clearly unsuitable for approval and should be refused.

---

Kind regards