

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 16/12/2025 6:41 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] Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>Objection to Proposed Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Traffic and Highway Safety A development of around 350 homes would introduce 350-700 additional vehicles and over 1,000 new residents, placing unacceptable pressure on already overstretched roads and services. The A227 is frequently congested, particularly during school drop-off and pick-up times, with parking issues and regular near misses at the Longfield Road and Camer Road junction. When incidents occur on the A2 or M20, the roads through Sole Street and the A227 become rat runs, greatly worsening conditions. Drivers already overtake dangerously on this single-carriageway stretch between Istead Rise and Wrotham Hill. Additional access onto the A227 would significantly increase risk and worsen unsafe driving behaviour.2. Loss of Agricultural Land and Green Belt This site is good-quality agricultural land within the Green Belt. Such land is increasingly valuable nationally and plays a vital role in preventing villages from merging and losing their distinct identities. Once lost, it cannot be replaced.3. Lack of Justification or Exceptional Circumstances This proposal appears driven by developer profit rather than proven local need. Attractive sites are targeted because they are lucrative, not because they are appropriate. This does not constitute exceptional circumstances. There has been no clear evidence presented explaining why this site must be developed when alternative, less harmful locations exist.4. Flood Risk, Environment, and Wildlife
-----------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The land currently acts as a natural drainage area, helping to reduce flood risk. Development would compromise this function and could worsen flooding locally. The site also supports wildlife and contributes to local environmental quality, which would be permanently damaged.

5. Cumulative Impact

This proposal cannot be viewed in isolation. There are already five or six developments proposed nearby. If approved collectively, they could result in around 2,000 new homes, thousands of additional residents, and a dramatic increase in traffic. This proposal would be among the most harmful. Highway safety is already deteriorating and must be treated as a priority.

6. Child Safety and Schools

There are three, possibly four, schools very close to the site. Traffic conditions at school times are already problematic. Additional vehicles will significantly increase danger to children walking, cycling, or being driven to and from school.

7. Precedent

Approval would send a clear signal to other developers that similar land is available for development, encouraging further speculative applications and accelerating the loss of countryside and safety.

8. Housing Need and Affordability

While housing is needed, developments like this rarely deliver genuinely affordable homes and create car-dependent communities. Previously developed (grey-belt) land should be prioritised before sacrificing valuable countryside.

Conclusion

There is no compelling justification for this development. The traffic danger, environmental harm, loss of agricultural land, and cumulative impact far outweigh any benefits. This proposal would cause lasting damage to Meopham's safety, character, and quality of life.

Kind regards