

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/09/2025 4:42 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Blackthorn Farm Wrotham Road Meopham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 100No. residential dwellings (including affordable housing), with all matter reserved except for access and creation of a new access from A227/South Street.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

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

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Objection to Planning Application 20250802

I strongly object to this proposal for up to 100 dwellings at Blackthorn Farm. It is inappropriate for this location, conflicts with national and local planning policy, and would cause serious harm to Meopham and the wider area.

1. Green Belt harm

The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. Development here would encroach on open countryside, reduce openness, and contribute to the merging of settlements. The land is not previously developed, so cannot be classed as grey belt. No "very special circumstances" have been demonstrated. This conflicts with the NPPF (paras 147-151) and the Gravesham Local Plan.

2. Highway safety and traffic

NPPF paragraph 116 states that development should be refused if highway safety would be compromised or cumulative impacts severe. The A227 is already congested and dangerous at peak times. Around 200 additional vehicle movements will worsen gridlock and create risks at the proposed new access. Emergency service access is uncertain.

3. Unsustainable location

Paragraphs 105-110 of the NPPF require development in sustainable locations. This site lacks reliable public transport, with poor links to Meopham Station or Gravesend. Walking distances to services exceed acceptable limits. Residents will be car-dependent, contrary to sustainable development policy.

4. Ancient woodland and habitats

The site adjoins ancient woodland. NPPF paragraph 180(c) protects such habitats from loss or deterioration unless wholly exceptional reasons exist, which is not the case. There are also concerns about misrepresentation of woodland ownership in the application. Run-off from the chalk slope risks damage to woodland and flooding at Rhododendron Avenue.

5. Biodiversity and protected species

Bats and notable birds are present on site. Bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Surveys and mitigation are inadequate. The application also fails to demonstrate delivery of the required 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.

6. Flood risk and drainage

The site acts as natural drainage for Culverstone Valley and the A227. Building here will increase surface water run-off and flood risk. This breaches NPPF paragraphs 159-165 which require flood risk not to be worsened elsewhere.

7. Pollution

Air quality along the A227 is already poor. Additional traffic will worsen NO2 and particulates, contrary to NPPF 186. Light pollution will harm dark skies and habitats, contrary to paragraph 185.

8. Pressure on services

Schools, health facilities, utilities, and station parking are already stretched. The application offers no firm, funded mitigation. This fails NPPF paragraph 122 which requires adequate infrastructure.

9. Character and cultural identity

NPPF paragraph 130 requires development to respect local character and sense of place. Meopham is a rural community with a strong cultural identity rooted in its landscape and village scale. A large commuter estate would erode that distinctiveness, urbanising the area and undermining community cohesion.

10. Procedural concerns

Errors over land ownership and insufficient ecological data mean the application cannot be reliably assessed. Corrected documents and re-consultation are needed.

Conclusion

The scheme causes definitional Green Belt harm, fails the highway safety test in NPPF 116, threatens ancient woodland, increases flood risk, worsens pollution, and undermines the rural character of Meopham. It conflicts with multiple provisions of the NPPF (105-116, 122, 130, 147-151, 159-165, 180, 185-186) and the Local Plan.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that application 20250802 is refused.

Kind regards