

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/12/2025 5:49 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] Cheyne Walk Meopham Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Building here directly conflicts with the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF-preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside, and protecting openness. No very special circumstances exist to justify its loss.

Traffic in Meopham is already at breaking point. Wrotham Road (A227), Longfield Road and Camer Road are regularly gridlocked, especially at peak times. When the A2 or motorways are blocked, drivers cut through Cobham, Sole Street and Meopham, causing complete standstill. Residents have experienced 90-minute journeys for routes that normally take 10 minutes. The network cannot absorb additional vehicles.

Local roads are narrow, winding and unsafe for increased traffic and are shared by farm vehicles, school buses, cyclists and pedestrians.

The development would further erode Meopham's rural identity and push it towards becoming a town. It conflicts with the village's historic character and the council's settlement hierarchy.

Essential services (GPs, schools, parking and public transport) are already stretched with no capacity to support more homes.

There are already multiple applications in Meopham. The cumulative impact of developing on Green Belt land will cause long-term harm to the landscape, traffic

conditions, and local infrastructure.

For these reasons, the proposal is unsustainable, inappropriate and contrary to both national and local planning policy.

Kind regards