

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/12/2025 3:55 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:	Tradescant Drive Meopham Gravesend

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	1. Highways, Traffic Capacity and Road Safety

Kent Highways has already expressed significant concerns regarding this proposal, and these concerns must be given substantial weight. The development would introduce a very large number of additional vehicle movements each day onto an already overstretched and hazardous road network. The access point is currently difficult and dangerous to turn into, with poor visibility and frequent near-misses. Introducing up to 350 dwellings will greatly intensify traffic, leading to gridlock on surrounding rural lanes not designed for high volumes.

The cumulative impact on junction capacity, congestion at peak times, and increased collision risk is unacceptable. The road system is simply not capable of safely absorbing the extra traffic generated by this scale of development. This poses a clear and demonstrable danger to both existing and future road users. Additionally, the road networks around this area are largely unlit and unsuitable for cycling, therefore any suggestions that people will be encouraged to cycle are impractical.

### 2. Drainage and Flood Risk

The site consists of open land that currently provides natural drainage and flood mitigation. Replacing permeable fields with substantial hardstanding and roof

area will dramatically increase surface-water runoff. Existing drainage infrastructure in the area is already known to struggle during heavy rainfall. Development of this scale presents a serious risk of localised flooding both on-site and downstream, with no robust evidence that these issues can be safely mitigated.

### 3. Loss of Green Belt and Local Character

The proposal represents an unwarranted erosion of Green Belt land. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl, preserve the openness of the countryside, and maintain the distinct character of local settlements. Building up to 350 houses on this field would fundamentally alter the landscape, overwhelm neighbouring communities, and result in an irreversible loss of rural character. The development fails to demonstrate any "very special circumstances" that would justify such harm.

### 4. Biodiversity and Wildlife Impact

The site is home to a rich variety of wildlife, including badgers, hedgehogs, owls, bats, and other protected and priority species. A recorded badger sett lies within or close to the site, and disturbance, interference, or destruction of a badger sett is an offence under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Large-scale clearance, construction noise, lighting, and habitat destruction will severely impact these species and fragment important ecological corridors. No meaningful mitigation has been provided and the proposal conflicts with statutory protections and local biodiversity policies.

### 5. Pollution (Air, Noise and Light)

Introducing hundreds of additional vehicle journeys every day will significantly worsen air pollution, especially concerning given the proximity of local schools. Children are particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, and adding a major traffic generator so close to educational settings is irresponsible and harmful to public health. Increased noise and light pollution from traffic and residential use will further degrade the environment for both residents and wildlife.

### 6. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This application cannot be assessed in isolation. It must be considered alongside the growing number of developments proposed or approved in the surrounding area, each of which places additional pressure on the same already-overloaded infrastructure. The cumulative effect is a level of overdevelopment far beyond what the area can reasonably sustain. Repeated applications demonstrate a piecemeal approach that circumvents proper strategic planning.

### 7. Pressure on Local Services

Local services-including GP surgeries, schools, public transport, and utilities-are already stretched. There is no evidence that these services can accommodate the substantial increase in population that 350 new homes would generate. The proposal risks creating unacceptable strain on healthcare, education, emergency services, and community resources, leading to diminished service quality for existing residents and new occupiers alike.

### 8. Sustainability and Lack of Local Facilities

The site is not a sustainable location for development of this scale. Local facilities are limited, meaning future residents will be heavily dependent on private car use for commuting, education, shopping, and accessing basic services. This contradicts national and local planning policy aims to promote sustainable, well-connected development. Without adequate infrastructure, the scheme is

fundamentally unsustainable.

#### Conclusion

For all the reasons outlined above-highway dangers, flood risk, loss of Green Belt, harm to wildlife, increased pollution, cumulative overdevelopment, pressure on local services, and an absence of essential facilities-this application is wholly inappropriate and should be refused.

---

Kind regards