

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 4:12 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land Adjacent To Longfield Road Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0EW
Proposal:	Outline application for the erection of up to 120 residential dwellings, public open space and associated works. Approval is sought for the principal means of vehicular access from Longfield Road and all other matters are reserved.
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>1. Loss of Green Belt and Rural Character</p> <p>The proposal would remove a section of Green Belt whose purpose is to prevent unchecked expansion and safeguard the countryside's openness. Even at 120 dwellings, this development would noticeably urbanise the area, narrowing the gap between settlements and eroding the rural character that the Green Belt is designed to protect. No "very special circumstances" have been demonstrated to justify this permanent loss.</p> <p>2. Highways, Traffic Capacity and Road Safety</p> <p>Kent Highways has already identified significant issues with the surrounding road network. The access routes are narrow, difficult to navigate and suffer from restricted visibility. Adding traffic from 120 new homes would intensify congestion and increase the likelihood of collisions. This is especially concerning given the immediate proximity of a special needs school, where predictable, calm, and safe traffic conditions are essential for vulnerable pupils. The largely unlit rural lanes are also unsuitable for cycling, making claims of encouraging active travel unrealistic.</p> <p>3. Cumulative Overdevelopment</p> <p>When viewed alongside other recent and emerging development proposals in the</p>

vicinity, the cumulative pressure on infrastructure and the countryside becomes clear. Even a scheme of 120 homes contributes significantly to an overall level of growth that exceeds what the area can sustainably accommodate. This piecemeal pattern of applications undermines coherent, long-term planning for the area.

4. Pressure on Local Services

Local facilities-including GP practices, schools (including the nearby special needs school), utilities, and public transport-are already operating at capacity. There is no evidence that they can absorb the further demand generated by 120 dwellings. The proposal risks creating additional strain on essential services that are already stretched, diminishing provision for existing and future residents.

5. Sustainability and Lack of Local Facilities

This is not a sustainable location for new housing of this scale. The area lacks sufficient local amenities and reliable public transport options, meaning future residents would be heavily reliant on private cars for work, education and everyday needs. The proposal fails to align with national and local policies that require growth to be well-connected, accessible and genuinely sustainable.

6. Biodiversity and Wildlife Impact

The site provides important habitat for a range of species, including bats, owls, hedgehogs and badgers. A recorded badger sett lies within or close to the development boundary, and disturbing or obstructing it would breach the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Habitat clearance, lighting and noise would sever ecological corridors and cause lasting harm to local wildlife. The mitigation measures proposed fall well short of what is necessary to protect species and maintain biodiversity.

7. Pollution (Air, Noise and Light)

Additional traffic movements associated with 120 dwellings will worsen air quality locally. This is particularly concerning given the nearby special needs school, where many pupils may be more vulnerable to environmental pollutants not to mention the disruption caused by extensive building works and the loss of the current surroundings. Noise and light pollution from both construction and long-term occupation would further degrade the wider area for residents and wildlife.

8. Drainage and Flood Risk

The site currently assists with natural surface-water absorption. Replacing open fields with housing and hard surfaces would place additional strain on the already limited drainage network and increase the risk of flooding on-site and downstream. There is no robust evidence that these impacts can be safely or effectively mitigated.

Conclusion

Taking into account the loss of Green Belt, highway safety concerns near a vulnerable school, additional flood risk, pressure on services, ecological harm, increased pollution and the unsustainable nature of the site, the proposal for up to 120 homes is inappropriate and should be refused.

