Subject: Objection to Planning Application for 100 Houses at Blackthorn, A227, Culverstone

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the planning application for 100 houses at the site known as Blackthorn on the A227 in Culverstone.

This is a rural area where infrastructure and services are already under significant strain. I believe the proposal is unsustainable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Gravesham Council Local Plan for the following reasons:

1. Inadequate Water Supply (NPPF Paragraphs 15, 20, 26, 152):
Residents in Luddesdown and the surrounding area, including Leywood Road are already experiencing serious problems with water supply. Southern Water engineers have confirmed that the system is at capacity. Adding 100 new homes would further reduce reliability of supply, contrary to the NPPF's requirement that developments must be supported by adequate infrastructure.

2. Flooding and Surface Water Drainage (NPPF Section 14, Paragraphs 159–169):
The site lies on a slope, and during heavy rainfall water naturally runs downhill into Rhododendron Drive, which is now fully developed with houses. Constructing a large estate at the top of this slope will dramatically reduce the land's ability to absorb rainfall, as so much of the site will be covered with hard surfaces such as roads and buildings. This will increase run-off, overwhelm existing drainage, and heighten the risk of flooding to homes lower down. In 2019, excessive rainfall already caused serious flooding in the area, and further development would make such incidents more frequent and severe.

3. Highways and Road Safety (NPPF Paragraphs 110–112):
The A227 is already congested and hazardous. An additional 100 houses will bring a large increase in traffic, worsening congestion, road safety issues, and air quality. The NPPF states that developments must provide safe and suitable access for all users — this site cannot deliver that.

4. Unsustainable Rural Development (NPPF Paragraphs 7–12, 79, 174):
Culverstone is a rural area with limited public transport, shops, schools, and health services. A development of this size would place an excessive burden on already stretched local services, while also eroding the rural character of the area.

Conclusion:
For these reasons, I strongly object to the proposal and urge the council to refuse permission in line with the NPPF and the [Council's] Local Plan.