

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to lodge my **strong objection** to the above planning application. I believe this proposal is fundamentally unsound and would cause serious and lasting harm to the local community, environment, and infrastructure.

### 1. Highway Safety and Traffic Congestion

- The A227 is already heavily congested, carrying large lorries and acting as a **rat run between the A2 and A20/M20** during frequent motorway delays.
- Adding hundreds of extra vehicle movements from 100 homes will **exacerbate gridlock, pollution, and road rage incidents**.
- Three schools are located along this route, already making it hazardous for children and parents. My own son narrowly avoided serious injury when struck by a speeding car outside Meopham Secondary School. This was not an isolated concern but proof of the daily dangers.
- Speeding through Meopham village is common, and further traffic would increase the risk of **serious or fatal accidents**.

### 2. Structural Weakness of the Local Road Network

- The A227 is known to suffer from **sinkholes**, which have repeatedly caused closures and diversions.
- When blocked, traffic is forced onto narrow rural lanes that are **unsuitable for heavy volumes of vehicles**, compounding congestion and creating hazards.
- Approving this development would make an already fragile and overstretched road system even less resilient.

### 3. Unsustainable Location for Housing

- The area has **very limited local employment opportunities**, meaning new residents will almost certainly need to commute elsewhere.
- Public transport is inadequate: the nearest station is not walkable, bus services are infrequent, and residents will be **entirely car-dependent**.
- Each household is likely to require multiple cars, leading to higher congestion, parking pressures, and carbon emissions. This is directly at odds with **national and local climate commitments** to reduce car dependency.

### 4. Strain on Local Services

- GP surgeries, dentists, and hospitals in Gravesham and the surrounding area are already **over capacity**, with long waiting times. A development of this scale would worsen access to healthcare.
- Local schools are oversubscribed, meaning children from new housing would put further pressure on scarce places.

### 5. Environmental and Landscape Harm

- This proposal would destroy **greenfield countryside**, leading to the permanent loss of natural habitats for wildlife and birds.

- Hedgerows, trees, and open land contribute to biodiversity and provide essential corridors for species – all of which are at risk.
- Large-scale building increases **surface water run-off**, placing rural drainage systems under pressure and raising the risk of localised flooding.
- The development would cause **severe visual intrusion**, eroding the rural character of Culverstone and changing it beyond recognition.

## 6. Heritage and Community Identity

- Culverstone is a rural village. A 100-home estate is **grossly disproportionate** in scale and out of keeping with the character of the area.
- The development risks urbanising the countryside and undermining the distinct identity of the village community.
- If there are any heritage assets nearby, their setting and historic value would be harmed by such an intrusive scheme.

## 7. Dangerous Precedent and Cumulative Impact

- Approving one major development of this type would set a **dangerous precedent**, encouraging further speculative applications on surrounding greenfield land.
- This creeping overdevelopment would overwhelm local roads, services, and the environment.

## 8. Policy Conflicts

- National and local planning policies require development to be **sustainable, safe, and supported by adequate infrastructure**.
- Building on a car-dependent rural site, with insufficient jobs, transport, healthcare, and school places, is **contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework's sustainability criteria**.
- Local plans prioritise the use of **brownfield land**. Approving this scheme on open countryside would run against these principles.

## Conclusion

This development is **unsafe, unsustainable, and wholly inappropriate** for its location. It would:

- Endanger road users and schoolchildren.
- Overload an already fragile road and service infrastructure.
- Destroy countryside, biodiversity, and the rural character of Culverstone.
- Undermine both local and national planning policy commitments.

For all these reasons, I urge the Council in the **strongest possible terms to reject this application outright**.



