

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/12/2025 7:31 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]

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Formal Objection to Planning Application 20250993 I wish to lodge a formal objection to the above planning application for the construction of 120 new homes. My reasons for objecting are outlined below. 1. Conflict with the Gravesham Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) The proposal does not align with the Gravesham Local Plan or the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework-particularly those relating to sustainable development, Green Belt protection, and the need for developments to be supported by appropriate infrastructure. The scale, location, and overall design of the scheme are incompatible with the spatial strategies and sustainable growth objectives set out in both local and national policy. 2. Serious Concerns Regarding Highways, Traffic, and Air Quality The road network surrounding the site is already heavily congested and frequently gridlocks during peak times. Insufficient road capacity has led to surrounding rural lanes being used as alternative routes, worsening congestion and deteriorating air quality. This is especially concerning given the nearby presence of two schools and a country park, where pedestrian safety and clean air should be a priority. Furthermore, public transport provision in the area is extremely limited, meaning future residents would be predominantly dependent on private vehicles. This directly conflicts with the sustainable transport aims of both the Local Plan and the NPPF. 3. Drainage Capacity and Flooding Risks
-----------	---

Existing drainage systems are already operating at or near full capacity. Introducing additional impermeable surfaces through a development of this magnitude would increase surface water runoff and heighten the risk of localised flooding. The applicant has not provided adequate evidence that necessary upgrades to drainage infrastructure can be delivered without causing further strain on surrounding land and systems.

4. Impact on the Green Belt, Landscape Character, and Nearby AONB

The site lies within the Green Belt and close to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The proposed development would result in the loss of open countryside and would harm the rural character of the area. Such encroachment conflicts with the core purposes of the Green Belt, including preventing unchecked urban sprawl and preserving the openness of the landscape.

5. Adverse Effects on Biodiversity and Wildlife

The area supports a variety of wildlife, including badgers, hedgehogs, owls, and bats. Habitat destruction and disturbance caused by a development of this scale would have significant negative impacts on these protected and declining species. The mitigation measures proposed are insufficient to appropriately address or offset the level of ecological harm anticipated.

6. Cumulative Overdevelopment and Pressure on Local Services

This proposal forms part of a cluster of large-scale developments in the vicinity. The combined impact of these schemes would place unacceptable strain on already overstretched local services, including schools, healthcare facilities, and essential infrastructure. No credible evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the area can accommodate this volume of development without substantial harm to the local community.

Conclusion

Given its conflict with established planning policy and the unacceptable impacts on transport, drainage, the landscape, biodiversity, and local services, I strongly urge the planning authority to refuse this application.

Kind regards