

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 29/08/2026 9:26 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Woodlands Farm Wrotham Road Culverstone Gravesend Kent DA13 0RQ
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the development of 67 dwellings, public open space and associated works, with approval sought for the principal means of vehicular access from Newlands Lane. All other matters are reserved.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

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

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I object to planning application 20260815 for 67 dwellings at Woodlands Farm, Wrotham Road, Culverstone.

I am particularly concerned about highway safety and the proposed access from Newlands Lane. This is a narrow rural lane with no footway and limited room for vehicles to pass safely. It is also used by pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Introducing the additional traffic generated by 67 homes onto a lane of this nature raises serious safety concerns. The applicant's own figures indicate around 50 additional vehicle movements in the morning peak and 59 in the evening peak. Despite this, there appears to be no Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, no assessment of the Newlands Lane/Whitepost Lane junction and no proper cumulative assessment of the other developments proposed in the A227 corridor.

I am also concerned that the Council is being asked to establish the principle of 67 homes on a Green Belt site without a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The site is within the Meopham Downs Landscape Character Area and close to the Kent Downs National Landscape. As the land rises towards the southern boundary, development could become increasingly prominent in the surrounding countryside. I do not believe such an important impact should be assessed after the principle of development has already been approved.

Drainage is another major concern. Kent County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, has advised that a surface-water drainage strategy should be

submitted and reviewed before the application is determined. There are also unresolved questions concerning foul sewer capacity, groundwater protection and the proposed use of deep bore soakaways. Infiltration rates appear to have been assumed rather than established by on-site testing. These issues need to be properly investigated before deciding whether this site can safely accommodate a development of this scale.

I am concerned about the ecological impact as well. While the application refers to a 28.65% biodiversity gain for hedgerows, the submitted habitat figures show on-site habitat units reducing from 25.37 to 17.80, a loss of approximately 29.82%. The proposed solution depends on securing biodiversity units elsewhere, but these do not appear to have been secured. The site and its boundaries also provide habitat for wildlife including bats, and there remain unresolved questions concerning the removal of trees and potentially important hedgerows.

More broadly, I am very concerned by the amount of important evidence that appears still to be outstanding. This includes a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, agricultural land classification survey, Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, ground investigation and infiltration testing, water quality assessment and coordinated ecological assessment. These are not simply questions about the appearance or detailed layout of the development. They are relevant to deciding whether development of this site is acceptable in principle.

Although this is an outline application, granting permission would establish the principle of residential development here and the proposed 67 dwellings. The Council should therefore have all the evidence necessary to understand the consequences before making that decision, rather than allowing fundamental matters to be resolved afterwards.

I am also concerned about cumulative development in this area. Other substantial housing proposals would feed traffic onto the same A227 corridor. The combined effect on highway safety, congestion, drainage, infrastructure and local services needs to be properly assessed. Considering each development separately risks significantly understating the overall impact on Culverstone, Meopham and surrounding communities.

For these reasons, I ask Gravesham Borough Council to refuse application 20260815. At the very least, the application should not be determined until the outstanding assessments have been submitted and properly considered, with further public consultation where appropriate.

Given the scale of the proposal, its Green Belt location and the significant local concern, I also request that application 20260815 is determined by the Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers.

Kind regards