

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 9:46 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]

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Objection to the Proposed Development of 67 Homes at Woodland Farm, Wrotham Road, Culverstone I strongly object to the proposed development of 67 homes at Woodland Farm, Wrotham Road, Culverstone. In my view, this proposal would result in significant and irreversible harm to the local environment, place unacceptable pressure on already strained infrastructure and public services, and fundamentally undermine the rural character of the area. When considered alongside other developments that have already been approved or are proposed nearby, the cumulative impact of this scheme would be unsustainable and detrimental to the local community. Woodland Farm forms an important part of the countryside that gives Culverstone its distinctive rural identity. The site provides valuable green space and supports a wide range of wildlife habitats, accommodating numerous bird, mammal, insect, and plant species. These natural environments contribute to local biodiversity and ecological balance. Once such greenfield land is developed, the loss of habitat and countryside character cannot easily be reversed or replaced. The permanent transformation of this rural landscape into a housing estate would therefore represent a substantial environmental loss. Furthermore, the continued development of greenfield land is difficult to justify when brownfield sites remain available and should be prioritised for housing provision. Brownfield developments can help meet housing needs while minimising the loss of agricultural land, wildlife habitats, and open countryside. Prioritising previously developed land promotes sustainable growth and protects the character of established rural communities such as Culverstone. Allowing
-----------	---

further encroachment into the countryside sets an undesirable precedent and contributes to the gradual erosion of the very qualities that make the area attractive to residents.

In addition to the environmental concerns, the proposal raises significant issues regarding traffic and highway capacity. The local road network already experiences considerable congestion and frequently operates at or near its capacity. Residents regularly encounter delays along Wrotham Road and surrounding routes, particularly during peak commuting periods, school drop-off and collection times, and during ongoing roadworks. The situation has worsened in recent years due to repeated utility works, water main repairs, temporary traffic management systems, and highway maintenance projects. These disruptions often cause lengthy queues and substantial delays for local residents.

The surrounding road network is also relied upon when incidents occur on major routes such as the A227, A20, and M20. During such events, traffic is commonly diverted through local roads that were never designed to accommodate large volumes of vehicles. This frequently results in severe congestion and significant disruption to daily life. The introduction of 67 new homes would inevitably generate hundreds of additional vehicle movements each day, placing even greater pressure on roads that are already struggling to cope. The cumulative impact is especially concerning given the number of other housing developments that have recently been approved or are currently under consideration within the wider area. While individual planning applications may be assessed separately, local residents experience the combined effects of all developments. Without substantial highway improvements, the road network lacks the capacity to absorb further significant growth.

Increased traffic would also create additional safety concerns for all road users, including motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, and schoolchildren. Greater congestion can increase the likelihood of accidents, while delays on the road network may also affect emergency service response times. These issues should be carefully considered when assessing the overall suitability of the proposed development.

Serious concerns also exist regarding the capacity of local water supply and utility infrastructure. Residents already experience frequent water leaks, burst mains, emergency repair works, and recurring disruptions associated with ageing infrastructure. Roads are regularly excavated to address these problems, causing further inconvenience and traffic congestion. Such recurring issues raise legitimate doubts about the network's ability to support additional development without significant investment.

The region has also experienced periods of water stress, including hosepipe bans and other restrictions during dry weather. Residents are routinely encouraged to reduce water consumption due to pressure on water resources. Given these existing challenges, there is understandable concern about how the current water supply infrastructure could accommodate the demands associated with 67 additional homes. Without substantial upgrades, further development may exacerbate existing problems and place increased strain on already limited resources.

There are similarly important questions regarding drainage and sewage capacity. Additional housing will inevitably increase demand on these systems. If infrastructure improvements are not implemented before development takes place, there is a risk of increased environmental impacts, drainage issues, and pressure on wastewater facilities. Any proposal should demonstrate clearly that adequate infrastructure is available and capable of meeting future demand without adversely affecting existing residents.

The development would also place additional pressure on local services that are already struggling to meet current demand. Schools, GP surgeries, dental services, public transport, and other essential community facilities are facing growing pressures as the local population increases. Residents already encounter difficulties securing healthcare appointments and accessing school places. The proposal provides insufficient assurance that the necessary infrastructure and service improvements will be delivered to support the increased population generated by the development. Approving further housing

without corresponding investment risks reducing the quality and accessibility of services for both existing and future residents.

Perhaps the most significant concern is the cumulative impact of this proposal when considered alongside other developments across the area. The combined effect on roads, public services, water infrastructure, schools, healthcare provision, drainage systems, and the natural environment appears to have been underestimated. Residents are already experiencing the consequences of rapid population growth and ongoing development. Continuing to approve large-scale housing schemes without first addressing existing infrastructure deficiencies is neither sustainable nor responsible planning.

In conclusion, I strongly urge the Council to refuse planning permission for the proposed 67-home development at Woodland Farm, Wrotham Road, Culverstone. The proposal would result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats, damage the rural character of the area, and lead to the unnecessary development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives should be prioritised. It would exacerbate existing traffic congestion, increase road safety concerns, place additional strain on water supplies, drainage and sewage systems, and add further pressure to already overstretched schools, healthcare services, and community infrastructure. When assessed alongside other developments in the area, the cumulative impact would be substantial and unsustainable.

For these reasons, the development cannot reasonably be regarded as sustainable and should therefore be refused.

Kind regards