

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/12/2025 6:36 PM from [REDACTED]

## Application Summary

Address:	Land At Wrotham Road Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0AA
Proposal:	Outline application for the erection of up to 350 residential dwellings , public open space and associated works. Approval is sought for the principal means of vehicular access from Wrotham Road and all other matters are reserved.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Tradescant Drive Meopham

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Formal Objection to Planning Application 20250992

Land at Wrotham Road, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent DA13 0AA  
Outline Application for up to 350 Dwellings, Public Open Space and Associated Works

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing to register a strong objection to the above outline planning application for the erection of up to 350 residential dwellings, with vehicular access from Wrotham Road, and all other matters reserved. My objection is based on clear conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Gravesham Local Plan, and well-established planning case-law. The proposed development is inappropriate, unsustainable, and materially harmful to the local environment, infrastructure, and community.

1. Conflict with Green Belt Purposes and Local Policy  
Notwithstanding any "grey belt" classification discussions, the site lies within the Green Belt.

Under NPPF Chapter 13, the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The proposal is contrary to several Green Belt purposes:

Preventing urban sprawl (NPPF 143-152)

A development of 350 units constitutes unrestricted sprawl and would fundamentally alter the settlement pattern along Wrotham Road.

Preventing the merging of neighbouring towns and villages (Green Belt Purpose 2)

Meopham and surrounding settlements would experience further coalescence, eroding their distinct rural identity.

Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment (Purpose 3)

This is textbook inappropriate encroachment, with permanent loss of open countryside.

Preserving the setting of historic settlements (Purpose 4)

The development would harm the historic and distinctive linear village character of Meopham.

Case-law support:

R (Samuel Smith Old Brewery) v North Yorkshire CC [2020] UKSC 3 - confirmed that openness includes both spatial and visual impacts.

Redhill Aerodrome Ltd v SSCLG [2014] EWCA Civ 1386 - clarified that any harm to Green Belt must be afforded substantial weight.

The applicant has not demonstrated very special circumstances, as required by the NPPF when inappropriate development is proposed. Housing need alone does not constitute very special circumstances (as confirmed in multiple appeals, including Compton PC v Guildford BC 2019).

## 2. Inadequate Infrastructure and Services - Development is Unsustainable Transport and Highway Safety

The proposal would significantly increase traffic on Wrotham Road, which already suffers congestion and safety issues.

Poor existing public transport provision, with infrequent bus services.

Increased risk to pedestrian safety, particularly around Highstead.

A major new access junction onto Wrotham Road introduces significant highway risks.

Under NPPF 110 & 111, development must not create unacceptable impacts on highway safety or cause residual cumulative impacts that are severe. That threshold is clearly met here.

## Lack of Social Infrastructure Capacity

The local area does not have sufficient capacity to serve an influx of potentially 1,000+ new residents:

Schools in the area are already oversubscribed.

Local GP practices and healthcare providers face severe capacity constraints.

Community facilities, utilities, and emergency services are insufficient to support a development of this scale.

Under NPPF 20, 73, 93, development must be supported by adequate

infrastructure. The proposal fails this test.

### 3. Flood Risk and Drainage Failures

The site is known to be vulnerable to surface water flooding, and the submitted drainage strategy is inadequate.

Increased hardstanding will worsen runoff.

No evidence that downstream capacity is sufficient.

No robust mitigation for extreme weather events, contrary to NPPF 152-165.

A development that increases flood risk on- or off-site must be refused under NPPF guidance.

### 4. Design, Character and Residential Amenity Impacts

#### Design and Appearance - Out of Character

The proposed scale, height, density, and urban form are wholly incompatible with the character of Meopham, which is low-density and rural.

This conflicts with:

NPPF 130 & 134, requiring developments to be sympathetic to local character.

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy policies regarding landscape and village character.

#### Loss of Amenity to Existing Residents

The proposal would cause:

Overlooking and loss of privacy.

Overshadowing and loss of light to homes and gardens.

Overbearing impacts due to the scale and massing of the new dwellings.

Increased noise, light, and air pollution during both construction and occupation.

Under NPPF 185, planning decisions must safeguard residential amenity.

### 5. Environmental and Ecological Harm

Even if labelled "grey belt", the land retains environmental value requiring strong protection.

#### Loss of Biodiversity

Removal of mature trees, hedgerows, and wildlife habitats.

Reduction in ecological connectivity contrary to NPPF 174-179 and the Environment Act 2021 Biodiversity Net Gain duty.

#### Irreplaceable Habitats

