

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 8:37 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 Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Overall Sustainability and Suitability of the Location

The proposed development is fundamentally unsustainable. This is a location with very limited facilities, infrequent public transport, and no realistic alternatives to car travel for day-to-day needs. National and local planning policies require new housing to be well connected, supported by essential services, and capable of reducing reliance on private vehicles. This scheme fails on all counts. Without the necessary infrastructure or community amenities in place, the site is simply not a sustainable or appropriate location for a development of this scale.

Strain on Local Services and Community Infrastructure

Public services in the area-GP practices, schools, utilities, emergency services, and public transport-are already operating under significant pressure. Adding the population associated with up to 350 new homes would place an untenable burden on these facilities, further constraining access for existing residents and compromising service quality. No credible evidence has been provided to show that this level of growth can be accommodated.

Highways, Traffic Safety, and Transport Capacity

Kent Highways has issued clear and substantial objections, and these concerns must be given full weight. The surrounding road network is already fragile,

characterised by narrow rural lanes, poor visibility, and a history of near-miss incidents. Introducing a development of this size would push the network beyond safe capacity, creating heavy congestion and increasing collision risk at already problematic junctions.

Many of the adjacent roads are unlit and unsuitable for cycling, making sustainable travel alternatives unviable. The anticipated intensification of traffic is incompatible with highway safety and completely unacceptable for both current and future residents.

Drainage Limitations and Heightened Flood Risk

The site currently serves as an important natural drainage field, helping to regulate surface-water run-off. Replacing permeable land with housing, hardstanding, and roads would dramatically increase run-off volumes. Local drainage systems already struggle in periods of heavy rainfall, and the proposal offers no convincing or robust strategy to safeguard neighbouring land or properties from increased flood risk. The issue remains unresolved and represents a significant planning concern.

Loss of Green Belt and Erosion of Rural Character

The scheme involves the unnecessary removal of Green Belt land, directly undermining its core purposes: preventing urban sprawl, protecting openness, and preserving the character of rural settlements. A development of up to 350 homes would fundamentally transform the landscape and overwhelm the scale of nearby villages. There are no "very special circumstances" that would justify this level of harm, and the proposal is therefore in clear conflict with established Green Belt policy. Meopham would be entirely altered.

Ecological Damage and Threats to Protected Species

The site supports a rich network of wildlife, including protected species such as bats, owls, hedgehogs and badgers. The development would fragment habitats, introduce disruptive lighting and noise, and diminish ecological corridors essential for species survival. The mitigation put forward is insufficient and fails to reflect the site's environmental sensitivity or legal protections.

Environmental Pollution: Air, Noise and Light

A substantial increase in vehicular trips would severely worsen air quality, posing particular risks to children attending nearby schools. Locating a high-traffic development in close proximity to educational settings contradicts public-health objectives. Construction activity, coupled with long-term operational noise and lighting, would further degrade residential amenity and adversely affect local wildlife.

Combined and Cumulative Overdevelopment

This proposal cannot be considered in isolation. Several other developments—either approved or in the pipeline—will place additional pressure on the same overstretched network of roads, drainage systems, and community services. The cumulative effect represents significant overdevelopment that far exceeds the environmental and infrastructural capacity of the locality. Piecemeal expansion of this scale is incompatible with coherent, strategic planning.

When considered collectively, the issues are overwhelming: an unsustainable location, inadequate services, unsafe highways impacts, heightened flood risk, unjustified loss of Green Belt, severe ecological harm, increased pollution, and unacceptable cumulative pressures. These concerns demonstrate that the proposal is wholly unsuitable and should be refused in the strongest terms.

Kind regards