

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 8:43 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] Tradescant Drive Meopham Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection

1. An Ill-Judged and Fundamentally Unsustainable Location

The site is an inappropriate setting for a development of this magnitude. Local access to everyday amenities is extremely limited, public transport provision is minimal, and residents would have little option but to rely heavily on private vehicles for employment, education and routine trips. Such a car-dependent pattern of living is directly at odds with national and local policy objectives that prioritise sustainable, well-connected forms of growth. Introducing 120 dwellings in a location with such constrained accessibility would entrench long-term reliance on the car and undermine sound spatial-planning principles.

2. Excessive Pressure on Local Services and Community Infrastructure

Key services-including primary healthcare, utilities, bus provision and local schooling-are already operating at or beyond their practical capacity. A particular point of concern is the nearby special educational needs school, where pupils, families and staff depend on reliable services and predictable travel conditions. An influx of residents from 120 additional homes would intensify existing strains, with no credible strategy in place to expand or reinforce local provision. This would inevitably diminish the availability and quality of services for both current and future residents.

3. Highways Safety, Traffic Consequences and Restricted Access

The local highway network is fundamentally unsuited to accommodating additional vehicle movements of the scale proposed. Kent Highways has highlighted critical constraints: narrow rural carriageways, poor sightlines, and junctions operating close to capacity. These features already give rise to safety risks; the extra traffic generated by 120 homes would amplify collision potential and contribute to routine congestion. The close proximity of a special needs school heightens the seriousness of these risks, as vulnerable pupils rely on a calm and predictable highway environment. Assertions that walking or cycling could meaningfully reduce car use are implausible given the unlit, substandard and generally unsafe nature of surrounding routes.

4. Erosion of the Green Belt and Degradation of the Rural Landscape

The proposal entails the loss of a section of the Green Belt intended to limit urban sprawl and protect the countryside's openness. Even with a reduced quantum of 120 dwellings, the development would create a clear urban encroachment, diluting the rural character and narrowing the separation between existing settlements. No "very special circumstances" have been demonstrated to warrant the permanent erosion of Green Belt openness or its essential function as a strategic buffer.

5. Environmental Pollution: Air Quality, Noise and Artificial Light

Traffic arising from the scheme is likely to deteriorate local air quality, a matter of particular concern for pupils at the nearby special needs school, some of whom may be especially susceptible to airborne pollutants. Construction work and the long-term operation of a new residential enclave would also introduce additional noise and lighting, harming both neighbouring amenity and the wider environmental setting.

6. Biodiversity Reduction and Risks to Protected Species

The site forms part of a wider ecological network and provides habitat for numerous species, including owls, bats, hedgehogs and badgers. A confirmed badger sett lies within or adjacent to the site boundary, and disturbance of this sett would contravene the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Habitat clearance, increased lighting and construction noise would fragment wildlife corridors and jeopardise species viability. The mitigation measures put forward are inadequate and fail to reflect the ecological sensitivity of the area.

7. Drainage Constraints and Heightened Flood Risk

The land presently contributes to natural surface-water infiltration. Replacing permeable ground with hardstanding will significantly increase runoff and place further strain on a drainage network that already performs poorly. In the absence of rigorous, independently verified evidence demonstrating that flood risks-both within the site and downstream-can be managed safely, drainage remains a substantial barrier to development.

8. Combined Effects and Progressive Overdevelopment

Assessed in the context of other recent and emerging proposals, the cumulative effect is unambiguous: incremental, uncoordinated growth is pushing the locality far beyond its environmental limits and infrastructure capacity. Even a single additional project of 120 dwellings materially contributes to a wider pattern of overdevelopment that is inconsistent with coherent, strategic planning.

Conclusion

Given the site's unsustainable location, the excessive strain on already overstretched services, the significant highway risks near a vulnerable school, the unacceptable loss of Green Belt, the likelihood of increased pollution, the harm to biodiversity, unresolved flood-risk concerns and the cumulative impact of piecemeal development, the proposal for up to 120 dwellings is unsuitable and should be refused.

Kind regards