

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/12/2025 11:56 AM 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] meopham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>This submission sets out the legal and policy-based reasons why Planning Application 20250992 should not be approved by Gravesham Borough Council. The proposal, located close to Meopham School and the Meopham parade of shops, presents unacceptable and unmitigable highway and safety risks, especially to children, and conflicts with both national planning policy and core local plan requirements.</p> <p>1. Non-Compliance With the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - Highways and Safety</p> <p>a. Failure to Ensure "Safe and Suitable Access for All Users" (NPPF §110)</p> <p>The NPPF requires that all developments demonstrate safe and suitable access, particularly for vulnerable road users such as schoolchildren. The proposed development sits adjacent to:</p> <p>Meopham School, serving large numbers of pedestrians at peak times</p> <p>The Meopham parade of shops, already recognised locally as an accident hotspot</p> <p>A corridor of narrow, high-risk village roads not designed for increased vehicular movements</p>

The additional traffic generated-both during construction and once occupied-cannot be safely absorbed into a road network already under strain.

b. Unacceptable Highway Safety Impact (NPPF §111)

Development must be refused if it results in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The following hazards clearly meet that threshold:

The Meopham parade of shops area has a documented collision history, with vehicles frequently braking suddenly, limited pedestrian visibility, and longstanding congestion.

Narrow carriageways throughout Meopham, particularly approaching the village centre, already force vehicles to mount pavements during peak flow-directly jeopardising pedestrians.

Increased vehicle numbers near a secondary school significantly elevate the risk of both pedestrian collisions and vehicle-on-vehicle accidents.

The cumulative effect would be a material worsening of safety for local residents, especially children.

2. Disproportionate Risk to Children Walking to and From Meopham School

Highway safety carries elevated legal significance when children are the primary at-risk group. Pupils walking to Meopham School already navigate:

A busy A227 route

Congested drop-off areas

Limited crossing points

Pavements narrowed by parked vehicles

Any additional traffic will intensify existing hazards. The council cannot lawfully conclude the development provides safe access when pedestrian safety at school peak times is already compromised.

The risk is not theoretical-it is predictable, foreseeable, and well-established in collision records for the area.

3. Accidents and Collisions at Meopham Parade of Shops - A Known Black Spot

The junctions and road layout around Meopham parade of shops form a known accident cluster, with:

Poor visibility when entering/exiting parking bays

Regular near-misses involving schoolchildren and elderly pedestrians

Vehicles accelerating or braking abruptly in response to parked cars and turning traffic

Introducing additional vehicle movements from a new development would inevitably increase collision probability. Because this risk is tied to structural constraints-not behaviour-the harm cannot be mitigated through conditions alone. This makes refusal justified and necessary under the NPPF.

4. Construction Phase Risks - Heavy Vehicles on Narrow Roads

During construction, the site would require:

HGV deliveries

Plant machinery

Contractor vans

Roadside stopping/temporary closures

Meopham's narrow roads do not permit safe two-way flow when large vehicles are present. Construction traffic would routinely block sightlines, force vehicles onto pavements, and create heightened risk for children walking to school and residents visiting the shops.

Where a development cannot be built without causing unacceptable safety risks, refusal is required.

5. Conflict With the Gravesham Local Plan

The proposal appears to conflict with multiple local policies, including:

Policy T1 - Transport

Requires development not to worsen highway safety or congestion. This scheme would do both.

Policy CS11 - Community Facilities

Protects the functioning and safety of key services, including schools. Increased traffic adjacent to Meopham School clearly undermines this.

Policy CS19 - Development and Design Principles

Requires development to safeguard local amenity, health, and safety. The proposal fails to do so.

Where a development conflicts with local plan provisions central to public safety, refusal is the appropriate legal outcome.

Conclusion

Planning Application 20250992 should not proceed because:

It fails to provide safe access, contrary to NPPF §§110-112.

It would cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety, requiring refusal under NPPF §111.

It places children at Meopham School at increased, foreseeable risk.

It intensifies danger at a known accident black spot near the Meopham parade of shops.

Meopham's narrow road network cannot safely absorb further traffic, especially construction vehicles.

