

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/11/2025 1:21 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] Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to object to the proposed large-scale housing development, citing significant negative impacts on the surrounding villages and local environment. a) Unsustainable Increase in Traffic - The proposal relies on outdated journey data from 2011, which recorded 6,000 trips. Current figures indicate an increase of 1,115 journeys per day-a substantial increase. This surge has not been adequately addressed in the planning documents and is based on data profiles of 2011 so not reflective of current traffic. - No sustainable travel modes have been proposed. Previous suggestions for bus timetable changes and upgrades were dismissed by both KCC and Gravesham councils due to health and safety concerns. - When the A2 experiences issues, Sole Street becomes a rat run, causing severe congestion in local villages. This impact has not been factored into the current plans. - This fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 110, which requires developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users and promote sustainable transport. b) Green Belt and Environmental Concerns - The area is designated as green belt land. Gravesham has previously flouted green belt regulations to enable development, despite ongoing objections. This repeated disregard could be seen as bias against local villages. - The development would cause unrestricted urban sprawl, merging neighbouring villages and encroaching on the countryside, resulting in the loss of character for historic settlements such as Cobham Parish, which currently has only 604 houses. The proposed development would significantly increase the population and strain local resources. - This contravenes NPPF Paragraph 138, which sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. c) Inadequate Social Infrastructure - Local schools, GP surgeries, and public services are already at capacity. There is no clear plan to expand these facilities to accommodate the influx of new
-----------	---

residents.

- NPPF Paragraph 20 requires that strategic policies make sufficient provision for community facilities and services.

d) Flood Risk and Drainage

- The site is at risk of flooding, and the proposed drainage strategy is inadequate. This could exacerbate flooding in the local area, putting existing homes and infrastructure at risk.

- This does not comply with NPPF Paragraph 167, which requires that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere.

e) Environmental and Health Impacts

- The development would result in unacceptable levels of noise, light, and air pollution during and after construction. Light pollution is a particular concern, as many surrounding villages currently have no street lighting.

- There is a risk of loss of biodiversity, with important habitats, mature trees, and hedgerows under threat.

- The site is contaminated, and the developer's mitigation plans are insufficient, posing risks to health and the environment.

- These issues conflict with NPPF Paragraphs 174 and 180, which require planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, and to avoid significant harm to biodiversity.

Given the substantial evidence, data, and policy conflicts presented, I urge the planning authority to reject this proposal

Kind regards