

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/11/2025 10:10 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] Meopham |

Comments Details

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Commenter Type: | Member of the Public |
| Stance: | Customer objects to the Planning Application |

Reasons for comment:

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Comments: | <p>Summary of Objection</p> <p>I strongly object to this application on the grounds of highway safety, drainage and flood risk, loss of wildlife habitat, air quality impacts, over-capacity local services, and conflict with the Gravesham Local Plan and NPPF. The scale of 350 dwellings is wholly inappropriate for a village of this size and would cause significant, long-term harm.</p> <p>1. Drainage, Flooding and Pollution</p> <p>Some of the village does not have mains drainage, and the surrounding lanes are known to flood regularly. The development site currently provides essential natural drainage. Its loss would greatly increase surface-water run-off into already compromised lanes.</p> <p>The application does not present a robust or sustainable solution to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">foul drainage (risk of pollution from non-mains systems)surface water managementcumulative drainage pressure from nearby applications <p>This conflicts with NPPF Chapter 14 (meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding).</p> <p>2. Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking</p> <p>The road network is already at breaking point. The lanes are narrow, frequently gridlocked, and unsafe for increased volumes of cars, delivery vans and service vehicles. A development of 350 homes could mean 700-1,000+ additional vehicle movements daily, which the roads cannot absorb.</p> <p>Parking at local shops is already extremely difficult, and increasing car dependency conflicts with sustainable development principles (NPPF, paras 110-113).</p> <p>3. Wildlife and Biodiversity Loss</p> <p>The site and surrounding area support extensive wildlife, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">badgershedgehogs |
|-----------|---|

owls and bats

amphibians and small mammals

The scale of this proposal would fundamentally reduce habitat connectivity. The ecological assessment does not adequately account for cumulative loss created by several simultaneous applications. This contradicts NPPF Chapter 15 on conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

4. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

Local GP surgeries and Darent Valley Hospital are already at capacity, with long waiting times and no funded expansion. Schools, buses and local facilities would also be overwhelmed. The application provides no credible mitigation.

5. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This proposal sits alongside an additional 150-home application almost opposite it, plus a further 120-home proposal in the village. Assessing it in isolation is misleading; the combined impact is severe and unacceptable.

Conclusion

For reasons of drainage risk, highways unsuitability, ecological harm, and insufficient infrastructure capacity, I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Kind regards