

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/09/2025 8:42 PM from [REDACTED]

## Application Summary

Address:	Blackthorn Farm Wrotham Road Meopham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 100No. residential dwellings (including affordable housing), with all matter reserved except for access and creation of a new access from A227/South Street.
Case Officer:	Ms Amanda Cue

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Meopham, Gravesend

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	
1. Irreparable Harm to Local Ecology and Protected Species The site supports a wide range of wildlife, including bats and birds protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Neighbouring residents, such as [REDACTED] regularly observe bat activity and may provide video evidence. This land is not vacant but an active habitat. Large-scale building would destroy established ecosystems and cause permanent biodiversity loss, making development here wholly inappropriate.	

2. Threat to Ancient Woodland and Flood Risk  
The site borders designated ancient woodland, one of the most protected habitats. The View School, part-owner of this land, has raised concerns over planning document inaccuracies. The proposed development lies on a steep chalk slope above the woodland, creating serious risks of run-off, soil erosion, and flooding. Properties on Rhododendron Avenue already experience flooding, which this scheme would worsen. Visually, a large estate would also permanently scar this rural slope.

3. Conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
The proposal directly contradicts several NPPF provisions:

Para. 116: Unacceptable impact on highway safety, worsening traffic on the A227.

Para. 198: Development inappropriate to location, ignoring pollution, light, health, and sensitivity of the environment.

Para. 156: Green Belt release requires exceptional justification and sustainable transport links. This site offers neither, with no adequate connections to Gravesend or Meopham Station.

4. Inappropriate Use of Greenfield Land

This is undeveloped countryside, not brownfield. Building here defies local and national policy that prioritises conserving greenfield and reusing developed sites. No justification exists for losing this natural asset.

#### 5. Traffic and Safety Risks

The A227 is already congested and hazardous at peak times. Adding over 200 vehicles from 100 homes would severely worsen safety and delays. Site access from this main road is unsafe and would also compromise emergency vehicle response.

#### 6. Lack of Sustainable Transport

The site is poorly served by public transport. Residents would rely almost entirely on cars for shops, schools, healthcare, and rail stations. This enforced car-dependency undermines national sustainability and carbon reduction goals.

#### 7. Loss of Natural Drainage and Increased Flood Risk

The land currently absorbs surface water and reduces flooding for the A227 and Culverstone Valley. Development would remove this function, heightening flood risk locally and downstream. The application fails to assess or mitigate this properly.

#### 8. Deterioration of Air Quality

Traffic along the A227 already damages air quality. Extra vehicle journeys from this scheme would further increase pollution, undermining environmental targets and public health.

#### 9. Erosion of Rural Identity and Village Separation

The development would bring villages unacceptably close, merging distinct communities and eroding rural character. This directly opposes planning policies that seek to preserve settlement separation.

#### 10. Strained Infrastructure and Emergency Access

Local schools, healthcare, and roads are already stretched. The A227 and Meopham Station lack capacity for the increase in demand. Emergency access is especially concerning during peak congestion, putting public safety at risk.

#### Conclusion

The scheme is unsuitable for this location. It conflicts with national and local planning policies, threatens protected habitats, increases flooding and traffic hazards, degrades air quality, and undermines rural character. Infrastructure cannot support it.

I respectfully urge the planning authority to reject this application in full, protecting the ecological integrity, identity, and sustainability of the area.

---

Kind regards