

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/12/2025 1:34 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]

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Formal Planning Objection I wish to object to this development on legal, environmental and material planning grounds. Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and statutory duties concerning biodiversity and rural character. The scheme fails sustainability tests and demonstrates no compelling justification capable of outweighing established policy protections. 1. Conflict with Green Belt Policy and the NPPF NPPF Paragraphs 138 to 151 are explicit that Green Belt land should remain open, with development considered inappropriate unless very special circumstances apply. None have been evidenced. Even if the land is described as grey belt, Green Belt purposes remain in force. The proposal would reduce openness, extend urban form into countryside, and weaken the physical and visual separation between settlements. Such erosion is permanent, incremental and strategically harmful. The development cannot be classed as sustainable or policy compliant when it directly undermines the long term permanence that Green Belt designation exists to secure.
-----------	--

2. Infrastructure Capacity and Sustainability Failure

The development does not satisfy the sustainability requirements in NPPF Paragraphs 8 and 104 to 106. Local roads already experience pressure, with limited public transport routes and no certainty of improvement. Increased vehicle movement raises concerns for safety, air quality and congestion. School and GP capacity in the area is already strained. No guaranteed and funded mitigation has been demonstrated. Without secure provision for education, healthcare and utilities, the development creates a shortfall that would fall disproportionately on the existing community. Approval in this condition risks contravening the duty within the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 s.70(2) to assess material harm.

3. Harm to Rural Character, Culture and Identity

NPPF Paragraphs 130 and 174 require decisions to recognise the intrinsic beauty of the countryside and protect places where local identity and character are valued. This settlement is rural in nature with a culture rooted in landscape, open views, agricultural adjacency and low density living. Urbanising such land fundamentally alters not only scenery, but the social fabric of the community. Rural identity is not ornamental, it is a cultural inheritance developed over generations. The Localism Act 2011 gives weight to the character and voice of communities, and this proposal conflicts with that principle. Once rural culture is urbanised, it is not recoverable.

4. Residential Amenity and Human Rights Impact

The NPPF requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future residents. The scale and density presented risk overlooking, loss of privacy, daylight reduction and visual dominance for neighbouring homes. Increases in noise, traffic and artificial lighting would negatively affect quiet enjoyment of property. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 provides residents the right to peaceful enjoyment of their home and environment. This scheme materially interferes with that right on multiple measurable grounds.

5. Biodiversity Loss and Ecological Non-Compliance

Local authorities carry a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. The proposal risks habitat fragmentation, loss of hedgerows and disruption to wildlife corridors. The Environment Act 2021 requires biodiversity net gain. There is no clear evidence that ecological value would be retained or replaced to an equivalent level. Once removed, these assets cannot be replicated with immediate effect.

Conclusion

The proposal is incompatible with national planning law, Green Belt protection policy and sustainable development requirements. It would urbanise rural land, degrade cultural identity, strain essential services, undermine residential amenity and lead to avoidable environmental loss. I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Kind regards