

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 1:44 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:	Meopham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Formal Planning Objection - Application T3IKOTHPIEV00
	I object to planning application T3IKOTHPIEV00 on legal, policy and material planning grounds. Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions must align with the development plan unless material considerations justify departure. This proposal conflicts with policy within the National Planning Policy Framework, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and statutory duties to protect rural land, biodiversity, amenity and community character. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate justification capable of outweighing these harms.

1. Conflict with Green Belt and Countryside Protection Principles

NPPF Paragraphs 138 to 151 confirm that the essential aim of Green Belt policy is to maintain openness and prevent urban encroachment. Even where the land is grey belt or edge-of-settlement, these purposes still apply. The proposal would expand built form into countryside, reduce openness, contribute to settlement creep and set precedent for further loss. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated. The development therefore conflicts directly with national policy that requires Green Belt harm to be given substantial weight.

2. Infrastructure and Sustainability Concerns

Under NPPF Paragraphs 8 and 104 to 106, development should only proceed where transport, public services and community infrastructure are sufficient to support additional population without harm. The proposal does not evidence adequate road capacity, pedestrian safety provision or realistic public transport access. Increased vehicle reliance is highly probable. Education and healthcare capacity are already stretched locally, yet there is no secure delivery of new provision. Drainage and flood resilience have not been demonstrated to a reliable standard. Without infrastructure guarantees, the scheme is not sustainable within the meaning of national policy and risks non compliance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 s70(2) requirement to consider material harm.

3. Harm to Rural Character, Culture and Sense of Place

NPPF Paragraphs 130 and 174 require that development respects local identity, landscape, settlement pattern and countryside character. This location is rural by nature. Its spacing, hedgerows, open fields and low density layout form a cultural identity that has developed over generations. Urbanising this area would not only introduce incongruent density and massing, it would replace a rural community environment with suburban form. This represents cultural loss. The Localism Act 2011 confirms that community identity carries planning weight. The proposal does not reinforce local distinctiveness. It overwrites it.

4. Residential Amenity Impact

The NPPF requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future residents. The scale, layout and proximity of development could lead to overlooking, privacy loss, light reduction and visual intrusion. Increased traffic, noise and artificial light would reduce tranquillity currently enjoyed in this rural setting. The Human Rights Act 1998 Article 8 protects peaceful enjoyment of home and environment. This development risks undermining that right.

5. Biodiversity and Environmental Impact

Local authorities have a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. The development risks loss of hedgerows, habitat corridors and wildlife value. The Environment Act 2021 requires measurable biodiversity net gain, yet no clear evidence of equivalent or improved ecological value is provided. Removal of habitat cannot be reversed once construction begins. This represents permanent environmental harm.

Conclusion

This proposal conflicts with NPPF policy regarding Green Belt purposes, sustainability, rural identity, amenity protection and biodiversity conservation. No very special circumstances or mitigation have been demonstrated. Approval would undermine policy, rural cultural landscape and environmental obligation. I respectfully request that application T3IKOTHPIEV00 be refused.

Kind regards