

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/09/2025 1:19 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:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development on the existing site of Blackthorn Farm to a residential estate for c.100 dwellings and the associated infrastructure/amenities.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) I disagree with the developer's view that the site can be considered "grey belt". This is not a brownfield site, scrubland or a disused car park/petrol station and therefore can't/shouldn't be deemed of low ecological value with no biodiversity.</p> <p>There are 43 brownfield sites registered for development in Gravesham and they should be the priority for Gravesham Council as per government guidelines.</p> <p>The development would not preserve the setting and character/charm of the immediate area and wider village. How can squeezing up to 100 properties, many of which are back-to-back be in keeping with the look and feel of this part of the village?</p> <p>The expectation will also be, as seen countrywide, that the "affordable housing" part of this development will include as many units as possible, at the lowest possible cost, and therefore far from keeping with the look and feel of the area.</p> <p>The proposal will also take a step towards the merging of towns, in our case, traditional villages, and further urban sprawling should it be approved which deems this not to be "grey belt" land.</p> <p>Considering the plans of this development, there is no improvement to public services and infrastructure and adherence to the sustainability principles. In fact, it is very much the opposite, this development will only be adding to existing infrastructure problems, damage biodiversity, increase pollution (including light and noise) and lower the site's ecological value.</p> <p>The A227 (Wrotham Road) has had, and continues to have, significant issues</p>
-----------	--

impacting residents regularly. Traffic is already a constant issue driven by flooding and/or roadworks, with even minor works impacting the whole village and beyond.

The development will add further surface water run-off and drainage issues. The fact that the developer has had to include a surface water drainage pond, which comes with its own risks (including a danger to life), just highlights how unfit for purpose this site and proposal is. They are having to mitigate the issues that the development will bring on itself. No development, no incremental risks!

Further, the approval of Lower Thames Crossing is also expected to increase traffic flow through the village, impacting residents' ability to get children to school, commute or make critical trips to medical centres etc.

This road also saw the recent horrendous incident of a collision between a school bus and a tractor, injuring several children, one very seriously with life changing implications. This section of the road is not suitable to cater for industrial/construction vehicles, even in the short term.

There are limited footpaths which requires pedestrians to cross the road back and forth in either direction. This development will be increasing the risk of injury to residents, many of which will be children given the focus on "larger family homes" by the developer.

With 100 homes comes with a minimum of 2 cars each, which will have to be used by residents given no public transport and limited amenities of a village store and petrol station in walking distance.

Local schools do not have sufficient places available to cater for all these "larger families" which will lead to long car journeys to schools across the Borough. Those not attending Culverstone Green primary school (a one form entry village school) are going to have to be driven to/from their school, increasing traffic flow in the morning and afternoons. The road is already narrowed by parents having to travel to Culverstone Green school with insufficient parking and refusal by parents and Golden Thread Alliance Trust workers to use the Community Centre car park.

The use of bicycles, as the developer suggests in its plans, is not realistic in the slightest, given the above, and again, adding risk of injury, if not death.

Meopham Medical Centre already has 2-4 week wait times for any appointment, with no guarantee of even 1 more GP for this development housing 500+ people, considering Homes for England Fact Sheet 4 (recently deleted funnily enough!) this wait time will grow dramatically, potentially leading to missed opportunities to diagnose, if not a further risk to lives.

Are Gravesham Council seriously willing to add a risk to life for residents, just to tick a box for Labour's unachievable housing plans?

I urge Gravesham Council to see sense and not approve this ridiculous proposal and focus on the priority brownfield sites in the borough and not materially impact the lives of your residents/constituents.

Kind regards