

# 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 5:05 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

## Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I would like to begin my objection by citing a very simple fact from the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):  "Developments should be appropriate to location; pollution (affecting health), living conditions and the natural environment; sensitivity to wider area, light pollution, Ancient Woodland; loss or permanent damage to irreplaceable habitats."  Whilst I fully appreciate that new homes are needed in the UK to meet the demands of a growing population, it is abundantly clear that this site, and others being put forward in a similar manner, have been chosen not because they are sustainable or appropriate, but because they offer significant financial benefit to the landowner and developer. This location could just as easily have been chosen by dropping a pin on a map-it is wholly unsuitable for development.
	The site is a rural area that has never previously been developed and therefore does not meet the definition of "grey belt." It sits amongst active farmland and established woodland, in a location where roads already struggle to cope with existing traffic, particularly at peak school times. To describe this site as a beneficial or sustainable location is unjustifiable; the only benefit is financial.

Key Points of Objection:

### Lack of Public Transport Infrastructure

Public transport provision is minimal. The nearest train station is a two-mile walk away and is not of a size or capacity to accommodate increased passenger demand.

### Ancient Woodland

The site directly adjoins Ancient Woodland, which is a protected and irreplaceable habitat. There has been misrepresentation of the woodland ownership in the application-it is owned by the school. Furthermore, surface

water run-off from the steep chalk slope would cause environmental damage to this woodland and exacerbate flooding issues on Rhododendron Avenue.

#### Drainage Function of the Site

It is understood that the land currently serves as a natural drainage area for Culverstone Valley and the A227. Development here risks disrupting this vital function.

#### Visual Impact

The visual harm would be catastrophic, fundamentally altering the rural character of the area.

#### Air and Noise Pollution

The A227 already suffers from significant traffic volumes, which increase further when major routes (A2, M20, M26) are disrupted. Noise and pollution are already an issue and, at times, continue through the night. Additional development will only make this worse.

#### Highway Safety and Congestion

The A227 is a small rural road linking Gravesend to Wrotham. This development would add an estimated 150 additional vehicles (1.5 per household, which is likely an underestimate). This will lead to queues to exit onto the A227, a heightened risk of accidents, and further congestion. The alternative-a new traffic-light junction-would be completely out of character with the rural setting.

#### Schools and Education Capacity

Local schools are already over capacity, with severe congestion at drop-off and pick-up times. A short 5-minute journey can take 30 minutes or more twice a day. Adding further demand will make this situation intolerable.

#### Emergency Vehicle Access

Increased congestion and pinch points will further restrict emergency vehicle access, putting lives at risk.

#### Conclusion

This proposal fails on multiple grounds: it is inappropriate to location, environmentally damaging, unsustainable in terms of infrastructure, and detrimental to the community. The only driver for this application is financial gain.

For these reasons, I strongly and unequivocally object to this proposed development.

---

Kind regards