

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 11/12/2025 8:15 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:	Hurst Road Bexley

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	At its heart, the scheme would erode the openness of the Green Belt and undermine the rural identity of nearby settlements. Introducing 350 dwellings at this location would amount to unnecessary sprawl with no "very special circumstances" to justify such harm. The landscape, village setting, and countryside character would be irrevocably altered.

Travel:

Kent Highways has already raised strong concerns, and with good reason. The narrow, unlit rural road network is struggling as it is, with poor visibility and a record of near-miss incidents. Injecting hundreds of additional daily vehicle movements would push the system beyond safe limits, resulting in congestion, pressure on junctions, and elevated collision risk. Suggestions that cycling could offset car use ignore the reality of these unsuitable lanes.

Flooding Risk:

The site currently functions as an important natural drainage field. Replacing it with hard infrastructure would increase surface-water runoff at a time when the existing drainage network already fails during heavy rainfall. No convincing evidence has been offered to show that this risk can be safely mitigated, either on or off the site.

Biodiversity:

The area supports diverse wildlife, including protected species such as bats,

hedgehogs, owls and-critically-a confirmed badger sett. Construction and long-term occupation would fragment habitats, introduce lighting and noise, and jeopardise legally protected species. Proposed mitigation is insufficient and fails to align with statutory and local biodiversity obligations.

Pollution:

Air quality would deteriorate as vehicle numbers rise, posing particular concerns for children at nearby schools. Noise and light pollution, both during construction and after occupation, would further degrade the living conditions of residents and wildlife.

Cumulative Overdevelopment:

When viewed alongside other planned and approved schemes in the vicinity, the development contributes to an escalating pattern of piecemeal overgrowth. Each new project intensifies pressure on the same roads, drainage systems, green spaces, and services, creating an aggregate impact far beyond what the area can absorb.

Strain on Local Services:

Local GP capacity, schools, emergency services, utilities and public transport are already stretched. There is no credible indication that they could accommodate the population increase associated with 350 new homes without severely diminishing the quality of provision for both existing and future residents.

Unsustainable Location and Lack of Facilities:

The area lacks the facilities, public transport links, and employment opportunities needed to support development of this scale. Daily life would remain car-dependent, conflicting with national and local sustainability objectives.

Summary:

Considering the harm to the green belt, dangerous highway implications, inadequate drainage provisions, ecological harm, increased pollution, cumulative pressures, overstretched local services, and the lack of sustainable infrastructure, the proposal is clearly inappropriate. For these reasons, the application should be refused.

Kind regards