

# 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 8:32 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:	Pinewood Avenue Sidcup

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection Points
	<p>1. Scale and Settlement Character I am concerned that a development of 350 homes is disproportionately large for a small village, and would fundamentally alter its established rural character and sense of place.</p>
	<p>2. Loss of Greenfield Land The proposal involves building on an undeveloped field that currently contributes to the openness and landscape setting of the village, and its loss would represent a permanent change to the countryside.</p>
	<p>3. Highway Capacity and Road Safety Local roads are narrow, lack footways in places, and were not designed to accommodate the significant increase in traffic this development would generate. I am not satisfied that safe access or sustainable traffic levels can be achieved.</p>
	<p>4. Limited Public Transport and High Car Dependency The village has restricted public transport provision and few local services, meaning future residents would be heavily reliant on private cars, which conflicts with sustainable-travel objectives.</p>
	<p>5. Pressure on Local Services</p>

Schools, GP surgeries, emergency services and utilities are already operating close to capacity. I have seen no clear evidence that these essential services can expand at the scale required to support the additional population.

**6. Flood Risk and Drainage Concerns**

The field currently assists natural surface-water drainage. Replacing it with largely impermeable surfaces risks overwhelming local drainage systems and may increase surface-water flooding in the area.

**7. Impact on Wildlife and Habitats**

The site and its surrounding hedgerows, trees, and fields support a range of wildlife. I am concerned that habitat loss, lighting, and construction disturbance could harm species and break established wildlife corridors.

**8. Noise, Air Quality and Light Pollution**

A development of this size would introduce significantly more traffic and activity, leading to increased noise, air pollutants, and light spill in what is currently a quiet rural location.

**9. Cumulative Effects of Other Developments**

When considered alongside other recent or proposed schemes in the area, this development would contribute to cumulative impacts that may exceed what local infrastructure and the environment can reasonably support.

**10. Insufficient Justification for the Location**

Given the scale of the scheme, the limited local facilities, and the environmental constraints of the site, I do not believe a development of this magnitude is compatible with sustainable and proportionate village growth.

---

Kind regards