

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/03/2026 12:44 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of High View School Lane Higham Rochester Kent ME3 7HP
Proposal:	Application for Outline application with all/some matters reserved for the development of up to 50 residential dwellings (including affordable housing), vehicular access road from School Lane, internal roads, car parking, landscaping, public open space, and other associated works and infrastructure. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Chadwick Close Northfleet GRAVESEND

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	OBJECTION: Inadequate Infrastructure, Transport Impacts & Flood/Drainage Risks I object to this application as a concerned future resident. The proposal would place unacceptable pressure on already-strained local infrastructure, fails to demonstrate adequate transport mitigation, and does not sufficiently address flood and drainage risks. Planning applications must comply with the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy unless material considerations indicate otherwise. 1. Insufficient Social & Physical Infrastructure Policy CS10 requires development to be infrastructure-led with clear, deliverable mitigation for education, health, open space and utilities. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule shows that new development must contribute proportionately and in a timely manner. The application does not secure a committed, costed package of S106 measures to mitigate its impact. Kent County Council's education planning identifies the need for developer contributions when new housing creates additional demand, and national guidance confirms developers remain responsible for mitigating school-place impacts. The absence of quantified, enforceable education mitigation is a material deficiency. 2. Transport, Parking & Connectivity Deficiencies Policy CS11 requires robust Transport Assessments and Travel Plans for developments with highway impact, ensuring mitigation of congestion, provision
-----------	--

of sustainable travel options, and adequate parking in line with adopted standards. The submission does not demonstrate that trip generation, junction impacts, or safe pedestrian/cycle connections have been fully assessed or secured.

Gravesham's infrastructure evidence stresses the increasing cumulative pressure on roads and public transport, requiring an "infrastructure-first" approach. Without guaranteed improvements to bus services, walking/cycling routes and parking management, the proposal risks worsening congestion and reducing transport resilience.

3. Flood Risk, Surface Water & Wastewater Capacity

The Gravesham Water & Flood Risk Background Paper requires developments to demonstrate climate-resilient SuDS, mapped exceedance routes, and confirmation that foul and surface water infrastructure can cope. This application does not provide firm evidence that surface water will be managed sustainably nor that downstream systems have capacity.

Southern Water advises that developments of 10+ dwellings require pre-planning capacity checks to identify wastewater constraints. If these assessments have not been completed or published, the Council should not approve the scheme without verified capacity and enforceable mitigation or phasing.

4. Design, Amenity & Environmental Quality

The Core Strategy and Gravesham 2040 vision seek high-quality, healthy, accessible environments with sufficient amenity space, landscaping and biodiversity. The proposal lacks clear evidence of meeting these requirements, including play space, inclusive access, and long-term maintenance of green and blue infrastructure. ,

5. Policy Conflict & Planning Balance

CS10 (Infrastructure): Insufficient and unsecured mitigation for education, health and utilities.

CS11 (Transport): Lack of adequate modelling, sustainable travel measures and parking compliance. [kirby.wa-insight.com]

Flood & Drainage Evidence: No robust demonstration that SuDS and wastewater systems can accommodate the development without increasing flood risk.

The proposal therefore fails to present sustainable, infrastructure-led development as required by the Local Plan.

Request

I respectfully request that the Council refuse the application unless and until the applicant provides:

A complete Transport Assessment and Travel Plan with secured, funded mitigation.

Detailed S106 heads of terms covering education, health, open space and active travel.

A compliant flood/drainage strategy with verified wastewater capacity.

Evidence of high-quality design, amenity and biodiversity improvements.

These are essential to ensure the development is sustainable and compliant with the Local Plan.

Kind regards