

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/12/2025 8:21 PM from [REDACTED]

## Application Summary

Address:	Land West Of Norwood Lane Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0YE
Proposal:	Outline application with all matters reserved (except access) for a development of up to 150 dwellings (Use Class C3), including affordable dwellings, and associated landscaping, public open space and infrastructure works.
Case Officer:	Mrs Alison Webster

[Click for further information](#)

## Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Foxendown Lane Meopham

## Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I wish to object to the proposed development of 150 dwellings on this site. The proposal is inappropriate, unsustainable, and contrary to multiple planning principles for the following reasons:

### 1. Highway Safety and Unsuitable Road Network

The surrounding road network consists of narrow rural lanes that were never designed to handle the traffic generated by a development of this scale.

The junction of Camber Park Lane onto Green Lane is already dangerous, with poor visibility and frequent difficulty for vehicles trying to exit. Adding a major access point opposite this junction would introduce conflicting movements and significantly increase collision risk.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires developments to provide "safe and suitable access for all users." This proposal fails to meet that requirement.

### 2. Insufficient Local Services and Infrastructure

Essential services in the area are already under considerable strain:

- Schools are at or close to capacity
- GP surgeries and dentists are oversubscribed, with limited ability to expand
- Public transport options are minimal, increasing car dependency
- Road infrastructure is rural and entirely inadequate for sustained traffic growth

No credible mitigation has been presented to address these shortfalls.

Introducing 150 homes would place additional, unsustainable pressure on services that are already stretched well beyond their limits.

---

### 3. Loss of Countryside and Environmental Harm

The proposed development represents the destruction of open countryside that forms an important part of the village's rural setting. The consequences include:

a. Permanent loss of agricultural and greenfield land

Once this land is built on, it is lost forever. It contributes to the rural character, heritage, and openness of the area.

b. Harm to local wildlife and habitats

The fields and surrounding hedgerows support a variety of species-birds, small mammals, insects, and pollinators. Large-scale housing would fragment habitats, disrupt biodiversity, and remove important ecological corridors.

c. Increased pollution

More vehicles will increase noise, air pollution, and light pollution in an area that is currently quiet and rural.

The proposal conflicts with the NPPF's requirement to protect valued landscapes, prevent unacceptable environmental impacts, and promote biodiversity net gain.

---

### 4. Impact on the Character and Identity of the Village

This section of the village retains a distinct rural character, with open views, traditional field boundaries, and a landscape that contributes to the identity of the wider community. Introducing 150 modern homes in a concentrated estate format would:

- overwhelm the existing settlement pattern
- erode the semi-rural environment
- urbanise an area that is intentionally low-density
- undermine the conservation value of the surrounding landscape

Such a development is entirely out of scale and fails to respect the historic and rural context.

---

### 5. Unsustainable Location for New Housing

A development of this magnitude should be located where:

- infrastructure already exists,
- sustainable transport options are available,
- brownfield land can be reused, and
- community services can expand to meet demand.

None of these conditions are met at this site.

The proposal would create a car-dependent estate with no realistic access to services except by private vehicle, directly contradicting national policy promoting sustainable growth.

---

### Conclusion

For the reasons outlined-highway danger, insufficient infrastructure, unacceptable environmental damage, loss of countryside, and failure to meet sustainability principles-this proposal is fundamentally unsuitable.

I respectfully urge the planning authority to reject the application.

---

Kind regards