

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 8:32 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]

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

I strongly object to this proposed development of up to 50 homes on what has been prime agricultural and former green-belt land. It is inconsistent with Green Belt purposes and Local Plans, even if this land is now to be re-classified as "grey belt." This land is preventing the merging of the neighbouring villages of Culverstone, Istead Rise, and the large town of Gravesend. This land is preventing urban sprawl, and protecting the setting and special character of the historic village of Meopham.

Building 150 new homes that would need to use the extremely narrow Norwood Lane to enter and exit the development, could lead to untenable traffic congestion, pollution and an increase in accidents.

There are daily traffic build-ups in the lane, which in many places is only wide enough for one car to pass through. It is the main route between the villages of Meopham and Cobham, and is not suitable for large volumes of traffic.

There would not be a safe walking route from the housing to Meopham Station, and therefore realistically the residents would be reliant on their cars.

This large parcel of beautiful land, provides a bio-diverse environment, and contains irreplaceable habitat, as defined by the NPPF. It would mean the loss of mature trees and/or hedgerows.

Another point is that there is a lack of social infrastructure, as the local community lacks sufficient capacity in the schools and GP surgery. Even if the GP surgery was extended, I know from my work experience, that finding additional health care staff would be almost impossible. The local acute hospital is beyond breaking point, so hospital provision would not be there for an increase in population.

My last point is that the re-purposing of this land would inevitably result in a loss of biodiversity, as the land contains irreplaceable habitats, as defined by the NPPF.

Once this land has been developed, there is no going back.

The character of this beautiful and historic village will be much eroded; the inevitable traffic and noise pollution; loss of a large area of natural biodiversity and the buffer to stop the merging of neighbouring villages and urban sprawl; will be a cost that is far too high.

Kind regards