

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/12/2025 3:34 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: | [REDACTED] Gravesend Kent |

Comments Details

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Commenter Type: | Neighbour |
| Stance: | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| Reasons for comment: | |

Comments: My objection to the proposed developments in Meopham centres on how the plans are presented as inevitable and beneficial to our community. This narrative is fundamentally flawed. These projects are developer-led initiatives exploiting the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and implicit government approval, weaponizing the notion of "sustainable development" to rush through changes that serve profit over community needs.

I recognise that development is necessary, but Meopham is facing three confirmed proposals for 620 houses and an additional proposal for 750 houses pending approval. This could bring in a least 1240 residents (assuming two residents per dwelling), increasing to 1370 new houses and 2,740 new residents. Meopham had 6795 residents in the 2021 Census, so these three developments alone will result in an immediate 18% increase in population. If all four developments occur, that figure jumps to 40%. Such a rapid growth cannot be labelled sustainable.

Meopham is a rural area, enjoyed by residents like myself for its tranquillity and green spaces. Yet, we are faced with what seems like a property development gold rush. Let's be clear: this is not about our desires as a community; it's about profit for developers, regardless of their compelling presentations.

The applications boast ambitious transportation plans, but they push responsibility for infrastructure improvements to some undefined future date.

They evaluate each project in isolation rather than as a cohesive network of developments, which only dilutes the impact on local services. For instance, with 10,315 patients currently registered at Meopham Medical Centre, they face a potential 12% increase in caseload from just three developments. Moreover, traffic assessments ignore the upcoming Lower Thames Crossing that will further amplify congestion along the A227.

While the proposals include features like energy-efficient homes and electric vehicle (EV) charging points, they fail to address broader concerns about climate resilience. There is no mention of solar power or air source heat pumps, and the reliance on Low NOx gas boilers doesn't align with future energy plans. Plus, heavier EVs will aggravate our already damaged roads.

It's undeniable that Gravesham requires housing, but these developments are a shock to our community. They feel undemocratic and unsustainable, as the NPPF and developers insist otherwise. The pressing question for us in Gravesham and Meopham is this: what does truly sustainable and acceptable development look like? Because this is not it.

I also draw the committees attention to other issues in their documentation. I have more but the character count has limited the detail I can provide:

- Regarding "KCC Highways - Appendix E - Part 3: Appendix G - Manual for Streets Visibility Splay Calculations" the SSD calculations are wrong. They assume a gradient of 0%. This is incorrect. Based on OS map data I estimate an 18% gradient. This pushes the northbound SSD to 49.2 which is just below the threshold of 49.3.
- The presumption that cycling will be an option without major changes to A227 is disingenuous given cars speed, the roads are dark by design and poor road quality.
- 5.22 should say "Strood" not "Stroud"
- The popularity of Camer Parade is both a blessing and a curse; parking is limited and over subscribed at times. The topography of the road, south to north, from Longfield Hill Road to Green Lane slopes and curves left to right. This creates two problems. The confluence of the turnings at Longfield Hill and Camer Parade is confusing and in my opinion dangerous. This is exacerbated by the almost immediate exit to the North from Camer Parade which is obscured by the topography as well as the exit at the South used only by Big M customers (there is no No Exit/Ahead Only/One Way sign at this junction). Effectively the proposal results in five junctions within several hundred metres, combined with difficult topography and speeding cars will make for a toxic road conditions. The corrected SSD adds to this assessment.
- Speeding on the A227 is a problem as the developers own data demonstrates. Drivers are fully aware of the position of the static speed camera and I have personally witnessed dangerous overtaking along the section of road from Camer Parade to the junction of Norwood Lane. As they note parking restrictions are often ignored particularly during school pickup/drop off times. Enforcement is limited in regard to both parking and speeding, although parking wardens are occasionally deployed and there is sometimes a mobile police speed trap as well as one static speed camera (the only speed camera on the A227). The PIA data does not reflect the lived-experience of residents.
- The traffic assessments ignore the knock-on effects of the Lower Thames Crossing and the A227.

Kind regards