

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/11/2025 4:35 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] Norwood Lane Meopham Gravesend

## Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

I object to this proposal on the following grounds.

The selection of this site for development (and the other proposed housing developments) is not based on good town planning principles brought forward by professional town planners, but purely on land owner/ developer suggestions.

Existing brownfield sites that exist in Gravesham, should be developed before any approval is given to develop on greenfield sites. This would be a much more sustainable solution. If consent is granted to develop this and the other sites in Meopham, the brownfield sites in Gravesend will remain undeveloped for further decades, and Gravesend town centre will remain the rundown town it has now become.

It is premature to consider this application (and the other major development applications recently made or still to be made) in isolation. It can only be considered when the Council's Local Plan review is completed and adopted.

Based on the current Local Plan this application should be refused for the following reasons:-

1. It is designated Green Belt Land.
2. Loss of high grade agricultural land currently used for food production.
3. Loss of habitat for wildlife. (As a local resident I can confirm that sky larks (a red list species) breed on this and adjoining land, and were present all this last summer). There are also hedgehogs, newts, frogs, toads, several different species of bats, stoats, peregrine falcons, sparrow hawks, buzzards and many other small birds. Contrary to the wild life survey, there are at least 3 garden ponds within 150 metres of the site.

4. Local infrastructure is inadequate to support additional development. Traffic is frequently congested. There are no safe pedestrian or cycle routes out of Meopham, public transport is limited and a car is essential. The access to this development is off a very busy country lane which is frequently congested from its junction with the A227 back past the its junction at the southern end of Norwood lane.

5. Community infrastructure is close to or at capacity. The local hospital is at capacity, GP appointments are difficult to obtain, local schools are full. There is already a lack of formal play space (sports pitches). Children should not have to be driven to Gravesend to play form sports.

6. The development increases the risk of flash flooding to existing properties adjoining the site, particularly those in Norwood Lane. The storm water drainage system if surcharged, will cause flash flooding of a number of properties. It is noted that surface water drainage will be collected in ponds and which will be drained by natural infiltration. The soil is identified as a clay with silt which has poor infiltration characteristics. What allowance has been made for the inevitable compaction of the ground during construction works which will significantly reducing its natural drainage? Additionally, the drainage system is designed to be dependent on detailed regular maintenance. There is every likelihood that this maintenance will not be done when the development is completed. What guarantees will be given that the required maintenance will be carried out in accordance with the submission?

---

Kind regards