

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/03/2026 11:30 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of Camer Road Meopham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 725 dwellings (Use Class C3), a new two-form entry primary school (Use Class F1), a Local Centre (up to 500sqm of Class E floorspace), the provision of Public Open Space including sport and recreation facilities alongside associated access, landscaping, parking, and infrastructure; with all matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	Mulberry Close Meopham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	This objection addresses six interconnected issues, challenges the presumption of sustainable development, and asks that all four recent developments be treated as one large development for planning purposes. Housing is needed in Meopham, but not delivered in this way. It is overwhelming, undemocratic and condescending. Developers should engage with the community prior to development and ask what would be acceptable, rather than having teams of highly experienced consultants tell us what we want and to effectively "put up and shut up." 1. Cumulative Impact of Four Concurrent Applications This is the fourth planning application in Meopham in six months, collectively proposing 1345 dwellings across a 2km squared area. Each is assessed individually, avoiding scrutiny of the combined impact on the community or dismisses the impact as "minor". GBC has directed that Richborough's two applications be considered jointly; the same principle should apply across all four. This application relies on the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development on the basis that GBC's Local Plan is out of date and they meet the "golden rules". This presumption is not unconditional. NPPF para 11(d) requires
-----------	---

that adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The combined effects documented here constitutes exactly such an adverse impact. I ask GBC to require a cumulative EIA across all four applications before this application is determined.

2. A 49% Population Increase in Five Years

This application alone proposes 725 homes. Using the developer's own occupancy figure of 2.46 persons per household, the four applications collectively add 3309 residents to a village with a 2021 Census population of 6795 - a 49% increase to approximately 10104 within five years. No convincing evidence is presented that Meopham's infrastructure can absorb growth of this scale and speed. The figure of 13528 cited in section 4.39 as the LIA population appears inconsistent with the 2021 Census.

3. Loss of Green Belt and BMV Agricultural Land

All four applications are sited on Green Belt land, reclassified as 'grey belt' to circumvent protection. The NPPF places a high burden of proof on developers to justify such reclassification; that burden has not been met. The UK is already only 54% self-sufficient in food production (Defra), and food security is classified as Critical National Infrastructure by Parliament (Food Security, Seventh Report, 2022-23). With climate change and geopolitical instability increasing supply chain risk, the permanent loss of productive agricultural land cannot be treated as a minor matter. Once lost, this land cannot be recovered.

4. Unsustainable Transport Claims

The application asserts sustainable transport credentials that do not withstand scrutiny. Meopham is a rural settlement with narrow, unlit, heavily trafficked roads, and the A227 presents a continuous gradient. No viable cycling routes exist to Ebbsfleet or Gravesend. Bus provision is poor and the developers have a reserved route with no committed service. No mention is made of the Lower Thames Crossing and its projected increase in A227 traffic, and the Norwood Lane closure eliminates an important relief route. The developer's own modal data confirms the primary mode of travel will be private car; contrary to KCC LTP5 Outcomes 5 and 9. The rail timetable cited in section 3.4 is also factually incorrect: Meopham trains do not run every 30 minutes as stated.

5. Healthcare Capacity - A Significant Adverse Impact Understated

Section 4.130 describes the impact on healthcare as 'permanent, minor adverse (not significant).' This is not credible. MMC currently serves approximately 10,000 patients at a GP-to-patient ratio of 1:2101, well above the NHS baseline of 1:1800. The ICB has requested £3.1m in capital contributions but also states that "new housing developments should not negatively impact the existing population's access to healthcare services." It is difficult to see how further patient growth cannot but worsen an already existing deficit.

6. Grey Belt Not Independently Verified

The developer has reclassified this Green Belt land as 'grey belt' on the basis that it does not 'strongly contribute' to Green Belt purposes under the NPPF. GBC must not accept this self-serving classification without conducting its own independent assessment. It is the council's responsibility, not the developer's, to determine whether a site meets the criteria. Its development will also fundamentally alter the relationship of Hook Green and Sole Street to the Kent Downs National Landscape and AONB.

If the grey belt classification were accepted, NPPF policy requires that development must not 'fundamentally undermine the purpose of the remaining

Green Belt.' With four applications simultaneously consuming Green Belt land across a 2km squared area, GBC cannot satisfy itself on this criterion without a cumulative assessment.

Kind regards