

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/11/2025 3:54 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] Meopham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I strongly object to the proposed development on the following grounds: 1. Public Safety relating to Paragraph 116 of the Government National Planning Policy Framework - there are several schools in very close proximity, notably a primary school and SEN school meaning not just school children but even more vulnerable school children. The A227 is already a busy, fast road. To add potentially hundreds more cars to an already busy road that several times a day is packed with children and with narrow footpaths would be completely irresponsible. An accident waiting to happen. 2. Environmental Impact relating to Paragraph 198 of the Government National Planning Policy Framework- again, hundreds more cars on an often congested road will significantly impact air quality and pollution in the local area which is unacceptable. The A227 will inevitably become busier due to it being used as a cut through from the M20 to the Lower Thames Crossing, to add yet more vehicles to that is not in keeping with any government be it local or national's aims of reducing the impact of climate change. Any traffic survey/report which does not consider the impact of the Lower Thames Crossing must be dismissed as incorrect. Public transport links, particularly buses are very limited given the rural location, this will result in an over-reliance on cars as the primary method of transport. This is clearly not in line with Paragraph 156 of the Planning Policy Framework given the total lack of public transport facility and the total reliance on cars. 3. Lack of necessary facilities e.g. healthcare provision. The response from NHS Kent & Medway in relation to a local development clearly states that the needs of the proposed developments residents would need to be met by additional capacity. i.e. it cannot be met by current capacity. It also states that this would likely fall to Meopham Medical Practice. Given that this practice is on a fully developed site i.e. it is fully bordered by carparking and access roads for Meopham School, there is no practical way for that practice to expand capacity. As there is no current capacity, as stated, and no practical way to provide additional capacity, this application should be rejected as the needs of the resident will not be able to be met by current healthcare infrastructure, as stated
-----------	--

by NHS Kent & Medway in their submission. In terms of wider healthcare provision, Darent Valley Hospital is at capacity and massively struggles to cope with demand. It cannot accommodate hundreds of further homes, potentially thousands of extra people. Homes (anywhere) can't be built without the necessary investments in infrastructure.

4. The site is previously undeveloped agricultural land and does not therefore meet any 'grey belt' criteria. It is green belt and should therefore not be developed on. It is classed as Grade 2 which is very good quality agricultural land, that absolutely should not be developed on and does not even come close to meeting the classification of grey belt. There are no 'exceptional circumstances' presented in the application that would warrant approval. Any planning permission for this site should be rejected on this basis alone. It does not meet the criteria set by the government, end of discussion.

5. Accountability. Elected officials must be accountable for their decisions to constituents. Given that the boundaries of the existing Gravesham borough may well change as part of the government led reorganisation of borough/county councils, it is completely unacceptable that councillors making decisions now may not be held accountable for them in future due to boundary changes. One of the proposals put forward was the splitting of Gravesham (and Dartford) along the A2. It is an affront to our democracy that decisions can be made now by people that may have no accountability to nor responsibility for them in future. All major planning decisions should be paused until the issues of what the council will actually look like in a couple of years have been fully finalised. Only then should major planning decisions be made. This will ensure that responsibility and accountability remains in effect.

Clearly there are a number of reasons why this development is completely against planning policy and is totally inappropriate for this location. As a result, rejection of this development is the only logical outcome.

Kind regards