

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/03/2026 8:19 PM 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:	[REDACTED] /icarage court Beckenham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I wish to formally object, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposed development of 725 dwellings on land north of Camer Road, Meopham, Gravesend, Kent. My objection is based on the following key concerns: 1. Conflict with Planning Policy The proposal is fundamentally at odds with both the Gravesham Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It fails to meet the core principles of sustainable development and undermines policies relating to Green Belt protection and infrastructure provision. With approximately 78% of the borough designated as Green Belt, this development would contribute to the merging of settlements, directly conflicting with the NPPF's objective of preventing urban sprawl and protecting the countryside. Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) seeks to preserve the borough's rural character and visual amenity-both of which would be significantly harmed by this proposal. If the site lies within the Green Belt, the development must be considered inappropriate by definition, and no "very special circumstances" have been demonstrated to justify such harm. 2. Impact on Highways and Air Quality The local road network is already under significant pressure, with frequent congestion and increasing use of rural lanes as rat-runs. A development of this scale would exacerbate these issues, leading to further deterioration in air quality and increased risks to pedestrian safety,
-----------	---

particularly near the country park.

Public transport in the area is limited, meaning residents would be heavily reliant on private vehicles-contrary to sustainable transport objectives.

3. Drainage and Flood Risk Existing drainage systems are already stretched. The increase in hard surfacing would lead to greater surface water runoff, heightening the risk of flooding both on-site and in surrounding areas.

There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that drainage infrastructure can be upgraded effectively without causing further issues.

4. Harm to Green Belt and Landscape The development would result in the permanent loss of open countryside and a significant erosion of the area's rural character. Its proximity to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty amplifies this harm.

Such encroachment into the Green Belt directly conflicts with its purpose and risks setting a damaging precedent for future development.

5. Impact on Biodiversity The site supports a variety of wildlife, including protected and declining species such as badgers, bats, birds of prey, and hedgehogs. The scale of habitat loss and disturbance would have serious ecological consequences.

Proposed mitigation measures are insufficient and fail to adequately compensate for the biodiversity loss.

6. Cumulative Overdevelopment and Infrastructure Pressure This proposal must be viewed in the context of cumulative development in the area. It represents part of a broader pattern of large-scale housing growth that is placing unsustainable pressure on infrastructure and services.

With Meopham currently comprising approximately 2,500-3,000 homes, the addition of around 1,000 further dwellings-including this proposal-would amount to an expansion of roughly one-third. This level of growth is neither proportionate nor sustainable and would fundamentally alter the character and function of the village without a coherent strategic framework.

Local infrastructure-including schools, healthcare, and utilities-does not have the capacity to support this scale of development. There is no convincing evidence that necessary improvements will be delivered, and concerns raised by service providers further underline these limitations.

Conclusion For the reasons outlined above-including clear policy conflicts, transport impacts, infrastructure constraints, environmental harm, and the cumulative effects of overdevelopment-I strongly urge the planning authority to refuse this application.

Kind regards