

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 10:44 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] Camer Street Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	This objection challenges the proposed development of up to 725 dwellings on Green Belt land north of Camer Road, Meopham, submitted as a resident of a Grade II listed property whose setting and structural integrity would be harmed. The scheme conflicts with national and local planning policy, the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (LURA), and established case law on irreversible Green Belt harm. 1. Conflict with Gravesham's Local Planning Framework The proposal contradicts the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and the Housing Development Strategy (2024-2029), both of which prioritise urban regeneration and development on brownfield sites. Key failures include: a) Expanding into rural greenfield land rather than following the spatial strategy. b) Breaching settlement boundaries. c) Undermining Green Belt protections intended to preserve a rural buffer. 2. Invalid 'Grey Belt' Reclassification The developer's attempt to label the site as "Grey Belt" is technically incorrect
-----------	--

because:

- a) The land is Grade 2 agricultural land with a Significant Contribution rating in the Gravesham Green Belt Study.
- b) Land benefiting from protections under Footnote 7-including National Landscapes (AONBs)-cannot be classed as Grey Belt.
- c) The proposal would cause permanent harm to the Kent Downs National Landscape, automatically disqualifying it from reclassification.

3. Coalescence of Villages

The scheme fills the final green gap between Meopham and Sole Street, causing coalescence and violating Green Belt Purpose 2 (preventing towns/villages merging). Case law (the Harrietsham precedent) confirms that housing need does not override irreversible settlement-merging harm.

4. Breach of the 'Duty to Further' (LURA 2023)

Under Section 245 of LURA, the Council must actively further conservation of the Kent Downs National Landscape.

Key issues:

- a) The Kent Downs team confirms this is an active duty requiring enhancement-not mere mitigation.
- b) The site's escarpment setting is of "enormous value," and the development would cause a "considerable change" and "direct loss of open countryside."

5. Infrastructure and Technical Constraints

Camer Road urbanisation: Proposed engineering works (roundabout, widening) conflict with rural lane design guidance and would destroy hedgerows and vernacular character.

Southern Water constraints: Restrictions on planting near sewers undermine the applicant's landscape mitigation; SuDS responsibilities and phasing create further risk in a water-stressed area.

Heritage impact: Construction vibrations from HGV traffic pose risks to Grade II listed foundations, violating NPPF requirements to give "Great Weight" to heritage conservation.

6. Design, Massing, and Dark Skies Impact

The 3-storey suburban massing is alien to a village of 1-2 storey cottages and fails NPPF design requirements.

Light pollution from a development of this scale would erode protected dark skies, a valued characteristic of the Kent Downs.

Conclusion

The proposal should be refused because it:

- a) Misapplies Grey Belt policy to high-performing Green Belt.
- b) Eliminates the essential green gap between Meopham and Sole Street.
- c) Breaches statutory duties under LURA 2023.
- d) Threatens heritage assets through structural and setting harm.
- e) Cannot deliver required landscaping due to utility constraints.
- f) Causes irreversible landscape and character damage, including the loss of rural lanes and dark skies.

The development is incompatible with national policy, local strategy, statutory

duties, and established planning principles protecting the Kent Downs landscape and Meopham's historic rural identity. I would therefore object to this proposal.

Kind regards