

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 10/12/2025 3:03 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]

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	<p>I am writing to object to this planning application. The proposals raise a wide range of serious concerns that would have a long term and negative impact on the environment, the character of the area and the wellbeing of the community.</p> <p>The site lies within the Green Belt, and the development directly conflicts with the core purposes of Green Belt policy. Any construction on this land would reduce its openness, encourage further spread of built development and narrow the important gaps that separate nearby towns and villages. These are the very reasons why the Green Belt is protected. The application does not demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required by the National Planning Policy Framework, nor does it comply with local policy that prioritises brownfield land. It is also important to highlight that the council's existing housing targets may already be met or can be met more sustainably elsewhere, without resorting to the loss of protected countryside.</p> <p>Environmental impacts are another major concern. The site supports wildlife habitats and contributes to local biodiversity, all of which would be disrupted or permanently lost. The removal of natural land also has wider climate implications. Replacing fields and vegetation with hard surfaces reduces the area's ability to absorb carbon, undermining local climate mitigation policies. The location promotes car dependency and therefore conflicts directly with climate commitments aimed at reducing emissions.</p>

Drainage and flood risk issues have also not been adequately addressed. Furthermore, when viewed alongside other recent and proposed developments in the area, the combined impact on traffic, local services, drainage and general environmental quality has not been properly assessed. The area is already reaching capacity, and additional development only compounds existing infrastructure pressures.

Transport and access concerns are significant. The plans rely entirely on surrounding roads that are predominantly single lane and simply not capable of accommodating more traffic. Additional vehicles would make local walking routes less safe and significantly less enjoyable for residents who currently rely on them. Increased traffic, lighting, noise and activity would also lead to a clear loss of tranquillity, which would negatively affect the rural environment and devalue surrounding homes. These changes would erode the countryside character that residents depend on for their well being.

Essential services are already stretched. Increasing the population without providing corresponding infrastructure places further pressure on ambulance, fire and police services. Existing congestion could slow emergency response times, putting residents at risk. The development also fails to reinforce local distinctiveness and does not reflect the character or appearance of the surrounding rural landscape.

Construction impacts would also be damaging. Prolonged noise, dust, vibration and heavy construction traffic would harm both residents and wildlife. Heavy vehicles pose particular risks to the rural road network, which is not designed to bear the weight or volume of construction machinery and may suffer lasting damage.

In summary, the proposal conflicts with multiple local and national planning policies and would cause lasting harm to the countryside, local infrastructure, residents' quality of life, climate objectives and the distinctive character of the area. I therefore strongly urge the Council to refuse this application.

Kind regards