

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 5:32 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] Ediva Road Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to register a formal objection to the above planning application. The proposal is in clear conflict with the Gravesham Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and several material planning considerations. My concerns are set out below.

1. Highways, Traffic Capacity and Road Safety

The local road network is already operating at or beyond capacity, with frequent periods of gridlock on narrow rural lanes not designed to accommodate further traffic volumes. Additional vehicle movements generated by the proposed development would significantly worsen congestion, increase journey times, and create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

The NPPF requires developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid severe residual cumulative impacts on the transport network. This proposal clearly fails that test.

2. Drainage and Flood Risk

The site is known to experience surface-water issues, and any further hard surfacing will exacerbate runoff into surrounding properties and roads. The application does not demonstrate an adequate sustainable drainage strategy nor compliance with Local Plan policy requiring developments to reduce-not

increase-flood risk on- or off-site.

Given recent extreme weather conditions, it is unacceptable to permit a scheme without robust and independently verified flood-risk mitigation.

3. Loss of Green Belt and Harm to Rural Character

This development would result in the irreversible loss of Green Belt land, directly undermining the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF: preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside, and preserving openness.

The proposal would significantly erode the rural character of the village and introduce suburban housing forms completely out of scale with the existing settlement pattern, contrary to the Gravesham Local Plan's design and landscape policies.

4. Biodiversity and Wildlife Impact

The site and surrounding hedgerows, fields and woodland support a rich range of wildlife including badgers, hedgehogs, owls, bats and other protected species. A recorded badger sett exists within or adjacent to the site, meaning the development risks breaching the Protection of Badgers Act 1992.

The application fails to provide sufficient ecological surveys, fails to demonstrate a measurable biodiversity net gain, and does not safeguard essential wildlife corridors. This is contrary to both the NPPF and local biodiversity policies.

5. Pollution - Especially Close to Schools

Increasing traffic levels so close to local schools will worsen air pollution, exposing children to harmful particulates and nitrogen dioxide. The NPPF emphasises that planning decisions must ensure new developments do not contribute to unacceptable levels of pollution.

This proposal risks doing exactly that, with no meaningful mitigation offered.

6. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This application cannot be assessed in isolation. When considered alongside other ongoing or approved developments in the village, the cumulative impact on traffic, landscape, wildlife, drainage, air quality and community infrastructure becomes severe.

The area is already under pressure, and further expansion represents unsustainable overdevelopment that conflicts with both the Local Plan and the NPPF's requirement for cumulative impacts to be properly assessed.

7. Pressure on Local Services

Local services-including GP practices, dentists, schools, public transport, and emergency services-are already stretched. The proposal offers no credible strategy to address this additional demand.

Increasing population without expanding key services is not sustainable and contradicts the plan-led approach required by national and local policy.

8. Sustainability and Lack of Local Facilities

The village lacks essential services such as shops, employment opportunities and adequate public transport. Future residents would be overwhelmingly car-dependent, contradicting the NPPF's emphasis on reducing reliance on the

private car and promoting sustainable development.

The site location therefore fails the basic sustainability criteria required for new housing.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, this proposal is contrary to the Gravesham Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework, and a wide range of material planning considerations. The development would cause demonstrable harm to the environment, local community, and rural character of the area.

I therefore respectfully request that the application be refused.

Kind regards