

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 12/12/2025 11:17 AM 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] gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: This is 1 of 3 planning applications for building a total of 420 HOUSES, see applications 20250993 and 20250992. The proposed houses will be located in an area where public transport facilities to access nearby town of Gravesend/ A2/M2 are extremely poor. The rail station at Meopham has more regular (but limited) bus links, but bus services to Sole Street Station are practically none existent. This means that most current and future, commuters access work directly by car, or by car to a rail station, if they are unlucky not to live within walking distance. Given that a total 420 houses may well put an extra 840+ cars on to the road system, to commute to Sole Street Station or to the A2/ Gravesend and beyond, it will over populate the narrow road network already overcrowded at peak times. Green Lane especially is extremely narrow in parts making the passing by HGV vehicles extremely difficult. Also as there will be insufficient parking at Sole Street, so cycling to and from the station would be extremely dangerous with the increased traffic volume from the three developments. This application will just add more cars to an already overloaded road transport network in a picturesque rural area. It will just add more congestion especially at peak times UNLESS supported by IMPROVED public transport. Without an improved public transport infrastructure the application is untenable and should be rejected. Some mitigation could be achieved if the total number of houses proposed was reduced significantly.

Kind regards