

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/03/2026 8:15 AM 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] Foxendown Lane Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I strongly object to this application on the grounds of Green Belt desecration, connecting two villages which is against local plan, highway safety, drainage and flood risk, loss of wildlife habitat, air quality impacts, over-capacity local services, and conflict with the Gravesham Local Plan and NPPF. The scale of 725 dwellings is wholly inappropriate for a village of this size and would cause significant, long-term harm. 1. Drainage, Flooding and Pollution Some of the village does not have mains drainage, and the surrounding lanes are known to flood regularly. The development site currently provides essential natural drainage. Its loss would greatly increase surface-water run-off into already compromised lanes. Videos and pictures available show extensive flooding currently in Sole Street, Foxendown Lane and Wrotham Road. The application does not present a robust or sustainable solution to: - foul drainage (risk of pollution from non-mains systems) - surface water management - cumulative drainage pressure from nearby applications This conflicts with NPPF Chapter 14 (meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding). 2. Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking
-----------	---

The proposal fails to meet Policy CS19 which requires safe access and that development does not cause severe traffic congestion. The road network is already at breaking point. The A227 is already at capacity, the surrounding lanes are narrow, frequently gridlocked, and unsafe for increased volumes of cars, delivery vans and service vehicles. A development of 725 homes could mean 1,450 extra cars and associated delivery vehicles. Foxendown Lane, one field over is suitable for one car at a time and gridlocks now when Camer Road or Wrotham Road is busy, it simply cannot cope with more. Every access from Foxendown Lane is on a blind bend, at Camer Road and Wrotham Road, the increased traffic would be too dangerous.

Parking at local shops is already extremely difficult, and increasing car dependency conflicts with sustainable development principles (NPPF, paras 110-113).

3. Greenbelt and Wildlife and Biodiversity Loss

The site is greenbelt under policy CS02, this proposal is not exceptional circumstances and fails to protect the openness of Greenbelt. The proposal is a violation of landscape and character (Policy CS12 & CS19) and would have a detrimental effect on the rural environment. This development would also connect two villages, Meopham and Sole Street in violation of local plan.

The site and surrounding area support extensive wildlife, including: badgers, hedgehogs, owls and bats, amphibians and small mammals

The scale of this proposal would fundamentally reduce habitat connectivity. The ecological assessment does not adequately account for cumulative loss created by several simultaneous applications.

4. Pressure on Local Infrastructure

Local GP surgeries and Darent Valley Hospital are already at capacity, with long waiting times and no funded expansion. Schools, buses and local facilities would also be overwhelmed. The application provides no credible mitigation. Dr Mounty has stated his surgery is already at capacity.

5. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This proposal sits alongside other additional home applications assessing it in isolation is misleading; the combined impact is severe and unacceptable.

Conclusion

For reasons of drainage risk, highways unsuitability, ecological harm, and insufficient infrastructure capacity, I respectfully request that this application be refused.

Kind regards