

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 1:16 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:	Meopham Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I strongly object to this outline application on the grounds of 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 proposal is wholly inappropriate and would cause significant, long-term harm. 1. Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking The road network is already at breaking point. The lanes are narrow, frequently gridlocked, and unsafe for increased volumes of cars, delivery vans and service vehicles. A development of 150 homes could mean 300-500 or more additional vehicle movements daily, which the roads cannot absorb. Parking at local shops is already extremely difficult, and increasing car dependency conflicts with sustainable development principles (NPPF, paras 110 - 113). 2. Inconsistency with Green Belt Purposes and Local Plans The proposed development fundamentally undermines the purposes of the Green Belt, even if the land is classified as "grey belt." According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the primary purposes of the Green Belt are: Preventing Urban Sprawl: The development would cause the unrestricted sprawl of a built-up area. Preventing Merging: The development would prevent neighbouring towns or
-----------	---

villages from merging into one another.

Safeguarding the Countryside: The development represents an inappropriate encroachment into the countryside.

Loss of Character: The development would harm the setting and special character of a historic town or village.

The proposed development fails to meet the criteria for "not inappropriate" development on grey belt land as it is not in a truly sustainable location and would fundamentally weaken the wider Green Belt's integrity.

3. 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.

The proposal 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).

4. Wildlife and Biodiversity Loss

The site and surrounding area support extensive wildlife, including:

badgers
hedgehogs
owls and bats
amphibians and small mammals

The scale and location of this proposal would fundamentally reduce habitat connectivity. The ecological assessment does not adequately account for cumulative loss created by several simultaneous applications. This contradicts NPPF Chapter 15 on conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

5. 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 proposal provides no credible mitigation. It is unsustainable as the existing local infrastructure cannot cope with the increased population. Specific concerns include:

Transport Impact: The development would lead to a significant increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate public transport provision, or pose a risk to highway and pedestrian safety.

Lack of Social Infrastructure: The local community lacks sufficient capacity in schools, healthcare facilities (e.g., GP surgeries), and other public services to support the new homes.

6. Design, Character, and Amenity Issues

The proposed development will negatively impact the surrounding area and the quality of life for existing residents.

Design and Appearance: The scale and density of the proposed buildings are out of character with the existing environment and local area.

Loss of Amenity: The development would cause a significant and demonstrable loss of amenity for neighbours, through:

Overbearing Impact: The sheer size or massing of the buildings would be oppressive and visually dominant from neighbouring properties.

Pollution and Noise: The development would lead to unacceptable levels of noise, light, and air pollution during and after construction.

7. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This proposal sits alongside an additional 350 dwelling application almost opposite it, plus a further 120 dwelling proposal in the village. Assessing it in isolation is misleading; the combined impact is severe and unacceptable.

8. Conclusion

For the reasons set out above including highways unsuitability, drainage risk, ecological harm, and insufficient infrastructure capacity, I object very strongly to this outline application.

Kind regards