

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 09/12/2025 6:02 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: Building here directly conflicts with the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF-preventing urban sprawl, safeguarding the countryside, and protecting openness. No very special circumstances exist to justify its loss.

Traffic in Meopham is already at breaking point. Wrotham Road (A227), Longfield Road and Camer Road are regularly gridlocked, especially at peak times. When the A2 or motorways are blocked, drivers cut through Cobham, Sole Street and Meopham, causing complete standstill. Residents have experienced 90-minute journeys for routes that normally take 10 minutes. The network cannot absorb additional vehicles.

Local roads are narrow, winding and unsafe for increased traffic and are shared by farm vehicles, school buses, cyclists and pedestrians.

The development would further erode Meopham's rural identity and push it towards becoming a town. It conflicts with the village's historic character and the council's settlement hierarchy.

Essential services (GPs, schools, parking and public transport) are already stretched with no capacity to support more homes.

There are already multiple applications in Meopham. The cumulative impact of developing on Green Belt land will cause long-term harm to the landscape, traffic

conditions, and local infrastructure.

For these reasons, the proposal is unsustainable, inappropriate and contrary to both national and local planning policy.

Kind regards