

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/03/2026 1:55 PM 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] Windmill Close Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development of 725 homes in my village.

This development would fundamentally undermine the purpose of the Greenbelt. It would lead to urban sprawl and risk the merging of nearby settlements, permanently eroding the separation between communities such as Sole Street and Hook Green. The loss of this open land would also harm the countryside, destroying natural habitats, ancient ecosystems, bird flight paths, and mammal habitats.

The character of Meopham and its surrounding villages would be significantly damaged. Sole Street and Hook Green have a distinct rural identity, which would be lost under the scale of this development. The existing community would face excessive strain, and local amenities - already operating at capacity - would not be able to cope with the increased demand.

Infrastructure concerns are particularly serious. Local GP practices in Meopham and Istead Rise are already at full capacity, as documented. There is no clear plan to expand healthcare provision to meet the needs of hundreds of additional households.

Traffic impact is another major issue, one that concerns me most. The development could result in approximately 1,450 additional cars, not including other local traffic. This would worsen congestion, increase pollution, and create safety concerns. Access for emergency vehicles, particularly along Norwood Lane, would be negatively affected.

The proposal also raises accessibility concerns. The local train station lacks step-free access, with a bridge and no lift, meaning disabled individuals and those with prams would struggle to use it. Increasing the population without addressing this is unacceptable.

Environmental impacts extend further. Additional traffic and development will increase both air and light pollution. The cumulative effect of multiple developments in the area has not been adequately considered.

Flooding is already a known issue in areas such as Norwood Lane and Wrotham Road. Open fields currently play a vital role in absorbing water and reducing flood risk. Building on this land will exacerbate flooding problems.

Furthermore, the loss of open land reduces its function as a natural carbon sink, undermining efforts to address climate change. It also threatens local food security by removing agricultural land.

For all of these reasons-damage to the Greenbelt, loss of village character, inadequate infrastructure, increased traffic and pollution, accessibility issues, flood risk, and environmental harm-I strongly urge that this proposal be rejected.

As someone who has lived in Meopham their entire life, I would be devastated to see this go ahead.

Kind regards