

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/12/2025 2:53 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:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Objection to Proposed Development of Up to 150 Dwellings on Green Belt Land
	1. Inappropriate Development on Green Belt Land
	The proposed development constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and is contrary to the fundamental purpose of Green Belt policy, which is to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside from encroachment, and preserve the setting and character of small rural settlements. The scale of up to 150 houses is wholly disproportionate to the size and character of the village and would result in permanent and irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt. No "very special circumstances" have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh this harm.
	2. Impact on Village Character and Sustainability
	This proposal represents overdevelopment in a small village setting and would fundamentally alter its rural character. The scale and density of the development would overwhelm existing infrastructure, services, and community facilities, undermining the sustainability of the village rather than supporting it.
	3. Lack of Capacity in Local Healthcare Provision
	The village doctor's surgery has categorically stated that it has no capacity to

accept additional patients. This is a critical constraint that has not been adequately addressed. Introducing up to 150 new dwellings would place an unacceptable burden on already overstretched healthcare services, directly conflicting with planning principles that require development to be supported by adequate infrastructure.

4. Ecological Harm and Impact on Protected Species

The hedgerows and surrounding habitat within and adjacent to the proposed site are known to be used by amber- and red-listed endangered bird species. These habitats are vital for feeding, nesting, and movement. The loss or degradation of hedgerows and increased disturbance from construction and occupation would result in significant harm to local biodiversity, contrary to national and local policies requiring the protection and enhancement of ecological networks.

5. Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage

The local area has a documented history of flooding. The introduction of a large number of additional houses, hard surfaces, and associated infrastructure will inevitably increase surface water runoff and exacerbate existing flood risk. This poses a serious threat to both the proposed development and surrounding properties. The proposal fails to convincingly demonstrate that flood risk will not be worsened, particularly in the context of changing climate patterns.

6. Cumulative Impact of Multiple Developments

There are currently several proposed, or soon-to-be proposed, developments in the wider area. The cumulative impact of these schemes has not been properly assessed. When considered together, the scale of development is alarming and would place unsustainable pressure on infrastructure, services, road networks, and the environment. Planning policy is clear that cumulative impacts must be fully considered, not assessed in isolation.

7. Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

The surrounding road network is wholly unsuitable for the significant increase in traffic that up to 150 dwellings would generate. Local roads are narrow, rural in nature, and were not designed to accommodate substantial additional vehicle movements. Increased traffic would worsen congestion, reduce road safety, and negatively impact residents' quality of life.

8. Danger to Cyclists and Pedestrians

Local roads are already dangerous for cyclists, with no street lighting in many sections and limited visibility. The expected increase in traffic would significantly heighten the risk of accidents, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians. The lack of safe, well-lit routes further demonstrates that the location is unsuitable for development of this scale.

9. Conclusion

For the reasons set out above-harm to the Green Belt, lack of healthcare capacity, ecological damage, increased flood risk, unacceptable cumulative impacts, and serious highway and safety concerns-the proposed development is unsustainable and contrary to planning policy. The application should therefore be refused.