

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 11:16 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] Denesway 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 following grounds:

1. Unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure
Meopham's infrastructure is already under significant strain, and this development would exacerbate existing deficiencies to an unacceptable level. Local roads, healthcare services, schools, and public transport are not equipped to absorb the scale of growth proposed. The addition of up to 725 dwellings represents a substantial and disproportionate increase relative to the size and capacity of the existing community.

2. Severe traffic impact and highway safety concerns
The proposed development would significantly increase congestion, particularly at the Green Lane / Wrotham Road junction, which already experiences delays and safety issues.
There is a high likelihood that drivers will seek alternative routes to avoid congestion, resulting in increased use of residential roads such as Tradescant Drive and Denesway as "rat runs." These roads are narrow, not designed for through traffic, and heavily used by residents, including families and pedestrians. This would create serious safety risks and a substantial deterioration in residential amenity.

3. Inadequate healthcare provision

Local GP surgeries are already operating at or beyond capacity, and nearby hospitals are under sustained pressure. There is no clear or credible plan demonstrating how healthcare provision will be expanded to meet the needs of a development of this scale.

4. Overcrowded rail services

Meopham's commuter rail services into London are already congested during peak times. This development would further increase demand without any corresponding improvement in capacity, leading to worsening conditions for existing and future residents.

5. Loss of Green Belt/countryside and environmental harm

The development would result in the loss of valuable green space and countryside, negatively impacting biodiversity, wildlife habitats, and the rural character of the area. This land contributes to the openness and environmental quality of Meopham and should be protected.

6. Coalescence of settlements

The proposal would erode the important gap between Meopham and Sole Street, effectively merging the two. This would permanently alter the character of the area and undermine the planning principle of maintaining separation.

7. Pollution and environmental degradation

The increase in traffic and population will inevitably lead to higher levels of litter, air pollution, and general environmental degradation. These are already concerns locally, where volunteers frequently litter-pick to try to keep our village clean. This will be significantly worsened by a development of this scale.

8. Cumulative impact of multiple developments

This proposal must not be considered in isolation. There are already several developments proposed or underway in the surrounding area. The cumulative impact of these schemes is excessive and unsustainable. This particular application is by far the largest and most disproportionate, representing an overdevelopment that is entirely out of keeping with the scale and character of Meopham and surrounding villages.

For the reasons outlined above, this proposal represents an unsustainable, disproportionate, and harmful development. It fails to adequately address infrastructure constraints, environmental impacts, and community wellbeing. I therefore urge the Council to refuse this application.

Kind regards