

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/03/2026 11:38 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] Wrotham Road Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to register my formal objection to planning application 20260207. After reviewing available documentation and the published council responses, I have significant concerns regarding the suitability, safety, and sustainability of this proposal. Current baseline traffic flows on Camer Road already total around 7,600 vehicles per day, with the Transport Assessment projecting up to a 20% increase north of the new access and 15% south of it. These increases would intensify congestion on an already pressured road network. Present safety risks, especially at the Norwood Lane / Camer Road junction, which is already constrained. Lead to rat-running through nearby residential lanes not built for heavy traffic volumes. The scale of the roundabout and road changes is wholly out of keeping with the rural setting and creates an urban-style highway footprint in the middle of a village environment. Documentation submitted by the applicant does not sufficiently address drainage capacity or wastewater infrastructure limitations. As local resident I am already aware, the area already experiences issues with Surface water run-off, Poor drainage during heavy rainfall and Sewer capacity challenges in surrounding settlements. Adding 725 homes and a school risks overwhelming existing systems unless fully evidenced mitigation is guaranteed - which the Environmental Statement currently does not provide. This development would transform one of the few
-----------	--

remaining open green landscapes separating Meopham from surrounding settlements loss of rural character and open countryside.

Visual dominance of large-scale housing. Adverse impact on long-range views central to the character of Meopham's ridgeline.

Urbanisation of Norward Lane through road widening and "active travel" engineering works. The proposal would introduce 725-730 new homes, effectively doubling the population of the local area and this is not taking into account the many other applications being put forward.

This is far beyond what Meopham's infrastructure, services, and rural road network can safely accommodate. Pressure on GP surgeries, which are already at capacity.

Increased demand on secondary and primary school places.

Additional pressure on an already poor local transport services, emergency services, and utilities. While some affordable housing is proposed, the scale and density are not proportionate to the character of a rural village. The proposal does not align with:

Maintaining separation between rural communities, Protecting green space, Preserving village identity. It is without doubt that the site will remain car-dependent, and the Transport increases in vehicle will bring the local roads to a standstill during rush hours times and the safety of children around local schools will rise significantly and with young children myself this is extremely worrying. Living on Wrotham Road I see first hand every day the already high levels of traffic and more cars in the area will result in being gridlock like places like Dartford. I strongly urge the council to refuse planning application 20260207. The risks to residents, community character, and local infrastructure significantly outweigh any purported benefits.

Kind regards