

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/12/2025 9:55 AM 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] Norwood Lane Meopham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>I object to the plans at this site for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· The water pressure on Norwood Lane is not very good and further developments of this scale would be unsustainable and create major water shortages for local residents.· The waste water systems would be overburdened by such large growth of the local area.· The development would result in urban sprawl, fundamentally changing the character of the current beautiful landscape which many local businesses rely on as an attraction of customers to Meopham and its local pubs and businesses.· The surrounding roads are very narrow country lanes and the site would make the local roads unsafe due to the additional traffic that would be created coming on to Wrotham road once complete. The building works traffic would also be very hazardous.· It is a significant overdevelopment on Norwood Lane which is just a country lane that cannot be made safer with paths to separate road traffic from pedestrians. It also can't be improved to better accommodate two-way traffic because the houses further down the street are already in place meaning it cannot be made safer. There are many blind bends on Norwood Lane which is very hazardous when even one car is driving down, let alone a huge influx of vehicles.· There are not enough local transport links which would mean the site is reliant on self drive transport which would be unsustainable for the local area.
-----------	---

- The number of new residents is unsustainable for the local area's amenities and infrastructure which are already strained. It is currently very hard to get a doctors appointment and get children into the local schools and this development would make things far worse.
 - This is Greenbelt land and should not be built upon. Building on Meopham Greenbelt land would destroy Meopham's character and beauty.
 - The area would become unsafe for pedestrians who also use local lanes for routes of travel.
 - Slow moving traffic around the school areas will cause harmful levels of pollution to local residents including school children.
 - The development would cause significant light pollution. Meopham is an area of natural beauty and at night you can get a good view of the stars. This would be impacted.
 - There are 5,500+ Brownfield sites in Gravesham which should be prioritised for development before Green Belt land is targeted.
 - There are many different species of birds and wildlife in the area that use the greenspaces for nesting and surviving. This scale of development would destroy that.
 - The plans risk merging of areas which goes against greenbelt policy of preventing urban sprawl.
 - The area is prone to water build-up during periods of rainfall with our greenbelt already acting as a way to absorb water and prevent flooding. This development would cause flooding risks to local communities.
 - The greenbelt acts as a carbon sump, we should protect it and develop brownfield sites instead. Gravesend has so much potential with plenty of brownfield sites, including riverside development which would improve the area, not detract from it. These plans very much make the area worse rather than improve it which should be the aim.
 - Meopham's character comes from farmland and open field, this should be protected. It would also heavily impact the local farmers who use this land for their livelihood. The last few years have seen a bit of progress for farmers who have traditionally been dealt a very bad hand by government - we should be continuing with that trajectory of improving life for them, not making it worse with development plans like these.
-

Kind regards