

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/12/2025 1:47 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] Longfield Road Meopham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>Formal Planning Objection - Application T57RQRHPJHC00 (Land West of Norwood Lane, Meopham)</p> <p>I object to application T57RQRHPJHC00 on legal, policy and material planning grounds. Under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions must follow the development plan unless material considerations clearly justify departure. This proposal conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the aims of Green Belt and rural land protection, community character, sustainable development principles, and statutory duties to protect biodiversity and amenity. No justification or exceptional circumstances are evident that would warrant approval.</p> <p>1. Green Belt / Countryside Protection Policy Breach</p> <p>The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy under NPPF is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>GOV.UK +2 House of Commons Library +2 This proposal would extend substantial built development into open / semi-rural land, eroding countryside character, reducing openness, damaging the</p>
-----------	--

separation between settlements, and setting a precedent for further encroachment. The development therefore represents "inappropriate development" for which the NPPF requires "very special circumstances" before approval could be considered.

GOV.UK

+1

No such circumstances have been demonstrated in this application.

2. Infrastructure, Sustainability and Public Services Deficit

NPPF requires that new development be supported by adequate transport infrastructure, community services and utilities, so as not to impose unsustainable burden.

GOV.UK

+1

The application fails to show that local roads can sustain significant additional traffic, which would likely compound congestion, compromise highway safety and increase pollution. Public transport provision appears limited, which would force heavy reliance on private vehicles. Local services - schools, healthcare, utilities - are currently under pressure and no plan for expansion or mitigation is provided. Surface-water management and drainage solutions are not demonstrated with adequate clarity. On sustainability grounds, the proposal fails to meet basic NPPF requirements for responsible development in a rural-edge location.

3. Loss of Rural Character, Local Identity and Cultural Landscape

NPPF Paragraphs 130 and 174 demand that development respect local context, landscape character, settlement pattern and local distinctiveness.

GOV.UK

+1

Meopham and its surroundings are rural in nature, shaped over generations by open land, hedgerows, scattered housing, low-density settlement and a quiet, countryside way of life. This proposal, for up to 150 dwellings, risks transforming that character entirely. Rather than integrating sensitively, the density, scale and urban form would overwrite the rural settlement pattern, replacing a cultural landscape with suburban uniformity. This would be a tangible cultural loss for residents, damaging the community identity built on rural living. Planning policy must protect such local character and heritage rather than allow irreversible change.

4. Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity and Environment

New housing at this scale would create unacceptable impacts on the amenity of existing residents. The additional traffic, noise, light pollution, and general activity that accompany such development would radically alter the tranquillity and setting. Privacy, daylight, outlook and the relative calm of rural life would be undermined. NPPF requires that new development secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

GOV.UK

+1

The proposed scheme fails that test - the scale of change is too great and the local environment too sensitive.

5. Biodiversity, Ecology and Environmental Risk

The land likely retains ecological value - natural habitat, hedgerows, open ground, wildlife corridors. The NPPF demands that developments should protect and enhance biodiversity, avoid habitat loss and net environmental harm.

GOV.UK

+1

There is no credible ecological mitigation or biodiversity net gain strategy

presented. Loss of habitat, disturbance to wildlife, potential drainage or runoff impacts, and removal of green infrastructure would cause irreversible environmental damage. This is inconsistent with statutory and policy obligations to protect biodiversity and the natural environment.

Conclusion

This proposal conflicts fundamentally with national planning policy on Green Belt protection, sustainability, rural landscape preservation, ecological safeguarding and residential amenity. It offers no very special circumstances, no viable mitigation, and no evidence that local infrastructure or community can absorb the impacts. Granting permission would set a damaging and irreversible precedent. I therefore respectfully request that application T57RQRHPJHC00 be refused.

Kind regards