

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 5:17 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] Foxendown Lane Meopham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I object to this application due to its unacceptable impact on highways, drainage, wildlife, pollution, and local services, especially when combined with the nearby 350-home proposal. 1. Unacceptable Cumulative Traffic Impact This site is near the 350-home proposal. Combined, the developments could generate well over 1,500-2,000 vehicle movements per day. The narrow village lanes cannot sustain such traffic and are already gridlocked at peak times and problem times, as well as the junction black spots and accident spots at the junction with The Georg Pub, Green lane/Camer park and the parade. . This raises: pedestrian safety concerns emergency access constraints increased air pollution near homes and shops This conflicts with both the NPPF and Gravesham Local Plan highway policies.

2. Drainage and Flooding Concerns

As with the larger proposal, the area is known for flood-prone lanes some of which do not have mains drainage including ours. Removing permeable greenfield land will significantly worsen flooding for existing residents. No adequate Sustainable Drainage Solution (SuDS) has been demonstrated.

3. Loss of Wildlife Habitat

The area supports a wide variety of wildlife, including badgers, which are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Cumulative habitat fragmentation will occur if both developments proceed. The ecological reports do not demonstrate how continuity of habitat will be preserved.

4. Lack of Local Infrastructure Capacity

Local GPs, schools, buses and the Darent Valley Hospital are already struggling. No meaningful infrastructure expansion is included with the proposal.

Green belt is included which has not been released from the greenbelt boundary.

Conclusion

This development represents unsustainable cumulative overdevelopment that would overwhelm infrastructure, harm wildlife, increase flooding risk, and severely compromise road safety. It should be refused.

Kind regards