

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 03/12/2025 3:31 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:	Mulberry Close Meopham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

My objection to the proposed developments in Meopham centres on how the plans are presented as inevitable and beneficial to our community. This narrative is fundamentally flawed. These projects are developer-led initiatives exploiting the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and implicit government approval, weaponizing the notion of "sustainable development" to rush through changes that serve profit over community needs.

I recognise that development is necessary, but Meopham is facing 3 confirmed proposals for 620 houses and an additional proposal for 750 houses pending application. This could bring 1240+ residents (assuming 2 residents per dwelling), increasing to 1370 houses and 2,740+ residents. Meopham had 6795 residents in the 2021 Census: 3 developments will result in an immediate 18% increase in population. If all 4 developments occur, that figure jumps to 40%. Such rapid growth cannot be labelled sustainable.

Meopham is a rural area loved by residents like myself for its tranquillity and green spaces. Yet we are faced with a property development gold rush. Let's be clear: this is not about our desires as a community; it's about profit for developers, regardless of their compelling presentations.

The applications boast ambitious travel plans, but they push responsibility for infrastructure improvements to some undefined future date. They evaluate each project in isolation rather than as a cohesive network of developments, which

only dilutes the impact on local services. For instance, with 10,315 patients currently registered at Meopham Medical Centre, they face a potential 12% increase in caseload from 3 developments. Moreover, traffic assessments ignore the upcoming Lower Thames Crossing that will further amplify congestion on the A227.

Proposals include features like energy-efficient homes and electric vehicle (EV) charging points; they fail to commit to renewable energy e.g. solar or air source heat pumps, leaving the door open to use "low carbon" gas boilers misaligned to future Government energy plans. Heavier EVs will aggravate already damaged roads.

It's undeniable that Gravesham needs housing, but these developments are a shock to our community. They feel undemocratic and unsustainable. The pressing question for us in Gravesham and Meopham is this: what does truly sustainable and acceptable development look like? Because this is not it.

I draw the committees attention to issues in the documentation:

Planning Statement

- Economic of Development 7.9 "Housing development is a key component of economic growth and the additional population will support the vitality and viability of services and facilities in Meopham.". I was unaware local services were in need of support? Can Wimpy evidence this?

Transport Assessment

- 7.5.1 "Upon review of local committed planning applications, it was determined that there were no approved planning developments that would materially impact the study area as part of this assessment.". This is disingenuous. Wimpy are well aware of Richborough's development less than 500m from the Southern end of the site, plus the development on Longfield Rd. They are also aware of a proposal for the development of 750 houses North Eastern side of Norwood Lane. Yes there are "no approved planning developments" currently, but this is a fundamentally dishonest statement.
- 7.9 Developers conclusion cannot be accepted when they have excluded the other developments in the area.
- Appendix A When did "passive surveillance" become an acceptable measure of safety. I hadn't realised the Government had outsourced safety to Ring Doorbell. Meopham has low crime, however, the roadways and pavements are dark and difficult. A torch is essential.
- Appendix A - Road Safety Audit, 1.4.3, Only one speed camera is installed. There are no other static speed cameras on the Wrotham Road.

Travel Plan

- 3.15 30mph does not mean safe. Was feedback sought from "Cycle for All" with their assessment of cycling Meopham?
 - 3.2.2 The timetable for bus 308 is wrong and presented in a overly positive way. Buses are not every 90 minutes: Gravesend to Sevenoaks: 0934, 1103, 1233, 1423: however, 1705 and 1805 terminate Vigo Village. Note the 2.5 hour gap in the afternoon. There is one early bus on School days only at 0705. The return journey from Sevenoaks to Gravesend: 1009, 1134, 1304, 1434, 1638 (school days only). The 1736, 1836 start Vigo (redroutebuses.co.uk). As you can see the bus timetable is far more intermittent than presented.
 - 3.2.5 The train journey times are presented in a too positive way focusing on the quickest service running off-peak and not during commuter times. Only one train per hour off-peak is 35 minutes. All other journeys are 42-58 minutes duration.
 - 9.3.4 The travel plan uses the "should" word with no commitment e.g. "Should look to promote" car clubs and "It (the Travel pack) should include". How about "will include", "will promote"?
-

Kind regards