

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 4:06 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Wrotham Road Meopham Gravesend Kent DA13 0AA
Proposal:	Outline application for the erection of up to 350 residential dwellings , public open space and associated works. Approval is sought for the principal means of vehicular access from Wrotham Road and all other matters are reserved.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Mulberry Close Meopham Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I am objecting to the proposed developments in Meopham. The plans are presented as inevitable and framed as in the best interests of the community. This narrative is flawed in the assumptions. These projects are developer-led initiatives exploiting the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and assumed government approval. Claiming to be "sustainable development" in order rush through changes that serve profit to developers over community needs. I recognise that new housing is necessary, but Meopham has 3 large developments in planning phase for 620 houses. An additional proposal for 750 houses is being consulted on. This could bring an additional 1240 residents (assuming two residents per dwelling), an possibly 1370 houses and 2,740+ new residents. Meopham had 6795 residents in the 2021 Census, the 3 developments alone will result in an 18% increase in population. If all four developments occur, that figure jumps to 40%. Such a rapid growth cannot be labelled sustainable.

Meopham is a green belt, farming and rural area, enjoyed by residents like myself for its tranquillity. Yet, we are faced with what seems like a property development frenzy. Let's be clear: this is not about our needs as a community; it's about profit for developers, their compelling presentations are smoke and mirrors .

The applications boast ambitious transportation plans, but they do not accept responsibility for infrastructure improvements suggesting this will be addressed at a 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, a potential 12% increase in caseload can be predicted from just three developments. Moreover, traffic assessments ignore the upcoming Lower Thames Crossing that will further amplify congestion along the A227.

While the proposals include features like energy-efficient homes and electric vehicle (EV) charging points, they fail to address broader concerns about climate resilience. There is no mention of solar or air source heat pumps, or grey water reuse and the reliance on gas boilers doesn't align with long-term energy plans. Promoting heavier EVs will aggravate our already damaged roads.

It's undeniable that Gravesham requires housing, but these developments are a shock to our community. They are undemocratic and not sustainable, as the NPPF and developers might insist otherwise.

I also draw the committee's attention to other issues in the developers documentation.

- Regarding "KCC Highways - Appendix E - Part 3: Appendix G - Manual for Streets Visibility Splay Calculations" the SSD calculations are wrong. They assume a gradient of 0%. This is incorrect. Based on OS map data I estimate an 18% gradient. This pushes the northbound SSD to 49.2 which is just below the threshold of 49.3.
- The presumption that cycling will be an option without major changes to A227 is disingenuous given cars speed, the roads are dark by design and poor road quality.
- 5.22 should say "Strood" not "Stroud". NB there is no safe route to the start of the cycle route to Strood.
- The popularity of Camer Parade is both a blessing and a curse; parking is limited and over subscribed at times. The topography of the road, south to north, from Longfield Hill Road to Green Lane slopes and curves left to right. This creates two problems. The confluence of the turnings at Longfield Hill and Camer Parade is confusing and in my opinion dangerous. This is exacerbated by the almost immediate exit to the North from Camer Parade which is obscured by the topography as well as the exit at the South used only by Big M customers (there is no No Exit/Ahead Only/One Way sign at this junction). Effectively the proposal results in five junctions within several hundred metres, combined with difficult topography, speeding cars and poor parking practices will make for a toxic road conditions. The corrected SSD adds to this assessment.
- Speeding on the A227 is a problem as the developers own data demonstrates. Drivers are fully aware of the position of the static speed camera after Camer Parade and temper speeds accordingly, yet I have personally witnessed dangerous overtaking along the section of road from Camer Parade to the junction of Norwood Lane. As the developers note parking restrictions are often ignored particularly during school pickup/drop off times. Enforcement is limited in regard to both parking and speeding, although parking wardens are occasionally deployed and there is sometimes a mobile police speed trap deployed. The PIA data does not reflect the lived-experience of residents.
- The traffic assessments ignore the knock-on effects of the Lower Thames Crossing and the A227.

Kind regards