

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 4:21 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] 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), and 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 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, 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 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 as they seem oversubscribed.

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 two proposed development less than 500m from the Southern end of the site. They are also aware of a proposal for the development of 750 houses North Eastern side of Norwood Lane. While there are "no approved planning developments" currently, 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! Ring Doorbells is not an outsourced safety argument. Meopham has low crime, however, the roadways and pavements are dark and difficult. A torch is essential after dark.

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 and speeding is rife. 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 Travel plan uses the word "should" e.g. "Should look to promote" car clubs and "It (the Travel pack) should include" this is a deliberate lack of commitment

Kind regards