

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/03/2026 11:26 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of Camer Road Meopham Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Outline planning application for up to 725 dwellings (Use Class C3), a new two-form entry primary school (Use Class F1), a Local Centre (up to 500sqm of Class E floorspace), the provision of Public Open Space including sport and recreation facilities alongside associated access, landscaping, parking, and infrastructure; with all matters reserved except for access.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Sole street Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	1. Overdevelopment of the Site The proposal for 725 homes, a school, and a commercial centre constitutes a scale of development that is wholly disproportionate to the surrounding rural environment. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises that developments should be "sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting" (NPPF, Section 12). This application fails to meet that requirement. The density and massing would overwhelm the existing settlement pattern and erode the rural character that defines the area. 2. Harm to the Landscape and historically protected Green Belt The site formed part of the local green belt and open countryside. The NPPF is clear that the green belt must be protected to prevent urban sprawl and maintain openness (NPPF, Section 13). This development would: Permanently remove open green space Disrupt the landscape character Undermine the fundamental purpose of the green belt The proposal does not demonstrate the "very special circumstances" required to justify such harm. 3. Unacceptable Coalescence of Villages The development would effectively merge existing villages, erasing the physical separation that gives each settlement its identity. Both the NPPF and most Local
-----------	--

Plans seek to prevent settlement coalescence to protect community character and avoid the creation of unplanned conurbations. This application directly conflicts with those principles.

4. Inadequate Road Infrastructure

Local roads are already under strain and are not designed to support the significant increase in traffic that 725 new homes would generate. The NPPF requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users (NPPF, Section 9). This proposal would instead:

- Increase congestion

- Reduce road safety

- Impede emergency access

- Create daily disruption for existing residents

The transport assessment significantly underestimates the real-world impact on the road network.

5. Traffic Impact of the Proposed 2-Form Entry School

A two-form entry school would generate substantial peak-time traffic. School drop-off and pick-up periods already cause congestion in similar local settings. Adding a school of this size would likely result in twice-daily gridlock, worsening air quality and reducing road safety. This is inconsistent with NPPF guidance on promoting sustainable transport.

6. Objection to the Proposed 500sqm Local Centre

The addition of a 500sqm commercial/local centre raises further concerns:

- It introduces a level of commercial activity inappropriate for a rural setting

- It will attract additional vehicle movements beyond those generated by the residential development

- It risks undermining existing village centres, contrary to NPPF policies supporting the vitality of established communities

- It contributes to the creeping urbanisation of the area

This element of the proposal is neither necessary nor proportionate and further intensifies the overdevelopment of the site.

7. Negative Impact on the Local Property Market and Community Character

Many residents have chosen this area for its open spaces, rural setting, and village identity. The scale of this development risks:

- Reducing the desirability of the area

- Negatively affecting property values

- Undermining the qualities that attracted residents in the first place

While property values are not a planning consideration in isolation, the loss of character and amenity that underpins those values is a legitimate planning concern.

Conclusion

This application conflicts with multiple principles of the NPPF and local planning policy, including:

- Protecting green belt land

- Preventing overdevelopment

- Maintaining settlement identity

- Ensuring safe and suitable transport infrastructure

- Supporting sustainable, proportionate growth

Kind regards