

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/03/2026 9:58 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:	Camer Street Meopham Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 20260207

I wish to formally object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development of 725 dwellings on Land North Of Camer Road Meopham Gravesend Kent.

My objection is based on the following concerns:

1. Fundamental Conflict with Planning Policy

The proposal is in clear conflict with both the Gravesham Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It fails to meet the core principles of sustainable development and directly undermines policies relating to Green Belt protection and infrastructure provision.

A significant proportion of the borough (approximately 78%) is designated as Green Belt. This application would contribute to the coalescence of settlements, directly opposing the NPPF's stated purposes of preventing urban sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Furthermore, Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) seeks to protect the rural character and visual amenity of the borough. This proposal would cause substantial harm to both.

If the site lies within the Green Belt, the development must be regarded as inappropriate and therefore harmful by definition. No "very special

circumstances" have been demonstrated that would justify such harm.

2. Unacceptable Impact on Highways and Air Quality

The surrounding road network is already operating beyond capacity, with frequent and severe congestion at peak times. Rural lanes are increasingly used as rat-runs, creating unsafe conditions and worsening environmental impacts. The scale of this development would significantly intensify traffic levels, further degrading air quality and posing risks to pedestrian safety-particularly given the proximity of a country park.

Public transport provision in this area is inadequate, meaning future residents will be heavily reliant on private vehicles. This is wholly inconsistent with local and national sustainable transport objectives.

3. Drainage Constraints and Increased Flood Risk

Existing drainage infrastructure is already under significant strain. The addition of extensive hard surfacing will inevitably increase surface water runoff, heightening the risk of flooding both on-site and in surrounding areas.

There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the necessary upgrades to drainage systems can be delivered effectively or without adverse consequences elsewhere.

4. Significant Harm to Green Belt and Landscape Character

The development would result in the irreversible loss of open countryside and a marked erosion of the area's rural character. Its proximity to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty further amplifies the level of harm.

Encroachment into the Green Belt at this scale fundamentally conflicts with its purpose and would set a damaging precedent for further incursions.

5. Adverse Impact on Biodiversity

The site supports a range of wildlife, including protected and declining species such as badgers, bats, birds of prey and hedgehogs. The scale of habitat loss and disturbance arising from this proposal would have serious ecological consequences.

The mitigation measures proposed are inadequate and fail to compensate adequately for the extent of biodiversity loss.

6. Cumulative Overdevelopment and Infrastructure Deficit

This proposal must be considered in the context of the cumulative scale of development already facing the area. It is not an isolated scheme, but part of a broader pattern of large housing growth that, taken together, will impose unsustainable pressure on already overstretched infrastructure and services. Based on local planning data and 2021 Census indicators, Meopham comprises approximately 2,500-3,000 homes. The addition of a further 1,000 dwellings-alongside other recent applications-represents a dramatic and unjustified expansion of around one-third. This cannot reasonably be described as sustainable or proportionate growth. Instead, it would fundamentally alter the size and function of the village without any coherent or strategic framework to support such a transformation. The scale of development is characteristic of urban expansion and is entirely out of keeping with the established rural character of the area.

Local infrastructure-including secondary education, healthcare services, and utilities-lacks the capacity to absorb this level of growth. There is no credible or substantive evidence demonstrating that necessary upgrades will be delivered, and concerns raised by key service providers further highlight the inadequacy of existing provision.

Conclusion

For all of the reasons outlined above-including clear policy conflict, severe transport impacts, inadequate infrastructure, environmental harm, and the

cumulative effects of overdevelopment-I strongly urge the planning authority to refuse this application.

Kind regards