

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/03/2026 8:29 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] round street, sole street gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I am writing to object to planning application 20260207 for the proposed development at Land North of Camer Road, Meopham.

One of my main concerns is the impact this development would have on the clear separation between Sole Street and Meopham. Sole Street is a distinct settlement with its own identity, character and scale, and it should not be treated as an extension of Meopham. The open land between the two villages plays a crucial role in maintaining that distinction. If this development goes ahead, that separation will be lost permanently, and the two areas will effectively merge into one continuous built-up stretch. This would fundamentally change the character of where we live.

The fields themselves are an important part of the local landscape and are far more than just undeveloped land. They provide a natural buffer, open views and a sense of space that defines the rural nature of the area. The Parish Council's own assessment confirms that development would result in harmful landscape and visual impacts, as well as the permanent loss of agricultural land. This would replace open countryside with housing, roads and associated infrastructure, which is entirely out of keeping with the current setting.

The ecological value of the site is also significant. The fields and surrounding

woodland support a wide range of wildlife, including bats feeding across the land, skylarks nesting within the fields, and swifts and swallows that rely on the area for feeding after migration. Birds of prey such as owls and kestrels are regularly seen hunting here, and there is evidence of important invertebrate species including stag beetles and glow worms. This is a well-established and active habitat, and its loss would be both immediate and irreversible.

The scale of the proposed development is also a serious concern. A scheme of up to 725 dwellings is not in keeping with the surrounding area and would introduce a level of density that feels entirely inappropriate. The supporting documents show that significant highway works would be required, including a large new roundabout on Camer Road, as well as noticeable increases in traffic on local roads of around 15 to 20 percent. This highlights that the current infrastructure is not suited to accommodate a development of this size.

It is particularly worrying that key infrastructure issues, such as drainage and wastewater capacity, have not been fully resolved. The application acknowledges that further investigation and potential upgrades are required, and that there is a risk of increased pressure on the existing system before mitigation is in place. Approving development without certainty in these areas would be premature and could have real consequences for existing residents.

More broadly, I do not believe there is sufficient justification for releasing this Green Belt land for development. The proposal appears to be driven by opportunity rather than genuine need, particularly when there are alternative sites and existing housing stock that should be considered first.

Taken together, this proposal would result in the loss of important open land, harm to wildlife, increased pressure on infrastructure, and the merging of two distinct communities. These are not minor changes but permanent and significant impacts.

For these reasons, I strongly object to the application and ask that it is refused.

Kind regards