

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 8:27 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:	1. Coalescence of Settlements - Loss of Sole Street Identity A primary concern is the merging of Sole Street into Meopham, fundamentally altering the character of both settlements. Sole Street is a distinct, smaller rural community, separate in scale, identity and character from Meopham, which is recognised as one of the longest villages in England. The proposed development would erode this distinction entirely, creating a continuous urbanised stretch that directly conflicts with the established planning principle of preventing settlement coalescence. This is not simply a matter of additional housing - it is the permanent loss of a clearly defined village identity, replacing a rural break with built form. 2. Inappropriate Development on Green Belt Land The site sits within the Green Belt, where development should only occur in very special circumstances. No such circumstances have been convincingly demonstrated. Instead, this proposal appears to be driven by land value uplift for a single
-----------	--

landowner, rather than genuine planning need-particularly when:

There are significant numbers of vacant homes across the county, in some cases numbering in the hundreds or thousands.

Brownfield and underutilised sites remain available for redevelopment.

The development therefore fails the fundamental Green Belt test of necessity.

3. Severe Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity

The fields proposed for development are not low-value land-they are ecologically active and vital habitats.

They currently support:

Pipistrelle bats (feeding grounds and likely roosting within the central copse)

Skylarks (protected species) actively breeding and nesting

Swifts and swallows, relying on these fields for essential feeding following migration

Owls (tawny and little) hunting across the land

Kestrels, hobbies, ravens, and other bird species

Stag beetles and glow worms (with glow worms due to be registered on the National Database)

Hummingbird hawk moths and a range of invertebrates

This is not speculative-there is documented and filmed evidence of these species using the site extensively.

At a time when national policy is focused on biodiversity recovery and nature restoration, the destruction of such a functioning ecosystem is entirely contradictory.

Notably, skylarks-already in national decline-are protected, and disturbing their nesting habitat may conflict with the Wildlife and Countryside Act.

4. Loss of High-Quality Agricultural Land and Rural Character

According to the submitted documents, the site comprises Grade 2 agricultural land, which will be permanently lost to development .

This represents:

Loss of productive farmland

Loss of open countryside

Irreversible change to landscape character

The Parish Council has already identified moderate to significant adverse landscape and visual impacts, particularly during construction and early years .

This is not a marginal impact-it is a fundamental transformation of the rural setting.

5. Traffic and Infrastructure Pressures

The scale of the proposal introduces major infrastructure changes, including:

A ~45m diameter roundabout on Camer Road

Road widening and realignment

Forecast traffic increases of 15-20% on surrounding roads

This level of intervention demonstrates that the existing road network is not

suitable for the development.

Camer Road and surrounding routes are already heavily used. The introduction of this volume of traffic will:

- Increase congestion
- Reduce road safety
- Urbanise a currently rural road network

6. Drainage and Wastewater Risks

The application acknowledges that:

- Existing wastewater infrastructure may not have capacity
- Additional investigation and upgrades are required
- There is potential for increased sewer flood risk before mitigation

Approving development where critical infrastructure is unresolved is premature and poses clear risks to existing residents.

7. Cumulative Overdevelopment

This site does not exist in isolation. The Parish Council identifies:

- Nearby and adjoining developments
- Significant cumulative visual and landscape impacts
- Increasing urbanisation across this part of Meopham

Taken together, these developments represent incremental erosion of rural character, not sustainable growth.

8. Ground Stability and Site Constraints

The submitted reports identify:

- Potential chalk dissolution features and natural cavities
- Requirement for further intrusive investigations
- Uncertain ground conditions requiring engineering solutions

This confirms that the site has unresolved technical constraints, making outline approval inappropriate.

Conclusion

This application is fundamentally flawed. It:

- Merges distinct rural communities
- Destroys valuable Green Belt land
- Damages established wildlife habitats
- Places strain on inadequate infrastructure
- Relies on unresolved technical and environmental issues

It represents speculative development, not sustainable planning.

I strongly urge the Local Planning Authority to refuse the application

Kind regards