

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 9:00 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] Pincroft Wood Longfield

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I object to this application as it will adversely affect the village of Meopham and the wider surrounding area. It will add to the already heavy traffic and cause considerable disruption to the local roads. The access to the site is unsuitable for the level of traffic. The development as a whole will alter the local area beyond recognition. Combined with other proposed schemes it will double the population and Meopham will no longer be a village. It will add to the urban sprawl and will not be beneficial to the current population. The houses will not be affordable to local people and will be sold at great profit which will only benefit the applicant. Schools, doctors and local services will be unable to accommodate this many extra houses and people. The local waterways and drainage will be adversely affected. The loss of this much agricultural land is very worrying. There are other more appropriate brownfield sites that should be used instead. There will be a huge loss of habitat for birds, bats and wildlife. A scheme of this size is totally inappropriate for the area and should be rejected. This proposal is all about profit not actual housing need.

Kind regards