

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/03/2026 11:45 PM 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] The Russets Meopham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I strongly object to the proposed 750 home development in Meopham. In its current form, the application does not demonstrate that the scheme is sustainable, appropriately planned, or genuinely beneficial to the existing community. The first issue is the sheer scale. A development of up to 750 dwellings, along with a primary school and associated infrastructure, is not a small extension to the village. It is a major expansion that would fundamentally change the character of Meopham. The long term impact on local services, roads, and the surrounding rural setting would be significant. The application is also only in outline. Important details such as layout, landscaping, density, and visual impact are not fixed and are left to later stages. This means residents are being asked to accept the principle of a very large development without knowing how it will actually look or function in practice. That lack of detail makes it difficult to properly assess the true impact. There is also a heavy reliance on grey belt arguments to justify building on land that is currently protected. This raises an important question about whether this site is genuinely suitable for development at this scale, rather than simply being put forward because of wider housing targets. The proposal does not
-----------	--

convincingly demonstrate why this location is appropriate.

The claimed separation from Sole Street is another concern. The idea that the development will remain distinct depends on open space and landscape buffers, but it is not clear how permanent or effective these will be. There is a real risk that this separation will weaken over time, particularly if future changes or pressures lead to further development.

Traffic impacts are likely to be substantial. The plans include a new roundabout, road realignments, and changes to key junctions, which shows the scale of intervention required. Despite this, the transport assessment concludes there will be no significant effects, relying on assumptions about increased walking, cycling, and public transport use. These assumptions do not reflect how people currently travel in this area and seem overly optimistic.

There are also unresolved issues around infrastructure, drainage, and ground conditions. The site appears technically complex, with drainage depending on pumping stations and possible off site upgrades. There are concerns about groundwater, contamination, and whether the necessary testing has been carried out properly. At present, key elements of the drainage strategy are still uncertain and depend on further investigation.

Many of the claimed benefits, such as biodiversity gains and landscaped areas, depend on long term delivery and management over decades. These are not guaranteed outcomes and should not be given the same weight as the immediate and permanent impacts of the development.

Finally, the green areas within the scheme are expected to serve multiple roles, including drainage, biodiversity, separation, and recreation. It is questionable whether they can successfully fulfil all these functions without compromise.

Overall, this is a large and insufficiently defined proposal in a sensitive location. It relies on assumptions and leaves important issues unresolved. For these reasons, it does not demonstrate that it is appropriate or in the best interests of Meopham.

I strongly urge that the application be refused.

Kind regards