

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/03/2026 7:51 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] Halfpence Lane Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Dear Sir or Madam, I am registering my formal objection to the planning application. Having reviewed the Environmental Statement - Socio Economics and other documents, I believe the proposal will cause significant and unacceptable harm to local services, community character, and the rural environment. My key objections are as follows: 1. Severe Pressure on Local Healthcare Services The development introduces around 1,784 new residents into an area already suffering from inadequate GP provision. Meopham Medical Centre operates at 1 GP per 2,101 patients, far above the recommended 1:1,800. This development worsens the ratio to 1:2,464, reducing access to essential medical care, particularly for vulnerable residents. No new healthcare facilities are proposed, and reliance on unspecified financial contributions is not credible given existing strain and national recruitment shortages. With emergency departments already distant and difficult to reach, the impact on healthcare access would be permanent and severe. 2. Inadequate Early Years Provision The development will generate approximately 50 early years children, yet only two facilities exist within 1.6 km, both operating at or near capacity. (Cobham School's waiting list is not reflected in the applicant's data.) No on site nursery or childcare provision is proposed, worsening shortages and creating avoidable
-----------	--

hardship for local families.

3. Insufficient Secondary School Capacity

Meopham School already has a deficit of 125 places, and the development is expected to generate 135 secondary aged pupils. No secondary school is within walking distance, and no new provision or permanent transport support is proposed. Financial contributions do not guarantee new places or facilities and do not address the existing shortfall. This represents a significant and unmitigated impact on education access.

4. Harm to Rural Community Character

The area is characterised as "Retired Professionals"-a low density, rural, ageing community. Adding 725 dwellings and nearly 1,800 residents would fundamentally alter its character, scale, and demographic profile. The applicant provides no assessment of the social cohesion or identity impacts of such a dramatic change.

The site also sits between Meopham and Sole Street, creating uncertainty about community belonging and Parish Council responsibility.

5. Loss of Rural Landscape and Overstated Open Space Benefits

The proposal replaces virgin greenfield, food producing land with housing and infrastructure, resulting in a net loss of rural landscape character. The claimed "substantial open space" is primarily for residents and does not compensate for the loss of natural countryside.

6. Over Reliance on Car Travel and Ignored Transport Constraints

The assessment assumes residents will access schools, healthcare, and services primarily by car. Public transport is extremely limited, and many key services are beyond walking distance. Both Meopham and Sole Street stations already lack sufficient parking and have no capacity for growth.

The assessment fails to consider the socio economic consequences of increased car dependency, including congestion, emissions, and reduced accessibility for non drivers. This omission undermines the credibility of the applicant's conclusions.

7. Economic Benefits Are Limited and Overstated

The proposal's economic benefits are minimal:

- Construction jobs are temporary and not guaranteed to benefit local people.
- Operational employment peaks at 71 direct jobs, many part time.
- Indirect employment is estimated at only 9 jobs.

These limited benefits do not outweigh the long term strain on local services and infrastructure.

8. Inadequate and Outdated Housing Need Justification

The housing justification relies on outdated Local Plan targets and does not demonstrate that this site is the most sustainable or appropriate location for major development. Several brownfield sites and incomplete developments within a 10 mile radius offer far better infrastructure and access. This proposal represents unjustified encroachment into rural land without a robust strategic basis or community benefit.

Conclusion

This proposal would cause significant, long term harm to local services, community character, and the rural environment. Community deprivation would worsen due to increased pressure on essential services and the absence of credible mitigation. The commitments offered are vague, insufficient, or entirely missing.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council refuse this application.

Kind regards