

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 8:39 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] Brimstone Hill Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 750 residential dwellings on existing greenfield land. While I recognise the importance of housing provision, this proposal represents an unsustainable, disproportionate, and fundamentally inappropriate use of land that fails to consider the long-term environmental, infrastructural, and social consequences. This objection is not rooted in resistance to change, but rather in a reasoned concern that this development, in its current form and location, is neither justified nor responsible. The scale, location, and impact of the proposal raise serious concerns that cannot be mitigated through minor adjustments or planning conditions. The proposed development would result in irreversible damage to the natural environment, place intolerable strain on already overstretched infrastructure, significantly worsen traffic conditions on unsuitable rural roads, and permanently alter the character of the local area. There are more appropriate and sustainable alternatives available, including the redevelopment of brownfield sites and better utilisation of existing urban areas. These options must be prioritised before any consideration is given to sacrificing valuable greenfield land.
-----------	--

2. Loss of Greenfield Land

Greenfield land is a finite and irreplaceable resource. Once developed, it is lost permanently.

The proposed site currently serves as an open, natural landscape that contributes significantly to the environmental quality of the area. It provides ecological value, natural drainage, carbon absorption, and visual openness.

Developing 750 homes on this land would:

- Permanently remove natural green space
- Replace permeable land with impermeable surfaces such as roads, driveways, and buildings
- Eliminate a landscape that has taken decades to form
- Contribute to urban sprawl

The argument that housing demand justifies the use of greenfield land is flawed when alternative sites exist. The loss of such land should only ever be considered as a last resort - not a convenient option.

3. Environmental Impact and Climate Concerns

At a time when climate change is a global priority, this proposal directly contradicts environmental responsibility.

Green spaces play a crucial role in:

- Absorbing carbon dioxide
- Regulating local temperatures
- Supporting biodiversity
- Managing rainfall and preventing flooding

The destruction of this land will:

- Reduce the area's ability to absorb carbon emissions
- Increase local temperatures due to urban heat effects
- Remove natural buffers against extreme weather

Construction itself will also generate significant emissions, noise, and pollution over a prolonged period.

Approving this development sends a message that environmental commitments are secondary to short-term housing targets.

4. Biodiversity and Habitat Loss

The proposed site is not empty - it is part of a living ecosystem.

Grassland, hedgerows, and open fields support:

- Birds and nesting species
- Pollinators such as bees and butterflies
- Small mammals
- Native plant life

Construction will destroy these habitats entirely.

Claims of "biodiversity net gain" are often misleading. Artificial replacements cannot replicate the complexity and balance of established ecosystems. Relocation strategies rarely succeed at scale.

The loss of biodiversity is not only an environmental issue but a moral one. Once these habitats are gone, they cannot simply be recreated elsewhere.

5. Flood Risk and Drainage Issues

Greenfield land plays a vital role in natural water absorption.

Replacing it with housing will:

- Increase surface water runoff
- Overload drainage systems
- Raise the risk of local flooding

This is particularly concerning given the increasing frequency of extreme weather events.

While developers may propose sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), these are not equivalent to natural land absorption. They are engineered solutions attempting to compensate for the loss of a natural system - and they often fail under pressure.

Approving this development introduces avoidable flood risks to both new and existing residents.

6. Traffic, Country Lanes, and Road Safety

This is one of the most critical issues associated with the proposal.

The existing road network consists largely of narrow country lanes that are already struggling to cope with current traffic levels.

At present:

- Rush hour traffic is already severe
- Congestion, delays, and bottlenecks are daily occurrences
- Roads are operating beyond their intended capacity

The addition of 750 homes could introduce approximately 1,200 to 1,500 additional vehicles.

This would result in:

- Significant increases in congestion
- Longer journey times
- Increased driver frustration and risk-taking behaviour
- Greater likelihood of accidents

Limitations of Country Lanes

The local road infrastructure is fundamentally unsuitable for this scale of development:

- Roads are

