

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/01/2026 3:29 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land At Rose Farm Downs Road Istead Rise Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Outline planning application for the demolition of 64 Downs Road and erection of up to 154No. residential dwellings (including affordable housing), with all matters reserved except for access. Creation of a new access from Downs Road.
Case Officer:	Adeoye Lawal

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] The Drove Way Istead Rise Gravesend Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I object to the above planning application for the following reasons:-

Downs Road is already a very busy road with traffic and parked cars at all times of the day. The Primary school, near to the proposed single opening of this new development, causes severe congestion in itself at the start and end of the school day. Over 150 new houses with only one entrance right near the school will only add to this and increase congestion, pollution and danger to both drivers and pedestrians. Esquire state there would be 70 vehicle movements in the morning and 74 movements in the evening. 154 houses will almost certainly result in more vehicle movements than Esquire state. The national average of cars per house in England is 1.4. This equates to an average of 215.6 more cars in and around Istead Rise from this development of 154 houses.

This does not even take into account that there are over 800 houses in Istead Rise and the surrounding villages currently being considered for planning permission.

There is no train station in Istead Rise and the bus service to and from the village is unreliable, infrequent and expensive - again, leading to the use of extra cars within the village and onto our main A roads locally.

Downs Road is at the bottom of a hill and as such, often floods and has considerable surface water. Changing an open field to an impermeable surface will only increase these problems. The developer, Esquire, has not sufficiently

addressed how this problem would be mitigated.

Our two local GP surgeries (Istead Rise and Meopham) have both explicitly stated they do not have any further capacity for new patients. This is in complete contrast to Esquires lies about the availability of these surgeries. I believe Gravesham BC has been forwarded the letters from both surgeries, explaining why they do not have capacity. Furthermore, our local hospital (Darent Valley) and dentists are also struggling to cope with current demand.

There will be more traffic congestion along New Barn Road and Wrotham Road. Wrotham Road traffic will also be increasing soon due to the Lower Thames Crossing, which has not been considered. The junction from Istead Rise onto Wrotham Road is already dangerous, owing to the amount of traffic flow, which is considerable. National Highways have asked for the planning decision to be delayed while they evaluate traffic and accidents on the A2 and A227 junctions.

This would be a loss of Greenbelt land, which is currently used for farming. In turn this would also mean a further loss of local wildlife, due to the loss of their local habitat. Surely the potential here is for long term environmental damage?

The local Primary and Secondary schools have stated they do not have the capacity for the 45 Primary and 32 Secondary children that Esquire have advised would be living on the development. This number of children seems extremely low for a 154 house development.

This development will not be of any benefit to Istead Rise and the surrounding area. This is a village that cannot cope with the proposed development. Any further urban sprawl will result in the loss of the village character and, if allowed, may eventually merge Istead Rise with Gravesend, New Barn and Meopham. These villages should be protected and not violated by developers.

This plan does not reflect the needs of local people and for this and the reasons above should be rejected.

Kind regards