

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/08/2026 1:47 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	Land North Of The Drove Way Istead Rise Gravesend Kent DA13 9JY
Proposal:	Development for up to 100 residential dwellings (Class C3), including the formation of new accesses from The Drove Way, the provision of new areas of public open space and all other associated infrastructure and ancillary works (all detailed matters reserved other than means of access).
Case Officer:	Ms Rebecca Harrison

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Wrotham Road Istead Rise Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Objection suggestions please to this planning application. Development for up to 100 residential dwellings (Class C3), including the formation of new accesses from The Drove Way, the provision of new areas of public open space and all other associated infrastructure and ancillary works (all detailed matters reserved other than means of access).

Yes. Assuming this is the Istead Rise / The Drove Way application in Gravesham, there are several potentially strong planning-objection points. I found that the area has previously generated planning concerns around loss of amenity/open space, character, biodiversity and cramped development; there is also an earlier strategic assessment identifying land north of The Drove Way as having archaeological potential.

Strongest grounds to consider
Traffic and highway safety

100 dwellings is a substantial increase in traffic using The Drove Way.

Ask the Council to require a robust traffic assessment covering peak-hour movements, junction capacity, pedestrian safety, parking and emergency access.

Consider cumulative impacts from other development in Istead Rise.

If The Drove Way is relatively narrow or already congested, describe specific locations/times where this occurs rather than simply saying "more traffic".

Unsuitable access arrangements

The proposal specifically includes new accesses from The Drove Way. This makes highway safety a particularly important consideration.

Object if access points would create conflicts with existing driveways, pedestrians, parked vehicles, bends, visibility splays or established residential frontage.

Request that KCC Highways independently scrutinise the proposed access arrangements.

Overdevelopment / impact on village character

Up to 100 homes is a major expansion rather than a small-scale infill development.

The Council should assess whether the scale, density, layout and eventual appearance would respect the existing character of Istead Rise.

This is especially relevant because all detailed matters other than access are reserved: the outline application potentially leaves the eventual density, building form, heights, landscaping and relationship with existing homes insufficiently defined.

Loss of open/green land and landscape character

If the site currently contributes to the open setting of Istead Rise, argue that development would urbanise an important green edge.

"New public open space" does not necessarily compensate for the loss of existing countryside, agricultural land, informal amenity or landscape character.

Ask the Council to assess the whole landscape impact, not simply the amount of open space proposed within the red-line boundary.

Biodiversity and ecology

Require a proper ecological assessment, including hedgerows, mature trees, grassland, nesting birds, bats and other protected/priority species.

The Council should scrutinise whether the claimed biodiversity net gain is genuinely achievable and deliverable rather than relying on theoretical landscaping at Reserved Matters stage.

Existing habitat should be protected wherever possible rather than destroyed and nominally replaced elsewhere.

Drainage and surface-water flooding

Require a detailed assessment of existing drainage conditions and the effect of impermeable surfaces from 100 homes, roads and driveways.

The proposal should demonstrate that development will not increase runoff or flood risk to existing properties.

Ask for sustainable drainage to be demonstrated as deliverable at outline stage, rather than left entirely to a future application.

Pressure on local infrastructure

100 homes means potentially a significant increase in children, vehicle movements and demand for GP, school, community and recreational facilities.

Ask the Council to establish whether existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity and what developer contributions are required.

Don't simply state "schools are full" unless you have evidence-ask the Council to obtain the relevant capacity information.

Archaeology

This could be a particularly useful site-specific point. A Kent County Council planning document identified land north of The Drove Way at Istead Rise as having archaeological potential, including crop-mark evidence and indications of possible prehistoric, Romano-British or medieval remains.

If this is the same site, request an appropriate archaeological evaluation before permission is granted, rather than relying solely on a condition after approval.

Pedestrian and cycle connectivity

100 homes should not result in a car-dependent development.

Ask whether there are safe, direct walking and cycling routes to shops, schools, bus stops and other facilities.

The Council should assess routes from the development to existing facilities, including crossings and footway widths, rather than merely providing paths within the site.

Residential amenity

The eventual development could cause overlooking, loss of privacy, noise, light pollution and loss of outlook for existing residents.

Because this is outline permission, request sufficient parameters to establish that an acceptable relationship with existing properties can actually be achieved.

An important point about the wording

The application is for "up to 100" dwellings, with detailed matters reserved. I would specifically challenge whether the information submitted is sufficient to establish that 100 dwellings can be accommodated acceptably.

The applicant should not effectively obtain permission for the principle of 100 houses and then substantially determine the consequences at Reserved Matters stage.

Draft objection

Here is a version you could adapt and submit to the planning authority:

Objection to Planning Application - Development of up to 100 Residential Dwellings at The Drove Way, Istead Rise

I wish to object to this application for up to 100 residential dwellings, including new vehicular accesses from The Drove Way and associated infrastructure and public open space.

I consider the proposal to be inappropriate in terms of its scale, its impact on the existing character of Istead Rise, highway safety, infrastructure capacity, drainage, ecology and the living conditions of existing residents.

1. Scale and impact on the character of Istead Rise

The proposal represents a substantial expansion of residential development. Up to 100 additional dwellings would fundamentally alter the character and appearance of this part of Istead Rise and would extend the built-up area into land which currently contributes to the area's open and green character.

The Council should carefully consider whether a development of this scale is appropriate in this location and whether it represents sustainable development in the context of the existing settlement.

The fact that public open space is proposed within the development does not in itself compensate for the loss of existing open land, landscape character and the rural/open setting of the settlement.

2. Highway safety and traffic

The proposal would generate a significant number of additional vehicle movements and would place additional pressure on The Drove Way and its junctions.

I have concerns about whether The Drove Way and the proposed access arrangements are capable of safely accommodating traffic associated with up to 100 additional dwellings.

The highway assessment should consider peak-hour traffic, existing congestion, visibility, pedestrian safety, parking, emergency access, construction traffic and the cumulative effect of other development in the surrounding area.

I request that Kent County Council Highways undertake a rigorous independent assessment of the proposed accesses and the effect of the development on the surrounding highway network before the application is determined.

3. Pedestrian and cycle safety

The application should demonstrate that residents will have safe and convenient walking and cycling routes connecting the development with existing residential areas, local facilities, bus stops, schools and other destinations.

It should not be assumed that residents will be able to make these journeys safely simply because paths are provided within the development itself.

4. Drainage and flood risk

The additional roofs, roads, driveways and other hard surfaces associated with up to 100 homes could materially increase surface-water runoff.

The Council should require satisfactory evidence that the development can be drained without increasing flood risk or causing drainage problems for existing properties.

A robust sustainable drainage strategy should be demonstrated to be achievable on the site, with adequate capacity, maintenance arrangements and appropriate exceedance routes.

5. Ecology and biodiversity

The development would result in the loss and disturbance of existing land and potentially important habitats.

A comprehensive ecological assessment should consider protected species, trees, hedgerows, nesting birds, bats and other biodiversity interests.

The Council should be satisfied that any claimed biodiversity net gain is genuine, measurable, deliverable and capable of being maintained in the long term. Existing habitats should be retained wherever reasonably possible rather than relying upon replacement planting or habitat creation after development.

6. Archaeology

There is a potential archaeological issue associated with land in this area. Previous Kent County Council material identified archaeological potential on land north of The Drove Way, including crop-mark evidence and the possibility of below-ground remains dating from the prehistoric, Romano-British or medieval periods.

The Council should therefore ensure that an appropriate archaeological assessment and, where necessary, field evaluation is undertaken before the principle of development is accepted.

7. Pressure on local infrastructure

An additional 100 dwellings would place increased demand on local schools, healthcare, roads, public transport, recreation, community facilities and other infrastructure.

The application should demonstrate that sufficient infrastructure capacity exists or that appropriate, proportionate and secured contributions will be made to address the additional demand.

8. Impact on existing residents

The scale of the development creates potential impacts upon existing residents, including increased traffic, noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, light pollution and changes to the established outlook and character of the area.

These matters need to be properly assessed rather than being deferred entirely to a later Reserved Matters application.

9. Insufficient certainty at outline stage

The application seeks permission for up to 100 dwellings while reserving detailed matters other than access.

Given the scale of the proposal, the Council should not grant permission unless it can be demonstrated at this stage that a development of the proposed maximum scale can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts.

In particular, there should be sufficient information regarding density, building heights, layout, landscaping, drainage, open space, ecological mitigation and the relationship with existing properties to establish that the proposed development is genuinely capable of being delivered acceptably.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the application be refused.

At the very least, the Council should require substantially more evidence concerning highway capacity and safety, drainage, ecology, archaeology, infrastructure capacity, landscape impact and the ability to accommodate the full proposed 100 dwellings before determining the application.

I ask that these objections be taken into account when the application is considered and that the Council ensures that the development complies with the adopted development plan and other relevant material planning considerations.

One thing I would do before submitting this: tailor it to the actual planning documents. If you give me the planning application reference or the council's planning-portal link, I can examine the plans, transport statement, ecology report, flood/drainage documents and planning statement and turn this into a much stronger, site-specific objection, including the exact local-plan policies and previous planning decisions that can be cited.

Swanley Junction

-

Use precise location

Ad

Ads do not influence the answers you get from ChatGPT. Your chats stay private. Learn about ads and personalization

Thank you. Can you write a short concise summary that i can submit as an objection.

Absolutely - here is a concise version suitable for submitting as a planning objection:

Objection to Planning Application - Up to 100 Residential Dwellings

I wish to object to this application for up to 100 residential dwellings.

The scale of the proposed development is excessive for this location and would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and its existing open/green setting.

I have particular concerns regarding the additional traffic generated and the proposed new accesses onto The Drove Way, including highway capacity, congestion and pedestrian safety. The impact on local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare, roads and community facilities, also needs to be properly assessed.

The development could result in the loss of important habitats and green space and may have adverse effects on biodiversity, drainage and surface-water management. There is also potential archaeological interest in the area which should be properly investigated before development is permitted.

Given that this is an outline application for up to 100 homes, I am concerned that insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that a development of this scale can be accommodated without unacceptable impacts on existing residents and the surrounding area.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application is refused.

Kind regards

