

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/01/2026 6:35 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] Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We call on the local authority to reject the proposed development on Green Belt land.

I am opposed to this development because it would permanently damage protected Green Belt land without solving the problems it claims to address. We all recognise the need for more homes. But using this Green Belt land is the easiest option for developers, not the best one for communities. Brownfield and previously developed land are available. Empty or underused buildings that could be brought back into use, and scope to build more homes within existing towns where services already exist. Green Belt should only be used as a last resort, and that has not been proven here.

For the record, Esquire Developments has not handled this well in the meetings and has not proven it's the right thing to build on this land. I have no problem with building developments, "just not on Greenbelts." The are still Brownfields and previously developed land available, and scope to build more homes within existing towns where services already exist. Green Belt should only be used as a last resort, and that has not been proven here.

More cars on already busy roads
Longer commutes

Extra pressure on schools, GP surgeries, and infrastructure

This is not sustainable development and will make daily life harder for existing residents.

The environmental loss is permanent

This land helps absorb floodwater, supports wildlife, and provides a natural buffer against heat and pollution.

These benefits cannot be replaced once the land is built on. If this development is approved, it becomes much easier to justify the next one - and the next.

Bit by bit, the Green Belt is eroded, and local people lose trust that protected land is actually protected.

In Summary

This proposal sacrifices long-term environmental protection and community well-being for a short-term gain that does not solve the housing crisis. There are better places to build, and this is not one of them.

Kind regards