

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 20/01/2026 11:04 AM 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] Castlefields Istead Rise Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	The DEFRA Provisional ALC map identifies the site as Grade 3 agricultural land, but without a site-specific survey it is not possible to confirm whether Best and Most Versatile land would be affected. National policy requires clear evidence before such land can be released for development. The site lies within the Green Belt, where preserving openness and preventing encroachment are essential. The introduction of 154 dwellings would result in a permanent loss of open countryside and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify this harm. Local GP practices, including Downs Way and Meopham, have confirmed they are already operating at full capacity. The application relies on theoretical assumptions and provides no secured healthcare mitigation, contrary to national policy. Primary schools in the area are oversubscribed and no evidence has been provided showing that additional places could be delivered to meet the development's demand. The surrounding road network is not capable of safely accommodating construction traffic associated with a development of this scale. The proposed access point lies in immediate proximity to the main entrance of the neighbouring school, where pedestrian activity - particularly by children - is highest during peak hours. The introduction of heavy goods vehicles in this location would create a
-----------	--

severe and foreseeable highway safety hazard, significantly increasing collision risk and endangering vulnerable road users. This represents an unacceptable and unjustifiable impact on public safety.

The site contributes to an established ecological network. Development would remove greenfield habitat and reduce connectivity. Surveys recorded eight bat species, including roosting sites, alongside 36 breeding bird species, several of which are protected or priority species. The ecological impacts are significant and cannot be fully compensated.

Conclusion:

The proposal would cause substantial Green Belt harm, risk the loss of potentially high-value agricultural land, threaten biodiversity, increase construction-related safety risks particularly to children, and place undue pressure on local healthcare and education facilities. The development should be refused.

Kind regards