

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 31/08/2026 5:01 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] the drove way Istead rise

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to object to this application. I live on a road which directly borders the proposed site, with the development coming to within just a few metres of my home, so this would have a very real impact on my family and our neighbours. My biggest concern is access and the amount of additional traffic this would bring. The Drove Way is a residential cul-de-sac, but under these plans it appears that it would become the only normal vehicle access for up to 100 new homes. It already provides access to the village shops, doctors' surgery and community facilities, so it is already busy with residents, patients, shoppers, deliveries and pedestrians. Adding the traffic from another 100 homes through the same cul-de-sac is a huge change. There doesn't appear to be another route for normal traffic out of the development, so all of those additional cars would be funnelled through The Drove Way and then onto the existing village roads. This is particularly worrying because Istead Rise is already incredibly car dependent. We don't have a train station, our bus service is extremely limited and there aren't realistic walking or cycling routes into Gravesend or Meopham. The reality is that most people living in these new houses would need cars.
-----------	---

We are also already struggling with local infrastructure. Istead Rise Primary School is heavily oversubscribed and local children are already unable to get places there. Building another 100 homes without addressing that problem will only increase the pressure. Children who can't get into the village school then have to be driven elsewhere, creating even more traffic at exactly the busiest times of day.

I am also concerned about what this means for those of us whose homes directly border the site. At the moment this is open agricultural Green Belt land. This proposal would bring a large housing development right up behind existing homes. That means a significant change in outlook and character, as well as potential overlooking, noise, lighting and disturbance. There would also be a considerable period of construction immediately next to existing residential properties.

Drainage is another concern. Turning agricultural land into houses, roads and driveways will obviously change how water drains from the site. With existing homes immediately alongside the development, I would want to see very clear evidence that this cannot increase surface water or flooding problems for the properties already here.

Most importantly, I don't think this application can sensibly be looked at on its own. There are several large housing sites being proposed around Istead Rise. Each one may be presented as a certain number of houses, but together they potentially mean hundreds of additional homes relying on the same roads, school, GP services and extremely limited public transport.

I understand that new homes have to be built, but they need to be built in places that can actually support them. I don't believe putting up to 100 additional homes on Green Belt land, accessed through an existing residential cul-de-sac in a village where the school is already oversubscribed and residents are heavily dependent on cars, is sustainable.

For these reasons I strongly object to application 20260649 and ask the Council to refuse permission.

Kind regards