

# 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 12:45 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] Flowerhill Way Istead Rise |

## Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: This application appears to be driven primarily by commercial gain rather than by any genuine need that serves the long-term interests of the local community. The Green Belt exists to protect countryside from precisely this type of speculative development, where private profit is prioritised over environmental protection, community wellbeing, and sustainable planning principles.

The proposed development would result in irreversible harm to the Green Belt, permanently eroding its openness and rural character. This land is not underutilised or degraded; it is functioning countryside that contributes to the environmental quality, identity, and visual amenity of Istead Rise. Its loss would represent a significant public detriment for the financial benefit of a private developer.

There is also considerable concern regarding the impact on the natural environment and wildlife. Established habitats would be destroyed to facilitate development that offers no clear public benefit proportionate to the level of harm caused. Biodiversity loss, increased pollution, and disruption to ecosystems are costs borne by the community and future generations, while profits are realised elsewhere.

The scenic views across the Kent countryside are a defining feature of Istead Rise and an integral part of its character. These views are enjoyed by residents and contribute to the distinctiveness of the area. Their destruction cannot be

justified by short-term financial returns, particularly when alternative development options on non-Green Belt land should be prioritised.

Furthermore, the village lacks the infrastructure necessary to support a substantial increase in population. Roads are narrow and already under strain, and the increase in traffic - particularly from construction vehicles and additional daily commuting - would reduce safety, increase congestion, and negatively affect air quality. There are insufficient amenities, healthcare provision, schools, and public transport services to meet increased demand. These shortcomings have not been adequately addressed within the proposal.

Allowing this development would also establish a dangerous precedent, signalling that Green Belt protections can be overridden where sufficient financial incentive exists. This would undermine public confidence in the planning system and weaken long-standing safeguards intended to protect the countryside for the wider public good.

This proposal represents an unacceptable imbalance between private developer wealth and the permanent loss of public assets. The environmental, visual, and infrastructural harm caused would far outweigh any claimed benefits. I therefore respectfully urge the Planning Authority to refuse this application and uphold the principles that Green Belt policy is designed to protect.

---

Kind regards