

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 3:49 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] Downs Road Istead Rise

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Planning Application 20251233, proposing the demolition of 64 Downs Road and the construction of up to 154 dwellings on protected Green Belt land, is fundamentally incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014). The development would cause lasting harm to the environment, local infrastructure, road safety, and the character of the area, and must be strongly opposed. The proposal's location within the Green Belt is its most serious flaw. The NPPF makes clear that new housing in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless "very special circumstances" exist. None have been demonstrated. The development would permanently destroy open countryside, erode the landscape's character, and set a damaging precedent for further encroachment. Gravesham's planning policies emphasise protecting the Green Belt's openness, and this application directly contradicts those aims. Transport impacts alone justify refusal. The developer proposes a single access point from Downs Road, a road already heavily congested, especially during school drop-off and pick-up times. Queuing, pavement parking, and limited visibility already create unsafe conditions for children and pedestrians. Adding traffic from 154 new homes would significantly increase risk and congestion. The NPPF requires safe and suitable access for all users; this proposal fails that basic test. Public transport provision is also wholly inadequate. Bus services have been reduced in recent years, leaving residents with fewer and less frequent options. The nearest train station is 1.5 miles away, with no safe walking route-no
-----------	---

continuous pavements, poor lighting, and fast-moving traffic. This development would force residents into car dependency, worsening congestion and pollution. The NPPF requires developments to promote sustainable transport, yet this site is fundamentally unsustainable.

Local infrastructure is already overstretched. GP surgeries are at capacity, with long waits for appointments. The nearby primary school is oversubscribed. Water, drainage, and waste services are under pressure. The NPPF requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure, but the applicant provides no credible evidence that local services can absorb hundreds of new residents. The result would be reduced service quality and increased strain on essential facilities.

Environmental harm is another major concern. The site supports wildlife that relies on the Green Belt for habitat and movement. Both the Local Plan and the NPPF require developments to protect biodiversity and deliver measurable net gains. Instead, this proposal would destroy mature vegetation, sever ecological corridors, and displace species. The ecological assessments submitted are superficial and fail to reflect the site's true environmental value.

Flood risk adds further danger. The site sits on elevated land, meaning hard surfacing and dense development would accelerate surface water run-off downhill. Downs Road and surrounding properties already experience issues during heavy rainfall. The NPPF requires developments to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere, yet the drainage strategy is inadequate and fails to address the site's topography.

The scale and density of the proposal amount to overdevelopment that would fundamentally alter the area's character. The elevated position would lead to a loss of privacy and outlook for existing homes. Noise, traffic, and light pollution would increase, and construction disruption would last for years. The Local Plan requires development to respect local character and protect residential amenity; this proposal does neither.

Taken together, these issues form a compelling case for refusal. The development is inappropriate in the Green Belt, unsafe in its access arrangements, poorly served by public transport, unsupported by local infrastructure, harmful to biodiversity, risky in terms of flooding, and damaging to the community's wellbeing. It fails to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the Gravesham Local Plan on every meaningful measure.

For these reasons, the community must stand firmly against Planning Application 20251233. The long-term consequences of approving this development would be severe, far-reaching, and impossible to reverse. Protecting our Green Belt, our safety, and our quality of life must take precedence over speculative development that offers no genuine benefit to local residents.

Kind regards