

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 5:13 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 Kent

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to formally object to the proposed housing development planning reference 20251233 on Downs road, istead rise.

The proposal is fundamentally inappropriate, unsustainable, and in direct conflict with both national and local planning policy. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl, safeguard the countryside from encroachment, and preserve the setting and identity of nearby settlements. Permitting this development would undermine these core objectives and establish a harmful precedent for the future erosion of protected land.

Conflict with National Planning Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework is unequivocal in stating that development within the Green Belt is, by definition, inappropriate and should only be approved in very special circumstances. No such circumstances have been demonstrated in this case. The general need for housing, while acknowledged, does not constitute sufficient justification for development on Green Belt land, particularly where alternative non-Green Belt sites should be prioritised.

Impact on the Openness and Character of the Green Belt

The proposed development would result in a permanent and irreversible loss of openness, replacing undeveloped countryside with built form. This would cause

significant visual harm, erode the rural character of the area, and weaken the clear separation between settlements that the Green Belt is expressly intended to protect.

Environmental and Ecological Harm

Green Belt land plays a vital role in supporting biodiversity, climate resilience, and natural flood management. The proposal threatens the loss of green space, mature trees, and wildlife corridors. There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that these impacts can be adequately mitigated or compensated for, resulting in unacceptable environmental harm.

Infrastructure and Sustainability Concerns

Local infrastructure, including roads, public transport, schools, healthcare services, and drainage systems, is already under considerable strain. The development would increase traffic, congestion, and pollution, while encouraging reliance on private vehicles. This is contrary to the principles of sustainable development and sound spatial planning.

Failure to Demonstrate Alternative Sites

There has been no robust or convincing evidence that all reasonable non-Green Belt alternatives, including brownfield or infill sites, have been fully explored and exhausted. Development of Green Belt land should only ever be considered as a last resort, not as a matter of convenience.

Precedent and Cumulative Impact

Approval of this proposal would weaken Green Belt protections and make it increasingly difficult to resist further encroachment. The cumulative effect of such decisions would fundamentally and irreversibly alter the character of the area.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development is inappropriate, unjustified, and harmful. It conflicts with established planning policy and would result in lasting damage to the Green Belt, the environment, and the character of the area. I therefore respectfully urge the Local Planning Authority to refuse this application.

Kind regards