

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/01/2026 2:34 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:	Cheyne Walk Meopham Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I object to this proposal for up to 154 homes on agricultural land off of Downs Road Istead Rise via new entrance road. 1. The plan is for a cul-de-sac for all these proposed properties meaning 300+ vehicles would have to enter/exit, plus delivery/service vehicles, onto Downs Road. The entrance/exit would be at a very busy point particularly at peak times, due to the adjacent school, with all traffic having to access minor road/lanes to get to main access routes, towns, shops and most importantly places of work. 2. As regularly occurs when there is an issue with the A227/A2/M20 vehicle drivers, the main A227 junctions become blocked and drivers try to use back roads and lanes. This would happen regularly because there is a route to the A2 via Southfleet which has lanes that are not built for the levels of traffic already seen, and in places re regularly prone to extensive flooding. 3. Cycling routes within the proposed site are a good idea but there are no safe or designated cycling routes at all outside of the plan area. The local roads are simply too dangerous for all but specially skilled cyclists. This means there are no routes for cycling or walking safely to the two train stations, which are not feasible to access by cycle or walking. 4. There is insufficient room to build cycle routes throughout Istead Rise and the hilly nature from virtually all directions site make it impossible for all but the fittest of cyclists to make use of them anyway. 5 The site is high grade agricultural land in use for many generations Land that contributes to food production and security which is ever more important in this evermore uncertain world.
-----------	---

6. There are no reliable public bus services for the area, and in fact none on Sundays, and the route is subsidised and therefore not guaranteed.
 8. The local schools are already full and would not be able to facilitate the number of school aged children these proposed new homes would generate.
 9. The local GP surgery's do not have the free capacity to facilitate the extra people this proposal would generate, formally confirmed by both local surgery's. Who I might add have not even been approached for comment by the applicant.
 10. The closest emergency NHS hospital in Darenth Valley is already at bursting point, and indeed it is already going to get even more so with the extensive home building in Dartford and Bluewater/Ebbsfleet.
 11. There are only small convenience stores in the area, again meaning extensive extra vehicular journeys will be required to get food etc.
 12. No jobs in the local area therefore the home owners would have to travel to them. Creating even larger strains on the roads in the area, in particular the A227 which is already very busy all day in this area. If the idea is for the new home dwellers to travel via trains to their place of employment then it would be better for all and the environment that the new homes be built where the jobs are.
 13. Istead Rise and Meopham is losing the provision of smaller one/two bedroom bungalows. The sort of properties that retirees wish there were so that they could downsize and enjoy there remaining years in a more manageable home. No provision is being considered by the applicant for any of the plans. If they were a more diverse age group in these local communities, perhaps it would aid in the ideal of safer crime free areas.
 14. The proposed development area is not only farmland but valuable countryside vital for wildlife. For the benefit of all brownfield site must be the first priority for any deemed necessary new homes.
 15. The new designation of "greybelt" is so poorly defined it is being used by local authorities and developers as an excuse to build on what is STILL greenbelt/wildlife land. This land in the proposal is not greybelt at all.
-

Kind regards