

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 3:37 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] Fawkham Avenue New Barn Longfield

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

Having lived in Istead Rise for many years, I do not see a need to develop housing further out from the village. I also question that currently farmed arable land and equestrian outbuildings and land is 'grey - belt'.
The land is absolutely green - belt. This proposal by the Applicant is highly speculative of a proposed development which would result in harm to the landscape character and visual amenity of Istead Rise and its rural setting. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Core Strategy policies which require development to respect local character, protect landscape setting and safeguard important views.

I cite the following further reasons as to why this application should be turned down:-

- Destruction of an area of ecological importance, going against 'Kent Bio Diversity Action Plan'.
- I find the 'Supplementary Information' consultees reports do not reflect a knowledgeable local account of the area.
- Transport assessments are not in-line with the actual reality of the area, they are unrealistic - Arcadia Road and Upper Avenue are the routes from the development to Istead Rise Shops and Doctors Surgery and amenities. The Applicants information states that walking distance time is based upon 80 meters

a minute! How would this be achieved walking in the two roads which have a steepness of probably in excess of 1 in 12 steepness up and down. Walking times are nowhere near accurate and would prompt residents to use motor vehicles to travel to the centre of the village, especially in cold and inclement weather. Illegal parking would be a nightmare.

- Local bus services have proved to be unpopular to residents leading to a reductions in service, adding more homes and residents on the outskirts will not make public transport a solution due to the landscape of Istead Rise.
- National Highways and the Report from KCC Highways Officer, notes that Meopham Station is a 35 minutes walk, { There is no footpath on the A227 to the station }.
- Traffic in Downs Road will be immense during School times and the roads here do not come under the GBC Core Strategy for improvement.
- Some 154 new properties could generate in excess of 190 residents in employment needing to travel to work and likely 300 motor vehicles to congest Istead Rise. Kent Highways already notes that severe congestion and slow movement of traffic in the early peak times at the A227/ A2 junction.
- The TRICS Assessment used is very misleading in the predicted low number of 75 two way trips at morning peak time and 85 two way trips in afternoon peak time, this after their "Economic Benefits Plan" predicts 190 working residents from the development, no mention of the extra school bus runs required for Longfield, Meopham and Gravesend.
- The Assessment does not mention the heavy traffic at peak times on New Barn Road, currently there is heavy traffic in the morning rush hour at the roundabout to Pepperhill, and traffic queues at Longfield Hill junction during both rush hours, this will further increase with more motor vehicles.
- I note that granting planning permission does not convey any approval to carry out works on or affecting Public Highways, and must not assume that the Highway Authority and KCC will agree for any works.
- The 'Travel Plan' is unrealistic in its measures to reduce private car use on a terrain like Istead Rise, there will be significant increases in local traffic, statements like Meopham Station being a 4 minute drive by car is very misinforming, especially during peak times when a station is used to commute. There is no mention of traffic holdups for those wishing to commute to Ebbsfleet International Station.
- The Applicant has no local knowledge of Istead Rise, and has no solution for the Doctors Surgery which is over subscribed as to how a probable 600 new residents will be catered for, and indeed local hospitals which are at maximum capacity. Where will the young children be schooled when the primary school is at maximum capacity? None of these very important issues has been addressed in this speculative and naive application.
- The Applicant seems to not understand of relevant legislation and common law required, there is clearly a need to reject this application on the grounds that this is not a sustainable development.
- In Addition there is no evidence of Brownfield development of the many areas available within GBC.
- The application conflicts with no evidence of NPPF paragraph 124 directing authorities to prioritise " Brownfield first" approach to which this is not.
- I quote that NPPF states "The planning system should be genuinely Plan-Led", which this application is clearly not!
- The greatest fear of this application is that the 'affordable Housing' would be used to house families from the London Boroughs and not the people of around the area, this would provide zero benefit to the people of Istead Rise and the surrounding area.

Kind regards