

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 4:21 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] Longlands Road Sidcup

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to submit my objection to the planning proposal, due to the following reasons:

Increased Flood Risk in a High-Risk Location

The proposed development is located at the bottom of a valley along Downs Road, an area already susceptible to surface water accumulation. Introducing extensive hard landscaping will significantly increase runoff and exacerbate existing flood risk, placing current and future residents at greater danger. This is contrary to sustainable drainage principles and national planning policy on flood risk avoidance.

2. Insufficient Healthcare Capacity

The development would place unacceptable pressure on already overstretched local healthcare services. Contrary to the developer's claims, both the local GP surgery and hospital have confirmed that they have no additional capacity to accommodate further population growth. Proceeding without secured healthcare provision would be irresponsible and detrimental to residents' wellbeing.

3. Increased Traffic, Parking Pressure and Pedestrian Safety Risks

The proposal would generate a substantial increase in vehicle movements on

local roads not designed for such volumes. Increased on-street parking and traffic would make walking routes to school more dangerous, particularly at peak times. The introduction of a new junction would further increase risks for pedestrians and cyclists, especially children, in an area already experiencing traffic constraints.

4. Loss of High-Quality Agricultural Land

The development would result in the permanent loss of fertile farming land. At a time of growing concern over food security and sustainable land use, the unnecessary destruction of productive agricultural land is unjustified and short-sighted.

5. Worsening Regional Traffic Congestion

Additional traffic from the development would worsen congestion throughout Istead Rise and surrounding road networks, including the A227, A2, and New Barn Road. These routes already experience delays, and the cumulative impact of further development has not been adequately addressed.

6. Harm to Local Character and Sense of Place

The scale and density of the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and setting of the local community. Istead Rise is a small, semi-rural settlement, and the development would represent a marked and intrusive change, eroding its identity and village character.

7. Urban Sprawl and Coalescence of Settlements

The proposal would contribute to urban sprawl by closing the gap between Istead Rise and New Barn. This overdevelopment risks the coalescence of distinct communities, contrary to long-established planning principles that seek to maintain clear settlement boundaries.

8. Pressure on Schools and Educational Facilities

Local schools and colleges are already operating at or near capacity. The development would further reduce availability of school and college places, with no clear or guaranteed provision for additional educational infrastructure.

9. Irreversible Loss of Green Belt Land and Biodiversity

The development would result in the irreversible loss of valuable Green Belt land and natural habitats. The site supports wildlife, including protected species, and its destruction would undermine biodiversity objectives and conflict with environmental protection policies.

10. Lack of Supporting Infrastructure

The existing infrastructure is wholly inadequate to support a significantly larger population. Public transport options are limited, there is no train station, and local shops, parking facilities, and services are already constrained. No credible infrastructure improvements have been secured to address this deficit.

11. Creation of a Car-Dependent Community

Due to the lack of safe and direct walking or cycling routes to Gravesend or Meopham, the development would force residents to rely heavily on private vehicles. This conflicts with sustainable transport policies and undermines efforts to reduce car dependency and carbon emissions.

12. Increased Pollution, Noise and Loss of Privacy

Higher traffic volumes would increase air and noise pollution, adversely affecting existing homes, nearby schools, and wildlife habitats. The development would also result in a loss of privacy and tranquillity for both residents and sensitive ecological areas.

13. Failure to Reflect Local Needs and Community Opposition

The proposal does not reflect the needs, character, or wishes of the local community. It represents an inappropriate form of development imposed on a small settlement without sufficient regard for local opinion, infrastructure limits, or long-term sustainability.

Kind regards