

# Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/01/2026 7:52 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]

## Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	<p>Planning Application Reference: 20251233</p> <p>I wish to formally object to the above planning application. The proposal conflicts with both national policy and the Gravesham Borough Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies (2014) and would result in significant and demonstrable harm, for the reasons set out below:</p> <p>Flood Risk</p> <p>The proposed development would significantly increase flood risk along Downs Road, which is located at the bottom of a valley and is already vulnerable to surface water flooding. This is contrary to Policy CS20 (Development and the River Thames) and Policy CS21 (Flood Risk), which require development to avoid areas at risk of flooding and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>Healthcare Infrastructure</p> <p>The development would place unacceptable additional pressure on local GP surgeries and hospitals that are already operating at capacity. This conflicts with Policy CS08 (Community Facilities), which requires development to be supported by adequate health and community infrastructure to meet both existing and future needs.</p>
-----------	--

## Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

The proposal would result in a substantial increase in traffic and on-street parking along Downs Road and surrounding roads, creating unsafe conditions for pedestrians, particularly schoolchildren, due to the introduction of an additional busy and hazardous junction. This is contrary to Policy CS11 (Transport), which seeks to ensure developments do not compromise highway safety and promote sustainable transport patterns.

## Agricultural Land and Countryside Protection

The loss of high-quality, fertile agricultural land represents an unacceptable erosion of countryside resources and conflicts with Policy CS02 (Settlement Hierarchy) and Policy CS19 (Green Belt), which seek to protect the countryside from unnecessary and inappropriate development.

## Traffic Congestion and Air Quality

The development would exacerbate congestion at key junctions in and out of Istead Rise, along the A227, and on New Barn Road, harming highway efficiency and air quality. This is contrary to Policy CS11 (Transport) and Policy CS12 (Sustainable Design), which require development to minimise environmental impacts, including pollution.

## Education Capacity

The proposal would place additional strain on local secondary schools and colleges, reducing the availability of school places. This conflicts with Policy CS08 (Community Facilities), which requires sufficient educational provision to support growth.

## Green Belt and Biodiversity

The loss of Green Belt land and natural habitats would cause long-term and irreversible harm to biodiversity, including protected species. This is directly contrary to Policy CS19 (Green Belt) and Policy CS12 (Sustainable Design), which require the protection of ecological assets and the avoidance of harm to biodiversity.

## Urban Sprawl and Settlement Coalescence

The proposal represents urban sprawl and overdevelopment of Istead Rise, leading to the erosion of the gap between Istead Rise and New Barn. This undermines the settlement hierarchy and conflicts with Policy CS02 (Settlement Hierarchy) and Policy CS19 (Green Belt), which seek to prevent coalescence and protect the identity of settlements.

## Harm to Character and Amenity

The scale and form of the development would cause significant harm to the character, appearance, and setting of the area, as well as loss of privacy and residential amenity for existing residents. This is contrary to Policy CS12 (Sustainable Design), which requires development to respect local character and provide a high standard of amenity.

## Lack of Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure

The area lacks adequate infrastructure to support a larger population, including limited local shops, insufficient parking, no railway station, and extremely limited bus services that do not operate daily or in the evenings. The absence of safe

walking and cycling routes to Gravesend or Meopham would result in a car-dependent and unsustainable development, contrary to Policies CS11 (Transport) and CS12 (Sustainable Design).

#### Noise and Pollution

Increased noise and air pollution, particularly in the vicinity of the school, would further erode residential amenity and conflict with Policy CS12, which seeks to minimise environmental impacts and protect quality of life.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, planning application 20251233 is contrary to multiple policies within the Gravesham Borough Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies (2014), as well as the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal does not represent sustainable development and would result in significant and demonstrable harm. The application should therefore be refused.

---

Kind regards