

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 18/01/2026 7:44 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] Longwalk Istead Rise

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I wish to object to the proposed development on the grounds that it is inappropriate, unsustainable, and harmful to the character, environment, and infrastructure of the area.

Impact on the Green Belt and Conflict with Planning Policy

Although the site has been referred to as "grey belt" land, the proposed development would still undermine the fundamental purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The scale and nature of the scheme would represent an unjustified expansion of built development into open countryside, contributing to urban sprawl and weakening the clear separation between neighbouring settlements. This would erode the distinct identity of the area and harm the rural setting of the surrounding town and villages.

The development would also constitute an encroachment into the countryside, resulting in the loss of openness and undermining the wider integrity of the Green Belt. The proposal does not demonstrate that the site is in a genuinely sustainable location, nor does it show how the long-term function of the Green Belt would be preserved. As such, the development fails to meet the tests required for development on this type of land and conflicts with both national and local planning policies.

Inadequate Infrastructure and Unsustainable Growth

The proposal does not adequately address the pressure it would place on already stretched local infrastructure. The additional homes would inevitably lead to a noticeable increase in traffic, exacerbating congestion on local roads and raising concerns for pedestrian and highway safety. Public transport options in the area are limited and do not provide a realistic alternative to private car use, making the development inherently car-dependent.

There is also insufficient capacity within local schools, GP surgeries, and other essential services to accommodate a significant increase in population. No convincing evidence has been provided to show how this shortfall would be addressed.

In addition, concerns remain regarding drainage and flood risk. The proposed drainage strategy appears inadequate and there is a real risk that surface water runoff could increase, potentially worsening flooding both on and beyond the site.

Harm to Local Character and Residential Amenity

The design, scale, and density of the proposed development are out of keeping with the established character of the surrounding area. The height and massing of the buildings would appear intrusive and visually dominant, particularly when viewed from neighbouring properties.

Existing residents would experience a clear loss of amenity as a result of the scheme. This includes unacceptable overlooking and a consequent loss of privacy, as well as potential overshadowing that would reduce daylight and sunlight to nearby homes and gardens. The overall presence of the development would feel overbearing and oppressive for those living close to the site.

Furthermore, both the construction phase and the completed development would likely give rise to increased noise, light disturbance, and air pollution, all of which would have a negative impact on the quality of life of nearby residents.

Environmental and Ecological Concerns

Despite its classification, the site appears to have ecological value that has not been adequately recognised or protected. The development would result in the loss of wildlife habitats, as well as the removal of mature trees and hedgerows that contribute significantly to local biodiversity and landscape character.

There are also concerns regarding potential land contamination. The proposed mitigation measures have not been clearly demonstrated to be sufficient, raising questions about the long-term safety of future residents and the surrounding environment.

If the site includes any irreplaceable habitats, such as veteran trees or other features protected under the NPPF, their loss would be permanent and wholly unacceptable.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would cause significant and lasting harm to the Green Belt, local infrastructure, residential amenity, and the natural environment. It is not supported by robust evidence and does not comply with the principles of sustainable development. I therefore urge the Local Planning Authority to refuse planning permission.

Kind regards