

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/01/2026 2:42 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] Henley Deane Northfleet

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing to object to planning application 20251233 for the proposed 154 dwellings and access road at Istead Rise, Kent. This proposal represents a form of development that would deliver long-term and irreversible harm to the local environment and community, with insufficient justification or mitigation. The site lies within the Green Belt, where development is tightly controlled for good reason. The introduction of a new access road and a large housing estate would permanently undermine openness and introduce urbanising features into a rural setting. These impacts are neither temporary nor reversible and conflict directly with the objectives of Chapter 13 of the NPPF (2024). The proposal also conflicts with the Gravesham Local Plan, notably policies CS02, CS11, CS12, CS14, and CS19, which collectively require development to be sustainably located, supported by adequate infrastructure, and respectful of environmental constraints. The application fails to meet these requirements. Particular concern must be given to the proximity of the access road to Istead Rise Primary School. Children are uniquely vulnerable road users, and the siting
-----------	---

of a busy access route immediately beside the school is fundamentally inappropriate.

During construction, pupils would be exposed to extended periods of noise, dust, vibration, and disruption. In the long term, increased traffic volumes would pose an ongoing risk that cannot realistically be designed out.

From an environmental perspective, the development would result in the loss of habitats used by protected species, contrary to the objective of achieving net gains for biodiversity. The information submitted does not demonstrate that such harm can be adequately avoided, mitigated, or compensated.

Flood risk is another unresolved issue. The proposed measures do not provide sufficient confidence that surface water and downstream flooding risks will be effectively managed over the lifetime of the development, particularly in the context of increasingly intense rainfall events.

The proposal would also place additional strain on local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare provision, and transport networks, all of which are already under pressure. The scale of development proposed is disproportionate to the capacity of the surrounding area.

It is also notable that the principle of development on this site has been tested previously and rejected. Refusals such as application 20190372 (2019) and a recent 2024 appeal decision within Gravesham clearly indicate that residential development here has consistently been found unacceptable.

When viewed in the round, the proposal would deliver widespread harm with no overriding public benefit to justify it. I therefore urge the Council to refuse planning application 20251233.

Yours sincerely.

Kind regards