

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 20/01/2026 8:20 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] Downs Road Istead Rise Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I wish to oppose this development on the following grounds: The proposed development of 154 dwellings is out of scale with the existing village, resulting in overdevelopment. The size and density would fundamentally alter the rural character and settlement pattern of the village. Existing infrastructure (roads, drainage, utilities) is insufficient to support an additional 154 households. Local services such as GP surgeries, schools, and dentists are already under pressure and no adequate mitigation is provided. The development would lead to a significant increase in traffic, exacerbating congestion. Increased vehicle movements would pose safety risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders. Insufficient public transport provision would result in car-dependent development, contrary to sustainability objectives.
-----------	--

Loss of greenfield land and countryside results in harm to landscape character and visual amenity.

Potential adverse impacts on local wildlife, habitats, and biodiversity, with insufficient ecological mitigation.

Increased surface water runoff raises concerns about flood risk, particularly if drainage systems fail.

Prolonged construction would cause noise, dust, vibration, and disruption to existing residents.

Construction traffic would further impact road safety and quality of life.

Lack of detail regarding construction management and mitigation measures.

The development would significantly increase traffic movements during school drop-off and pick-up times, when local roads are already congested.

Increased vehicle traffic raises serious safeguarding concerns for children walking or cycling to and from the primary school.

The proposed access arrangements fail to adequately address pedestrian safety in the immediate vicinity of the school.

Construction traffic would conflict with peak school hours, posing an unacceptable risk to pupil safety.

Insufficient detail is provided regarding safe routing, timing, and management of construction vehicles near the school.

Increased on-street parking pressure could obstruct visibility and emergency access around the school.

Higher traffic volumes would worsen air quality adjacent to the school, where children are particularly vulnerable.

Idling vehicles during peak periods could increase exposure to harmful pollutants, contrary to public health guidance.

Construction noise and vibration would disrupt teaching and learning during school hours.

Ongoing traffic noise would adversely affect the school's learning environment and outdoor play areas.

The development may encourage unsafe crossing behaviour by children due to increased traffic flows.

The local primary school lacks capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated by 154 new homes.

The proposal fails to adequately consider the council's duty of care and safeguarding responsibilities toward children.

Locating a large development adjacent to a primary school without robust mitigation measures is inappropriate and avoidable.

