

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/04/2026 3:07 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	The Woodlands 217 Wrotham Road Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Alterations to existing restaurant, including alterations to elevations, additional works to accommodate plant, new corral and bin store, demolition of existing single storey side extension with erection of new single storey side extension, minor external work to existing parking bays, creation of patio and other associated work.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Old Road West Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	

I am writing to object to the proposed development of a fast food restaurant in this residential area.

1. Traffic, Congestion, and Road Safety

The proposed site is already located within a high-traffic area that experiences significant congestion, particularly during peak hours. The addition of a fast food outlet-especially one likely to attract pay and takeaway traffic, delivery vehicles, and short-stay parking-will exacerbate these existing issues.

This raises serious concerns about road safety, particularly given the proximity to local schools. Increased vehicle movements, illegal parking, and driver distraction could place children and pedestrians at heightened risk.

2. Air Quality and Environmental Impact

The area already suffers from poor air quality due to congestion. Increased traffic associated with the development will likely worsen local air pollution levels, including nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter.

This is especially concerning given the well-documented health impacts of air

pollution on children, including respiratory conditions and long-term health risks. Approving this development would appear inconsistent with environmental and public health objectives, including local and national commitments to improving air quality and reducing emissions.

3. Impact on Public Health and Wellbeing

The proposed location is near schools, making the increased availability of fast food particularly problematic. Public health policy consistently aims to reduce childhood obesity and promote healthier lifestyles.

Allowing another fast food outlet in close proximity to schools undermines these efforts by increasing exposure and access to unhealthy food options. Many local authorities have adopted policies to limit such developments near schools for precisely this reason.

4. Overconcentration and Lack of Need

The area is already saturated with fast food outlets. The addition of another establishment does not meet a clear community need and risks contributing to an unhealthy clustering effect.

An overconcentration of similar businesses can also reduce diversity in the local economy and diminish the character of the area, making it less attractive for a wider range of uses and services that would better serve residents.

5. Noise, Disturbance, and Anti-Social Behaviour

Fast food outlets often operate late into the evening and can attract noise, littering, and anti-social behaviour. This is incompatible with the residential nature of the area.

Residents may experience increased disturbance from customers, delivery drivers, idling vehicles, and general activity, negatively impacting quality of life and residential amenity.

6. Litter and Environmental Degradation

Takeaway food is commonly associated with increased litter, including packaging waste. This places additional strain on local waste management services and contributes to environmental degradation in nearby streets, parks, and school areas.

7. Sustainability Considerations

The development does not align with sustainable planning principles.

Encouraging car-based trips for short-distance food purchases runs counter to goals of reducing carbon emissions and promoting active travel such as walking and cycling.

Furthermore, fast food supply chains and packaging often have a significant environmental footprint, which should be considered in planning decisions.

8. Economic and Community Impact

While the proposal may create some jobs, these are often low-wage and do not necessarily contribute meaningfully to long-term economic resilience.

In contrast, the development may undermine existing local businesses, particularly independent cafés or healthier food providers, and reduce the diversity and vitality of the local high street.

9. Conflict with Planning Policy

The proposal appears inconsistent with key planning principles, including:

- Protecting residential amenity

- Promoting sustainable transport and reducing congestion
 - Improving public health outcomes
-

Kind regards