

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/05/2026 5:50 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	The Woodlands 217 Wrotham Road Gravesend Kent
Proposal:	Installation of new luminaires to existing external lighting suite, and new illuminated bollards.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Wrotham Road Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to this planning application. I live directly opposite the application site, approximately 30 metres from the car park boundary. This application must not be viewed in isolation. It is intrinsically linked to the main proposal for a high-turnover McDonald's outlet, which has already attracted over 400 local objections. Attempting to split these applications is a clear "salami-slicing" tactic to bypass cumulative impact assessments. I request that this application be refused on the following material planning grounds: 1. Historical Precedent of Environmental Harm There is a documented history of severe light nuisance associated with this specific commercial plot. Approximately 15 years ago, the Council's Environmental Health department was forced to formally intervene regarding high-intensity lighting at this site due to light trespass spilling directly into my home. The physical distance between this commercial site and the residential properties opposite remains entirely unchanged. Approving high-intensity lighting here will inevitably resurrect this statutory nuisance. 2. Severe Impact on Vulnerable Residents (Children, Elderly, and Disabled) Unlike a retail park or motorway services area, this site sits directly within a deeply sensitive residential neighbourhood. There are numerous bedrooms situated just 30 metres away from this car park. The occupants of these homes include young children, elderly residents, and disabled individuals who are highly vulnerable to sleep disruption. Under the Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010), the Council must actively protect vulnerable groups. Allowing
-----------	---

commercial-grade lighting to beam directly into bedrooms completely fails this duty.

3. Inappropriate Commercial Context

This site directly borders a dark, 14-acre public children's park and a residential zone. It is entirely inappropriate to install lighting infrastructure designed for high-brightness commercial zones. Under the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, this sensitive urban/park border should be strictly classified as Environmental Zone E2 (Low district brightness). Corporate floodlighting completely violates E2 thresholds for maximum light trespass.

4. Preparation for 'Creeping' Operational Hours

The applicant currently claims they intend to close at 10:30 PM to mirror the historic Beefeater operation. However, installing high-intensity, commercial-grade car park floodlighting strongly indicates infrastructure preparation for future, extended late-night or 24-hour operations. The physical capacity for late-night illumination must be restricted now via this application to prevent incremental, creeping harm to neighbours in the future.

5. Harm to Wildlife in the Bordering Park

Introducing intense, all-night illumination directly adjacent to a 14-acre public park will create a harsh "wall of light." This will disrupt the natural nocturnal habitat of local wildlife, including nesting birds and bats utilizing the park's tree canopy, directly conflicting with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirements to protect biodiversity.

Yours sincerely,

Kind regards