

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/03/2026 4:16 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] Wrotham Road Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	Statutory Duty: Equality Act 2010 & PSED The Council has a statutory Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) to ensure this development does not disproportionately harm residents with protected characteristics. My household includes individuals with disabilities and a family member with Asthma. Under the Human Rights Act (Article 8), we have a right to "quiet enjoyment" of our home. This proposal represents a direct threat to the medical stability of my family. Early morning deliveries and noise from plant equipment may impact sleep, lack of which is a known trigger for seizures and impacts overall health. Failure of "Agent of Change" (NPPF Para 187) & Residential Encroachment Under NPPF Paragraph 187, the applicant is the "Agent of Change." The legal burden of proof lies entirely with McDonald's to demonstrate that their new layout and intensified operations will not cause a Significant Observed Adverse Effect (SOAEL) on existing sensitive residential receptors. This application fails that test in the following ways: Gratuitous Encroachment: By moving the primary entrance 5 metres closer to residents, placing it directly opposite my front door, the applicant is needlessly encroaching on residential peace. This is a deliberate shift of high-intensity
-----------	---

commercial activity into a quiet residential frontage.

Incompatible "Flipping" of Site Orientation: For over 50 years, this site's active social and operational areas were concentrated at the rear, with the front serving as a passive, quiet buffer. The proposal to "flip" this orientation by placing a high-turnover outdoor patio just 30 metres from my home is a direct threat to the residential amenity of this street.

Uncontained Acoustic Impact: Introducing an uncontained social hub here will create a permanent "flashpoint" for noise and light pollution. Unlike an indoor dining area, an outdoor patio offers no acoustic shielding from social shouting, the constant scraping of furniture, and the "lingerer effect" of groups congregating into the evening.

Violation of Noise Baseline: The applicant's own noise report admits the area is "surprisingly quiet" at night. Introducing an uncontained commercial patio into this low-baseline environment is a fundamental violation of the Agent of Change principle and will result in a significant observed adverse effect on sleep and mental well-being.

Medical Triggers & Human Rights: For my household members living with health conditions, the unpredictable, loud noises and expected light spill from this patio may impact health. This proposal fundamentally compromises their health, safety, and our right to "quiet enjoyment" of our home under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.

Public Health & Policy Conflict (NPPF 96 & 97)

Gravesham is the 97th most deprived area nationally and 40.1% of Year 6 children are living with excess weight.

NPPF 2024 Mandate: Paragraph 97 creates an explicit presumption against fast-food outlets within walking distance of schools. This site sits on a primary "active travel" route for St George's School and is adjacent to Woodlands Park. Additionally Wrotham Road Primary School is just 0.4 miles from the site.

Approving a high-intensity takeaway hub here directly violates national health mandates designed to protect children in deprived areas.

Technical Failures: Air Quality & Extraction

Air Quality (NPPF 192): The lack of an Air Quality Assessment (AQA) is a major procedural failure. Given the site's history as an AQMA and the health impacts associated with pollutants on residents, including my son suffering with asthma, introducing a "food factory" and moped hub without an AQA is negligent.

Substandard Extraction: The applicant admits that discharging 1m above the ridge height is "not achievable." This fails DEFRA guidance. Terminating at the eaves may cause "building down-wash," forcing grease fumes and noise into residential windows, creating a Statutory Nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Highways, Safety, and Accessibility

Over-development: Providing only 7 parking spaces for a high-intensity operation is grossly inadequate.

Obstruction: Inevitable overspill will force vehicles onto pavements. This creates a physical barrier for residents with mobility issues (including neighbors with mobility issues) and presents a safety hazard for children walking to St George's CE School (within walking distance of the preposed development).

Emergency Access: Increased congestion poses a severe risk to "Blue Light" access for the nearby Almshouses, where most residents are over 65 years of age and many rely on wheelchairs and scooters.

Desecration of a Non-Designated Heritage Asset

The 1896 design of "The Woodlands" is a local landmark. Replacing its historic

character with generic industrial grey cladding is "architectural mutilation." Per Policy CS19, development must respond to local character; this corporate aesthetic is entirely discordant with the residential grain of the area, it's not in keeping with the street-scope.

I'm concerned that woodlands park, 14 acres of green space for all to enjoy, and particularly the children's playground behind the hotel, will be full of litter, foul smells, fumes and vermin, ruining enjoyment for all.

We give up our time to be street champions and regularly litter pick at park and surrounding streets. We are already picking up McDonald's branded packaging, which points to the fact that there is already a McDonald's outlet nearby in the town centre. A second site within one mile likely leads to this development being unnecessary and excessive.

I note The inclusion of a totem pole on the layout plans must not be taken as tacit approval; it remains a contentious and harmful feature that requires its own rigorous public consultation.

The Council is bound by its Equality Duty and the 2024 NPPF health mandates. This is an intrusive industrialisation of a residential frontage that will actively harm the health and safety of its most vulnerable residents. I urge the Council to refuse the application.

Kind regards