

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 07/05/2025 3:14 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	The Peacock Public House 78 Peacock Street Gravesend Kent DA12 1EG
Proposal:	Change of use from Public House (sui generis) to Place of Worship or Religious Instruction (Class F1) at ground floor.
Case Officer:	Mrs Lisa Fisher

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Meopham Meopham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments: I write to object to the above planning application on planning, legal, environmental and cultural grounds. The proposal to convert a public house to a place of worship is inappropriate for this site and would create significant harm to the local area.

1. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

Peacock Street is narrow and already overburdened with parked vehicles. The proposed use would attract significantly more traffic and visitors, especially during religious gatherings. No suitable off-street parking is provided, which will increase the risk of obstructive and dangerous parking, blocking access for emergency services and endangering pedestrians. This conflicts with:

- NPPF Paragraph 111, which states that development should only be approved where safe access is available for all users.
- Core Strategy Policy CS11, requiring development to manage traffic impacts and ensure adequate parking.
- Highways Act 1980, Section 130, which protects public rights of safe highway access.

2. Noise and Loss of Residential Amenity

The proposed use could generate amplified sound (such as calls to prayer or public address systems), causing noise pollution that would disturb nearby residents, particularly during early mornings or evenings. This is contrary to:

- NPPF Paragraph 185, which states that development should mitigate noise impacts on health and quality of life.
- Environmental Protection Act 1990, which enables councils to act against statutory noise nuisance.
- Core Strategy Policy CS19, which seeks to protect residential amenity.

3. Incompatibility with Local Character

The area is residential in nature and already includes a major religious facility, the Sikh Gurdwara, nearby. Introducing another large-scale religious institution could disrupt the area's established cultural and social balance. This change of use would not reflect the built form or identity of the neighbourhood, contrary to:

- NPPF Paragraph 130, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.
- Core Strategy Policy CS01, which supports maintaining the distinct identity of communities.

4. Loss of a Community Asset

The Peacock Public House, though closed, remains a recognised community asset. Pubs serve as neutral, inclusive gathering spaces. Its permanent loss to a single-use religious facility would reduce opportunities for community cohesion. This is inconsistent with:

- NPPF Paragraph 93, which seeks to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities.
- Core Strategy Policy CS10, which supports retention of community infrastructure.
- Localism Act 2011, which empowers communities to protect community assets, listed or otherwise.

5. Overdevelopment and Precedent

Approving this application risks setting a precedent for other unsuitable conversions in residential areas, leading to overdevelopment and pressure on local infrastructure. This conflicts with:

- Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 39, requiring sustainable development.
- NPPF Paragraph 124, encouraging development suited to the area's role and character.

6. Inadequate Community Consultation

There is no evidence of proper local engagement. For a change with such social and environmental implications, wide public consultation is essential. This falls short of:

- NPPF Paragraph 39, which promotes early engagement with communities.
- The council's own Statement of Community Involvement.

Conclusion

This proposal does not meet national or local planning policy and would negatively impact the local environment, culture and community wellbeing. I therefore urge the Council to refuse Planning Application 20250369.

Kind regards