

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/05/2025 1:55 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] Gravesend

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I object to this application for the following reasons: 1. Traffic and Parking Concerns: Similar places of worship in the area (e.g., the one in Westcourt) already cause significant traffic disruption and parking issues, especially during busy times like Fridays. Roads become congested, residents are often blocked in, and emergency access could be compromised. Introducing another such venue would likely cause further traffic chaos in an already strained area. 2. Overconcentration: Our town already has a high number of places of worship serving various communities. There is no demonstrated need for additional facilities of this kind, and further saturation could be detrimental to the balance of community infrastructure. 3. Loss of Community Amenity: Public houses are historically valued community spaces offering a neutral social environment. Converting this space into a single-use religious facility would limit its accessibility and use for the wider community. Once lost, such neutral venues are hard to replace. 4. Noise and Disturbance: These venues often operate at unsociable hours and can generate large gatherings. There is a risk of increased noise levels, especially during early mornings, late evenings, and key religious observance days. 5. Change in Character of the Area: A shift from a social venue to a religious one could alter the character and dynamics of the local neighbourhood, potentially reducing social cohesion if the facility primarily serves one group.
-----------	--

In summary, I believe this change of use would not be in the best interest of the local community and would cause more disruption than benefit.

Kind regards