

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 4:46 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	34 The Street Cobham Gravesend Kent DA12 3BZ
Proposal:	Removal of internal raised ground floor and first floor over garage, internal replanning and conversion of garage to living room, plus new detached garage to front and new front boundary wall.
Case Officer:	Mrs Katherine Parkin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Halfpence Lane Cobham

Comments Details

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

Reasons for comment:

Comments:

The design of the proposed wall along the street will both narrow the opening currently used for access to the village shop, but also will create a sightline issue for any vehicle ingress or egress from the parking area.

By reducing the opening width from the current site plan 6600mm to 5000mm, even with the splayed bays, will create a solid wall, rather than the see through condition of the current fence.

Additionally the splayed bays (apparently added for roadway entrance sightline requirements) are removing the ability to have 2 of the parking spots needed for the visitors of the shop and therefore overall parking is reduced by several spots in the existing parking - this is not clear to the planning committee in the architectural plans as the current parking is not delineated with painted lines, however measurement and historical usage precedence show that there are more parking spots currently in use and available than this proposal is demonstrating.

The solid wall does not mask the existing visual impact of this post war modern bungalow that is already not in keeping with the architectural style of all adjacent buildings which are much older and are the basis for the area being designated a conservation area.

The proposed flint stone design of the wall is somewhat in keeping with a couple of nearby but not adjacent buildings, but it is not high enough to mask the bungalow and if it is high enough to mask the bungalow it creates a lethal height that would be greater than the 1.05m limit for vehicular in & egress as visibility splays will be reduced to near zero, requiring a vehicle to already be over the

pavement area and in the roadway before a driver can see any pedestrians or oncoming traffic.

The design of this wall and exit width appears to not support the X & Y dimensional guidelines as detailed in Volume 6 Section 2 Part 6 TD 42/95 Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions, especially for traffic coming from the school side of the property (LHS if a vehicle is exiting the property). Additionally the solid wall does not permit smaller children to be seen as they walk along the pavement as there is no visual transmission through the wall, unlike the fence today. Given that a children's primary school is located 65m away from this entrance and is a highly travelled pedestrian route for children, walkers and elderly residents to get to & from the church & shop, this solid wall presents a clear reduction in pedestrian safety & constitutes a documentable hazard to life for small children should it be approved.

In short, this proposed design, despite being an attempt to keep in character with certain design features of the surrounding environment, is actually a reduction in safety, an increase in hazardous conditions and is not appropriate for the location or adjacent public use needs and I object to it proceeding as drafted.

Kind regards