
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/16/3156162
40 St Vincents Avenue, Dartford DA1 5DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Saad Saimon against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DA/16/00452/FUL, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is 'double storey side extension, front porch with pitch roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension, front porch with pitch roof at 40 St Vincents Avenue, Dartford DA1 5DA in accordance with the terms of the application DA/16/00452/FUL, dated 7 March 2016, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, A01, A02, A03, A04 and A05.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon local parking provision and highway safety.

Reasons

3. The Council's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document July 2012 (SPD) requires two parking spaces for homes of four bedrooms or more. The requirement for three bedroom homes is 1.5 spaces. The SPD states that an alternative level of parking provision may be considered on a site by site basis.
 4. The existing dwelling does not have any existing on site provision. Whilst the Council says that it does not consider it would be possible to provide parking within the curtilage, I noted at my site visit that a crossover has been constructed though no associated on-site parking has yet been provided. This
-

does though indicate that the appellant is actively seeking to provide parking on the site.

5. Notwithstanding the construction of the crossover, the appellant argues that there is sufficient space available on the road for more than two cars. At the time of my site visit (late morning) there were some parking spaces available near to the dwelling, although these were fairly limited in number and I expect that parking pressure increases in the evenings.
6. Nevertheless, I have no evidence before me that the parking pressures in the area are so significant that this proposal, producing an additional demand of no more than one parking space, would result in any severe implications upon local parking provision or highway safety. Though St Vincent's road appears to be a busy one, the additional traffic movements arising in this case would be minimal and there is no indication that the proposal would lead to an increased risk of either accidents or inconvenience for highway users.
7. I therefore find no conflict with the relevant parking and highway safety aims of policies B1 and T23 of the Dartford Local Plan 1995 or policies DP3 and DP4 of the Dartford Development Policies Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Document. The weight of the later policies is limited as the emerging plan is still under examination.
8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR