



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/21/3283481

33 Henley Deane, Northfleet, Gravesend, DA11 8SU

- 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 David Acland against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20210611, dated 10 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Convert existing garage into a living room, remove garage door and dig footings and fit new window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to convert existing garage into a living room, remove garage door and dig footings and fit new window at 33 Henley Deane, Northfleet, Gravesend, DA11 8SU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20210611, dated 10 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (all unnumbered): OS Plan; Part Block Plan; Proposed Front Elevation, Proposed Side Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation; Proposed Ground Floor Plan.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular reference to parking provision.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling with an integral garage and driveway parking for one vehicle. The Council confirm that the dwelling is a four-bed property, having been extended under LPA ref. GR/20050495. Condition 4 of that planning permission controls the use of the garage for the 'accommodation of a private car'.
4. The proposal is to convert the garage to living accommodation, with associated changes to the fenestration of the dwelling, which would result in the dwelling having one parking space that complies with the Council's standard dimensions

for parking spaces as set out in the SPG 'Kent Vehicle Parking Standards' (2006) ('the SPG') and Kent County Council Vehicle Crossing Guidance (2018).

5. Policy P3 of the Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994) (LP) states that the Borough Council will expect development to make provision for vehicle parking, in accordance with the Kent County Council Vehicle Parking Standards, as interpreted by Gravesham Borough Council, unless justified as an exception. The Council confirm that the SPG, as updated by the Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3 (2008), states that as a guide, two parking spaces should be provided in relation to dwellings with four bedrooms. I note that the Interim Guidance Note also states that the two spaces should ideally be able to be accessed independently which is not currently the case as the driveway is to the front of the existing garage.
6. The appeal property is accessed from Glendale Road, which is a short section of road leading from Mulberry Road. Glendale Road terminates at the appeal site in a large rectangular tarmac area that provides access to the dwellings that front it and to several garages in the rear gardens of properties that back onto it.
7. At my site visit I did not see any restrictions on parking on the highway in the vicinity of the appeal site. I noted that the first section of Glendale Road was heavily parked, with vehicles parked on the road, parallel to the highway. However, there did not appear to be much on-street parking within the tarmac area to the front of the appeal property that could indicate a high degree of evidence of a clear parking problem. The cars that were in the tarmac area were parked perpendicular to the adjacent footways and there was plenty of available space for additional parking which, in my view, would have no serious implications for highway safety as there is no through traffic at this point.
8. The appellant has also referred to a parking survey which was carried out along this section of Glendale Road on three days between the hours of 13.00 - 16.00hrs and 18.00 - 20.00hrs. The appellant states that the survey revealed a parking capacity of between 4 to 7 spaces on average. Whilst I have not been sent a copy of the survey or had sight of the full survey data and can therefore only attach it limited weight, its results would tend to support my own observations at my site visit.
9. The Council and the appellant accept that the driveway to the front of the garage proposed to be converted is not of sufficient depth to accommodate two vehicles without overhanging the adjacent footway. Given the likely availability of parking within the tarmac area adjacent to the dwelling, in my view the occupiers of the dwelling would be unlikely to choose to park in tandem and overhang the footway. However, even if this was to occur, I am not persuaded that it would result in an unacceptable risk of serious inconvenience and danger to drivers and pedestrians given that the road terminates at this point, with no through traffic or heavy pedestrian movements.
10. In the absence of clear evidence of a local parking issue I do not consider that the proposal would result in a shortage of parking provision off road in this location. Nor has it been demonstrated that even if there was a deficiency, it would be bound to have a harmful effect on highway safety. This leads me to conclude that the proposal would not be likely to have a harmful effect on highway safety, with particular reference to parking provision. The proposal

would not conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy P3 of the LP which seeks to ensure development is served by adequate parking.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard 3 year implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for clarity.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR