
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/W/25/3358631

24 Browning Road, Dartford, Kent DA1 5ET

- 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 Ms Maria Perry against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is DA/24/00478/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of an attached two bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an attached two bedroom house at 24 Browning Road, Dartford, Kent DA1 5ET in accordance with the terms of the application ref. DA/24/00478/FUL, 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: Location plan, proposed site plan, A03, A04, 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.
 - 4) The dwelling hereby approved shall be designed such that internal water usage shall not exceed 110 litres per person per day.
 - 5) Prior to the first occupation of the new dwelling, a scheme of hard and soft landscaping to include proposed boundary treatments, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and maintained thereafter. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of soft landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Preliminary matter

2. My attention is drawn to a permission granted by the Council for a two-storey side extension to the appeal property (ref. 21/01674/FUL), and I understand that this has been implemented. If appropriate, I shall have regard to such background when considering the merits of this scheme.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the the effect of the proposal on a) parking provision; and b) the living conditions of future occupiers of the dwelling with regard to internal accommodation.

Reasons

Parking provision

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached, two-storey house on Browning Road, a cul-de-sac in a largely residential neighbourhood. The property is modestly positioned at the end of the at the end of the close. Other buildings in the street scene comprise semi-detached and terraced dwellings, many with frontages that facilitate off-street parking, and small blocks of flats.
5. At my site visit I saw that Browning Road is a quiet, domestic highway with a prevalence of on-street parking along the western side due to the presence of driveways opposite. At the time of my visit, on a Thursday morning, on-street spaces were available close to the appeal site on the carriageway outside. Whilst I accept this is only a snap shot in time, it is an indication that on-street parking is not difficult to achieve at certain times of day. I also note that there are no restrictions by way of permits, time limits or a pay and display regime.
6. Therefore I find that the neighbourhood is not susceptible to undue parking stress; in my view there is sufficient on-street capacity to accommodate the demand arising from the development, without significantly worsening the existing parking situation close to the site and in surrounding streets. My reasoning is further supported by the site's accessible location in close proximity to a local parade of shops, and Dartford town centre with its public services and transport modes.
7. I therefore conclude that there would be no adverse harm with regard to parking provision. The scheme would comply with Policies M15 and M16 of the Dartford Local Plan April 2024 (LP) in relation to relevant standards and general environmental protection.

Living conditions

8. The Council states that the proposal would not fully comply with the internal dimensions referred to in the Government's 'technical housing standards – nationally described space standard March 2015' (THS). In particular, the overall floorspace of the unit would be approximately 3.4 square metres below the standard. The Appellant contests this, stating that the development would meet the requirement.
9. The ground floor plan shows that the lounge and kitchen/diner are relatively large with direct access to the rear garden area. There is unimpeded access to the bedrooms on the first floor via the stairs, and an overall layout that facilitates circulation with rooms of a useable size and shape,
10. Taken in the round, even if there would be a slight shortfall in overall space, I am satisfied that any deficit would be marginal. All the habitable rooms are shown with southerly-facing windows; overall to my mind each would provide an adequate standard of accommodation.
11. Accordingly, the scheme would not have a material effect upon the living conditions of future occupiers of the dwelling with regard to internal accommodation. It would be compatible with Policies S5 and M10 of the LP, which seek to ensure development does not materially harm amenity.

Conditions

12. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those used on the existing building would provide for a satisfactory appearance.
13. Landscaping works and boundary treatments would ensure visual enhancements to the development. A condition to limit water consumption rates for the dwelling would be necessary to protect the environment and ensure the efficient use of resources. Given my conclusions on the parking issue I consider that a condition requiring provision on-site is neither necessary nor reasonable.

Conclusion

14. Having regard to the above and all other issues, the appeal is successful.

C Hall

INSPECTOR