



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/25/3366807

76 London Road, Stone, Dartford, Kent DA2 6AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Lisa Robinson against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
- The application ref is DA/25/00205/FUL.
- The development proposed is a dropped kerb outside of 76 London Road, Stone, Dartford Kent DA2 6AN for access to a drive located at the front of the property.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The site is occupied by a terraced dwelling with a shallow front garden which is raised up from the pavement. The front garden is currently enclosed by a low brick wall and single pedestrian gate. The site is situated within a residential area comprised of semi-detached and terraced dwellings, with a petrol filling station on the opposite side of the road and a parade of shops and services close by.
5. London Road (A226) is a classified road which passes through Stone, connecting the settlements of Dartford and Greenhithe. The appeal site is situated in close proximity to a signalised junction and there are double yellow lines on the junction with Invicta Road and London Road which terminate to the front of neighbouring property, no.78. There are double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road and white diagonal stripes through the centre of the carriageway. Parallel parking is available on the street, and there are no restrictions on parking in front of the site and along the road in front of the parade of shops and services.
6. Policy M16 of the Dartford Local Plan (April 2024) permits the conversion of front gardens for car parking only where the garden is capable of accommodating a parking space in accordance with the parking bay minimum standards set out in the Dartford Borough Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2012), plus space for soft landscaping, and with unobstructed pedestrian access to the dwelling.

7. The proposed parking space would measure 5.4m by 3.4m and would be parallel to the road. The SPD refers to a minimum length of 6.0m for a longitudinal parking bay, to allow manoeuvring and to avoid the potential for a vehicle to overhang the footway and create an obstruction for pedestrians.
8. The appellant suggests their vehicle can be parked without an overhang into the footway, and that if it were a longer vehicle, it could be parked at an angle thus avoiding an overhang of the pavement. However, whilst I recognise the appellants' current vehicles could potentially fit into the space, I must have regard to the future occupants of the dwelling and the possibility of protrusion into the footway as a result of what would be a permanent development.
9. The proposed parking of a vehicle at an angle would be a difficult proposition given the position of the boundary treatment for neighbouring properties and would result in the need for more complex and multiple manoeuvres across and on the pavement. This would result in the introduction of conflict with pedestrians and hinder safe movement along the pavement. Parked vehicles overhanging the footway would also reduce the available space for pedestrians, with particular safety implications for more vulnerable pedestrian groups including children and wheelchair users.
10. Given the dimensions of the frontage, it would not be possible for vehicles to turn, enter and exit the site in a forward gear to mitigate the potential for conflict with pedestrians and other road users. This would leave motorists needing potentially to perform a more hazardous reversing manoeuvre in either arrival or departure. The resultant need for such a manoeuvre over the pavement would severely restrict the visibility of any driver to oncoming traffic approaching the access and junction. This would be exacerbated by the presence of any parked vehicles on the street adjacent to the proposed access. The proposal would therefore have the potential to result in a significant interference with the traffic flow on the main road (which is a busy classified A-road) that would be unsatisfactory in terms of highway safety.
11. Overall, I find that the proposal for a dropped kerb to facilitate off street parking at the appeal site with insufficient depth to accommodate vehicles at right angles to the road would introduce conflict with pedestrians and road users, causing significant harm to the effective use and safety of the highway. This would conflict with policy M16 of the Dartford Local Plan (2024) and the Parking Standards SPD (2012).

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to other dwellings with dropped kerbs and driveways in their front gardens in Invicta Road and also specifically at no.70 London Road.
13. I am mindful that Invicta Road varies significantly in character from London Road, in that it is a quieter residential road where many of the properties have off street car parking. With regards no.70 London Road and indeed other properties in the vicinity, I have not been presented with any details regarding the acquisition of planning permission and, if so, when such permission was granted. I also noted that at the time of the appeal site visit, a vehicle was parked at this property, overhanging the site and projecting into the footway. I do not therefore attach any significant weight to the cited examples in support of the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR