
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2026

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T2215/D/25/3376415

65A Main Road, Longfield, Kent DA3 7QT

- 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 Miss Shreevana Gurung against the decision of Dartford Borough Council.
 - The application reference is DA/25/00477/FUL.
 - The development proposed is provision of a dropped kerb onto B260 to provide off-street parking at the front of the property with alterations to gradient of front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of conciseness, I have taken the proposal description from the decision notice and appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling, which is set back from the highway. The appeal property is on higher land than the highway. It has a terraced front garden, with a central path that leads to the front door. While the evidence before me shows that the appeal property previously had a verdant front garden, I observed on my site visit that it now has a gravel finish.
5. While there are a variety of uses in the locality, residential is the predominant use. The dwellings in the area typically range from one to three storeys in height and are of a mix of designs. Properties are generally set back from the highway, behind front gardens and/or parking areas.
6. The proposal seeks to provide off-road parking for the dwelling. To facilitate this a dropped kerb is proposed and excavation works would be required to address the change in levels. The proposal seeks to provide a flat area of permeable paving directly to the front of the property. The paving would then slope at a gradient of 1 to 6 down towards the highway. New fencing is also proposed. While the appellant advises that the first panel would be 0.5 metres high, there is limited details before me of the height of the rest of the fencing or its siting and design.

7. The expanse of paving and change in levels would materially alter the appearance of the front garden, resulting in a harsh and urbanised environment. Given the size of the front garden and the proposed gradient of the driveway, it would be highly visible from the public realm. While the front garden no longer provides a green or verdant contribution to the street scene, the existing terracing provides some visual relief and interest to the front garden, compared to the appeal scheme. The proposal would detract from the character of the host property and would diminish the visual relief currently provided by the terraced front garden. Accordingly, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to No. 56 Main Road (No. 56), which has a gravel driveway to the front of the property. While full details of the circumstances of this other driveway are not before me, No. 56 has a relatively level front garden and therefore its driveway has a materially different visual impact to the appeal scheme before me. Accordingly, I give it limited weight in my decision.
9. I observed other properties along Main Road that have paved front gardens (including Nos. 17 and 19). Where paving is present the driveways are typically not as steep as the appeal scheme. Nonetheless, full details of the circumstances of the other cases are not before me. Furthermore, I find that the examples in the locality where front gardens are entirely paved, demonstrates the harm that such schemes can cause to the character and appearance of the area. I do not find that they provide justification for the harm that I have identified above.
10. The appellant argues that the proposal would make more efficient use of the front garden. However, the site is already in use as a domestic front garden and I do not find that the provision of off-road parking for the occupants outweighs the harm that I have identified above.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policies M1 and M10 of The Dartford Plan adopted April 2024. These policies among other things require that developments respond to, reinforce and enhance positive aspects of the locality and do not erode local character.

Other Matters

12. While no objections were raised to the proposal by the local highway authority, public rights of way officer and Parish Council, this does not alter my findings set out above.
13. The appellant advises that they would be happy to accept conditions relating to landscaping modifications. However, I have determined the appeal based on the plans before me, which show hardstanding to the entire front garden.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework that would outweigh this conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR