



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

**by L Reid BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: 6001704

#### 14 Old Road West, Gravesend, Kent DA11 0LJ

- 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 Mr & Mrs Dalton against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 20250641.
  - The development proposed is demolition of front wall, creation of vehicle access and driveway to front with installation of a dropped kerb and associated works to pathway.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of front wall, creation of vehicle access and driveway to front with installation of a dropped kerb and associated works to pathway at 14 Old Road West, Gravesend, Kent DA11 0LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20250641, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 01 – LOCATION PLAN, 04 - PLAN, ELEVATION & SECTIONS AS PROPOSED.
  - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 4) Within 6 months of the date of this decision, soft landscaping shall be planted as shown on drawing no. 04 - PLAN, ELEVATION & SECTION AS PROPOSED. If it should die, be damaged, removed or seriously diseased, it shall be replaced by those of a similar size and species to those originally planted.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the planning application form, as the main parties have not provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed.
3. I am also the appointed Inspector for a nearby appeal concerning a similar proposal at 16 Old Road West<sup>1</sup>. Given the proximity of the respective sites and the similarity of the issues involved, the decisions will inevitably appear similar. However, each proposal has been assessed on its individual planning merits.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/25/3375413

## Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
  - The character and appearance of the area; and,
  - Highway safety.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house. It is one of several pairs that sit above road level, sharing features such as stepped access and brick pillars that contribute to their distinctive character. The frontage includes grass, a low wall, and a small, hard-surfaced area. It is bound on one side by a staggered brick wall with railings, and a flint wall on the other side.
6. The proposal seeks to create a driveway within the frontage with vehicle access from the road. To facilitate this, the existing grass would be replaced with hardsurfacing and the low wall removed. A new wall would be erected at the rear of the parking area.
7. At my site visit, I saw that the frontages of the houses are varied; some retain their front gardens behind walls or hedges, whereas others have removed their front gardens and replaced them with hardsurfacing. Examples are evident along the road at Nos. 12 and 28 which I am unaware of their planning status, and No. 20 which was allowed at appeal in 2024 (the 2024 appeal)<sup>2</sup>. As such, there is no clear consistency in the extent of soft landscaping across the frontages.
8. Whilst the Council has highlighted concerns over the subsequent effect on the street scene following the implementation of the approved development at No. 20, hardsurfaced frontages clearly form part of the character and appearance of these houses. Furthermore, along the road, there are numerous examples of other hardsurfaced frontages with very little landscaping that are not too dissimilar to that proposed in this case.
9. The existing grass provides some greenery to the road, however, its extent is limited, and it does not make a meaningful contribution to the landscape character of what is essentially a suburban road, where hardsurfaced frontages are common.
10. Although the front garden would be replaced with hardsurfacing, this would not harm the visual relationship with the neighbouring houses, given the varied soft landscaping along the road and the replanting of some soft landscaping. Key characteristic features, namely the flint wall, brick pillars and the stepped access to the front door, would be retained, ensuring the house continues to harmonise with its neighbours. Keeping the stepped access would also ensure that the upward slope from the road to the house remains clearly visible, despite the changes to the land levels within the frontage to accommodate the proposal.
11. The size of the parking area would exceed the 'Parking Bay Size for Cars' set out in the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG 4 2006. However, these parking sizes are referred to as 'preferred sizes' and are not

---

<sup>2</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/24/3349193 – Appendix 5

suggested to be a maximum. The size of the driveway would be proportionate to the house, and there would be some landscaping along one of the side boundaries. The proposal would not be out of keeping in this local context and would be sympathetic to its surroundings, which is the general thrust of the guidance contained within the Householder Extensions/Alterations Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2021 and the Front Driveway Design Guidance 2023.

12. I have considered the previous appeal decisions cited by the Council. In the 2011 appeal decision at No. 12 Old Road West<sup>3</sup>, the Inspector highlighted the relative continuity of the frontages and considered this to contribute significantly to the attractiveness of the area. This continuity was not evident on my site visit, which is also largely consistent with the observations of the Inspector in the 2024 appeal. The 2011 decision therefore carries limited weight because of its age and the different character identified at the time of decision making.
13. The 1985 appeal decision<sup>4</sup> relates to development at Nos. 12 - 16 Old Road West and the 2010 appeal decision<sup>5</sup> relates to development at Nos. 12 and 14 Old Road West. Although copies of the plans proposed in these cases have not been provided, both appear to propose driveways extending across multiple frontages, unlike this appeal, which relates solely to the appeal site and would create a smaller driveway with some soft landscaping. Those decisions are therefore not directly comparable and carry limited weight. In any event, the appeal site would retain its side boundary walls, helping to break up the frontage and preventing a continuous stretch of hardsurfacing.
14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies CS12 and CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 (the Core Strategy). These policies, amongst other things, require new development to integrate well with the surrounding local area and protect the landscape character.

### *Highway safety*

15. The flint wall and the presence of the brick pier on the other side would limit visibility to some degree when reversing from the driveway. However, regardless of vehicle height, such manoeuvres are typically carried out at low speeds, allowing drivers time to see and respond to pedestrians or other vehicles. The driveway and dropped kerb would also alert pedestrians to the possibility of vehicle movements, encouraging appropriate caution. The proposal would therefore not pose a danger to pedestrians.
16. The crash map data supplied by the Council<sup>6</sup> appears to show collisions mainly concentrated around the traffic light junction, and further along the road where it meets Elmfield Close. Several nearby houses have similar driveways that are likely to be entered or exited by reversing. There is nothing substantial before me to indicate that this has resulted in incidents involving pedestrians and vehicles, and that the proposal would be likely to give rise to further danger.

<sup>3</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/D/11/2144419 – Appendix 6

<sup>4</sup> Appeal Ref: T/APP/K2230/A/84/24730/P7 – Appendix 2

<sup>5</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/A/09/2115782 – Appendix 4

<sup>6</sup> Appendix 7

17. Although the road is busy for both traffic and pedestrians, the nearby traffic lights interrupt traffic flow. This section of the road is straight and would provide clear views in both directions when reversing into or out of the driveway. The wide footpath would also allow a vehicle to pause safely while checking the road, even when reversing. The proposal would therefore not present a significant highway hazard.
18. Vehicles travelling along the road may need to pause briefly to allow vehicles to enter and exit the driveway, however, any disruption would be momentary and would not significantly harm the free-flow of the traffic along the road. Sun glare may reduce visibility at times, but this is a general driving condition rather than a site-specific risk, and drivers are expected to respond accordingly. The proposal therefore does not present an unusual or unacceptable hazard.
19. The previous Inspectors in the 1981 decision<sup>7</sup>, 1985 decision, 2002 decision<sup>8</sup>, 2010 decision and 2011 decision all concluded similar works at the appeal site and its neighbours would cause harm to highway safety and the flow of traffic. However, some of the cited decisions involved driveways spanning several houses, making their highway impacts not directly comparable with the current proposal. Given their age and these differences, these decisions carry limited weight. There is also an element of subjectivity when considering such highway matters, and each case must be determined on its own merits. I have therefore reached my own findings.
20. For these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety. Accordingly, it complies with Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy and Policy T5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review Saved and Deleted Policies Version 2014. These policies, amongst other things, require new development to mitigate their impact on the highway and for no danger to arise.

### **Other Matters**

21. Previous approvals do not in themselves create a precedent. Even if similar applications have been submitted, this does not alter the need to assess proposals against adopted policy. The Council's assertions that there would be a cumulative impact on the area that will reduce sections of soft landscaping are not supported by any robust evidence. I have therefore not considered this further.
22. The reasons for refusal list conflict with the Design for Gravesham Design Code Supplementary Planning Document 2024. However, it is not clear which parts of the Design Code the proposal is in conflict with.

### **Conditions**

23. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and have considered these in light of the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
24. The statutory implementation condition [1], along with a condition listing the approved plans are necessary to provide certainty [2]. In the interests of character and appearance, it is necessary to require the materials to match the existing ones

---

<sup>7</sup> Appeal Ref: T/APP/5277/A/81/09149/09 – Appendix 1

<sup>8</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/A/01/1077158 – Appendix 3

- [3] and to require the soft landscaping shown on the proposed plans to be planted [4].
25. The Council's suggested condition to require the driveway to be constructed of porous materials and/or incorporate appropriate drainage is not necessary, as this is shown on the proposed plans.
26. The Council has requested that permitted development rights be removed to restrict the driveway from extending. However, the Framework and the PPG, make clear that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so, which has not been provided. The suggested conditions limiting boundary heights and preventing gates would also require permitted development rights to be removed. Whilst I acknowledge the Council's highway safety concerns, I do not find the removal of these rights justified, given the site circumstances.
27. Requiring the applicant to provide a vehicle crossover to the requirements of Kent County Council Highways and Transportation is a matter regulated under separate highways legislation and can therefore not be controlled by a planning condition.

### **Conclusion**

28. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*L Reid*

INSPECTOR