



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2026

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002328

Maples, 2B Dobson Road, Gravesend, Kent DA12 5TE

- 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 Jack Hussein against the decision of Gravesham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20250544.
 - The development proposed is erection of new fencing facing on to Stacey Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of new fencing facing on to Stacey Close at Maples, 2B Dobson Road, Gravesend, Kent DA12 5TE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20250544, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing fence.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, MPD-A-001 Proposed Fence elevation, 2b, Dobson Road, Gravesend, DA12 5TE Block Plan - Existing Fence Line.; 2b, Dobson Road, Gravesend, DA12 5TE Block Plan - Proposed Fence Line.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the appeal form and decision notice as this succinctly and clearly describes the development proposed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and highway safety

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. In the vicinity of the appeal site, properties on corner plots generally have low level boundary treatment to their front gardens. To the side and rear of these houses there is high level boundary treatment up to the pavement edge enclosing the side/rear gardens. There is also a large garage to the corner at 361 Valley Drive.

Overall, the pattern of development in this area includes an open appearance to the front of corner plots and a more enclosed character to the side and rear parts.

5. Maples is on a corner plot and there is an existing 1.8m high close boarded fence to its side and rear set back a minimum of approximately 2.8m from the pavement. To the front of the house is hardstanding and an open grass verge. To the side and rear along Stacey Close between the existing fence and the road is a grass verge. Due to the incline along Dobson Road, the verge is sloped and the fence is at a higher level than Stacey Close, which is narrower than others nearby.
6. The appeal scheme proposes a fence sited closer to the road than the existing which would be between 3.7m-1m from the pavement edge. It would be around part of the open verge. The proposed development would be of similar materials, height and appearance as the existing fence.
7. The proposed fence would not extend forward to Dobson Road from the existing boundary. It would enclose the side and rear garden only and would retain the verge and hardstanding to Dobson Road in front of the house, which would remain as open land. This layout is in common with other corner plots in the area and would be appropriately spacious. The topography of the land means that the fence would be at a high level relative to the adjoining street. It is also a solid close board design. This is similar to the existing fence and as such would not result in detriment to character and appearance in these regards. The appeal site would be more enclosed. However, the retention of the open frontage along with part of the side verge would retain appropriate spaciousness in keeping with the pattern of development in the area.
8. Whilst planting could soften the appearance of the fence, given these findings that its appearance is acceptable, it is not necessary in this case and therefore should not be secured by condition.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be in accordance with Policy CS19 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) (CS) which sets criteria to achieve visually attractive development including that it makes a positive contribution to the street scene, quality of the public realm and character of the area.

Highway Safety

10. The rear part of the fence would extend along the boundary with 1D Stacey Close, alongside its driveway, which appears to be used for two cars to park but with no space for turning. This is in common with the other properties along Stacey Close many of which have off street parking, but with no space for on-site turning. The SPG4- Kent Vehicle Parking Standards (2006) requires that access to car parks requires adequate sight lines. The proposed development would result in one of the car parking spaces at 1D Stacey Close falling below the pedestrian visibility splay in one direction. Visibility from the second space would not be harmfully affected and the first space would achieve suitable vehicular visibility to the kerb edge, and suitable pedestrian visibility in the other direction.
11. Stacey Close is a short, narrow cul de sac and road users would be accessing the properties only. Pedestrian and traffic flows are therefore likely to be low and at slow speeds. Furthermore, given the arrangement of other off street parking along

the road it appears that it is common that vehicles reverse across the pavement with associated limitations to visibility. Consequently, pedestrians and drivers would be alert to vehicles crossing the pavement in this area and the crashmap details provided show no accidents on this road over a 5 year period.

12. Whilst the development would not achieve pedestrian visibility standards in one direction, given the arrangement of the neighbouring parking spaces, it would not be unexpected for road users in this location who would therefore be cautious in their movements. As such, in these site specific circumstances, there would not be an unacceptable effect on the operation of the highway or highway safety in this case. Consequently, a condition limiting the height of the fence would not be necessary.
13. Therefore, the proposed development would not be harmful to highway safety. As such it would be in accordance with policies CS11 and CS19 of the CS and saved Policy T5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review Saved and Deleted Policies version (2014). Together these require no intensification of existing accesses unless no danger would arise and a properly formed access can be created, that development mitigate its impact on the highway network and its layout is safe.

Conditions

14. The standard implementation condition is attached and in the interests of certainty a condition to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition requiring that the materials match those of the existing fence is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, however for clarity I have not included reference to materials to match the existing building.

Conclusion

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

H Miles

INSPECTOR