
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3359061

56 Parkhill Road, Bexley, DA5 1HY

- 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 A Al-Abdullah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/02606.
 - The development proposed is the retention and completion of a two storey front extension and conversion of garage into habitable space.
-

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is located within a residential area and the wider street scene is characterised by a mix of flats, detached and semi-detached dwellings which vary in scale, appearance and design.
5. The appeal property sits towards the middle of a row of nine detached dwellings that are set back from the highway with spacious driveways to the front. Due to the positioning of the dwellings, there is a reasonably distinct building line, however every dwelling within the row has a design feature that protrudes forward of the principal elevation such as a garage, porch or front gable extension. Whilst there is some variety in terms of external materials and in respect of certain design features, together the row of dwellings within which the appeal building sits, contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The appeal proposal would add an additional storey above the existing single-storey extension to provide additional living accommodation. It would also adjoin and merge with the existing two-storey extension. This would result in the full principal elevation of the property being extended forward of the original dwelling.

7. Although neighbouring properties also have forward protruding design features, they are generally modest in size, and do not exceed more than half of the principal elevation. The proposal would significantly alter the character of the host building and would diminish the positive contribution that the row of dwellings, within which the appeal building sits, makes to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the proposal would make the appeal property unduly prominent within the immediate street scene and for these reasons the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would therefore not accord with policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan 2023 which, amongst other things require development to contribute positively to the street scene and compliment the surrounding area especially in terms of height, scale and massing.
9. It has been suggested that the proposed development would comply with advice contained within the Bexley Design and Development Control Guidelines. However, it should be noted that as this is guidance it does not necessarily override non-compliance with the development plan policies as identified within this recommendation.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's submissions regarding the desire to create additional accommodation at the site and that the proposal would enhance the usability of the appeal property for larger families. However, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the development as proposed is the only way to achieve those objectives. In this instance, the potential benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm I have identified or alter my conclusion on the main issue.

Other Matters

11. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns raised by interested parties regarding the appeal proposal, in this instance it has not been necessary for me to consider those matters further in respect of this recommendation, given my findings in relation to the main issue described above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR