



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by F Bradford 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: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/24/3356553

2 Grove Road, Bexleyheath, Kent, DA7 6AX

- 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 Winifred Oppong-Dwamena against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/02115/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor side extension.
-

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 relating to the proposed development is its effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling (the dwelling) forms part of a distinct and established group of dwellings located to the northern edge of Leysdown Avenue and part of Grove Road (including No. 24A, 24, 12A-22, 6-12 Leysdown Avenue and 2-4A Grove Road) which are characterised through their similar architectural features and scale. The character of the area is mixed in terms of building types, however, there is an established sense of uniformity within the dwelling's group, which remain largely unaltered from their original forms. In general terms, the dwelling and its group contributes to a sense of spaciousness along Leysdown Avenue, achieved through the setting back of the building line from the edge of the highway.
5. The proposed development would introduce a first-floor side extension sited above the existing attached garage which would result in a substantial additional bulk. By reason of its scale in relation to the appeal dwelling, the development would be an observably dominant addition with its impact amplified by the prominence caused by the visibility as an end-of-terrace corner plot. The increased overall mass would result in the appeal dwelling being notably larger than both the other dwellings within the terrace and wider typological group, causing harm through the loss of uniformity.

6. The proposed addition would not only be dominant in relation to the appeal dwelling, but within the wider streetscape with visual prominence when viewed on Leysdown Avenue as a result of its scale and breach of established building line. The visual dominance of the proposed extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of Leysdown Avenue through the partial loss of a sense of spaciousness.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and street scene. I therefore find conflict with the development plan regarding policy SP5 (Placemaking through good design) and DP11 (Achieving high-quality design) of the Bexley Local Plan which, amongst other objectives, seeks to ensure high-quality design standards that respect the existing character and context, and compliment the surrounding area in terms of character to positively contribute to the street scene.

Other Matters

8. I have considered the personal circumstances of the appellant in this instance and recognise their motivations for the proposed development. There is no doubt that this development would result in social benefit, however, benefit must be considered proportionately against the established harm to character and appearance of the host building and street scene. Whilst social benefit would be attained, there would be no mechanism to ensure its retention or longevity due to factors outside of the remit of planning. Furthermore, there is no evidence before me to suggest that the benefits attributed could not be achieved through measures without harm to the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. Having given due regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant, I consider that the benefits associated with the proposed development would not outweigh the harm and resulting development plan conflict as identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

F Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. 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