



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 May 2025

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd of May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/25/3358944

195 B Park Crescent, Bexley, Erith DA8 3EF

- 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 Mrs T Evans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/02644/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Alteration of the roof space, including modifications to the existing roofline with a side hip-to-gable conversion, addition of a rear dormer extension, and installation of two roof lights on the front slope'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. An email has been received to confirm that the correct site address is 195 B Park Crescent, and I have therefore used this in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property sits at the eastern end of a short terrace of hipped roofed properties within a predominantly residential area. It is situated on a prominent corner location next to the junction between Park Crescent and Hind Crescent and at the end of a continuous, clearly identifiable group of hipped roof dwellings. The hipped roof planes within this group provide simple and balanced buildings that positively contribute to the street scene.
5. The Council has raised no objections to the proposed rear dormer extension and roof lights, and I have no substantive reason to question this. However, the proposed change in the roof form would have an unsympathetic relationship with the appeal building. The built-up gable end would provide additional visual bulk that would pronounce and unbalance the building and terrace row. As a result, the proposal would appear dominant, conspicuous and at odds with the harmonious appearance of the hipped roof forms that predominate this part of the street.
6. The appeal site's relatively exposed position is such that the discordant nature of the proposal would be plainly visible from along Park Crescent, Hind Crescent and from the windows of neighbouring properties.

7. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. As such, it would conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan 2023. These seek, amongst other matters, to achieve high quality design and ensure that factors including height, scale, and massing are complimentary to the surrounding area and contribute positively to the street scene.

Other Matters

8. I have had regard to the appellant's photographs of other properties in the area. However, these appear to be in relation to privacy matters which were not contentious in the application or appeal. The absence of harm in this respect, including the potential use of obscure glazing, are therefore not factors that weigh in the scheme's favour. The design and appearance of these examples are also clearly not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. I have been made aware of the appellant's family's need for additional space in the context of an uncertain property market. Whilst I have some sympathy in this respect, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, particularly where development is permanent. Moreover, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal represents the only means of extending the property and satisfying this need. All of these matters therefore do not overcome or outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR