



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14th May 2025

by **P H Wallace BSc (Hons) DipMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3362955

44 Stansted Crescent, Bexley, Kent DA5 3JB

- 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 D Middleditch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/03011/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension with accommodation within the roof slope incorporating front and rear dormer extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was originally described as, "Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front porch". The Council revised the description to include reference to a single storey side extension with accommodation in the roof slope incorporating front and rear dormer extensions. The dormers are clearly shown on the plan before me and the appellant has commented on these elements in their statement. I consider the development to be as described in the banner heading which more accurately reflects the proposal.
3. The appeal proposals include a number of alterations which are not part of the Council's reason for refusal, nor does the Council identify any conflict with the development plan in relation to those aspects of the application. Following my site visit, I see no reason to disagree. In the circumstances, the focus of this appeal is the proposed side extension incorporating the front dormer window.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling within a row of four single-storey homes set back but fronting the street. The end terrace properties feature distinctive front-to-rear gables. These project forward slightly from the rest of the terrace and have matching front-projecting bay windows. The middle two properties sit beneath a cross ridge roof, which integrates with the outer gabled ends in a perpendicular alignment. This roofscape is unbroken, with no dormer or other

projections disrupting its front-facing slope. To the west, an identically designed terrace mirrors this arrangement. At the time of my site visit, a small single-storey extension appeared to be under construction at that terrace's eastern end. While details of this addition are not before me, it appeared modest in scale.

6. The uniformity and symmetry of both terraces has a balanced and pleasing appearance. This introduces a sense of orderly rhythm to the built frontage at this point which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the street.
7. The proposed side extension maintains the main roof proportions of the terrace's central section but concludes with a subtly splayed gable-end that follows the property boundary and directly faces the end gable of an adjoining two-storey property. Although this results in some loss of symmetry within the terrace, its impact on the character and appearance of the street scene is mitigated by its close relationship with the neighbouring gable-end, which provides some contextual relevance for the roof form. In contrast, the proposed front-facing dormer would introduce a visually intrusive element, undermining the existing uninterrupted front-facing roof slope - a defining feature of both terrace properties – and as such would appear as a particularly incongruous feature.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the side extension, incorporating a front facing dormer window, would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The development would therefore conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan, the Design and Development Control Guidelines SPD, and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks developments that are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment and maintain a strong sense of place.

Conclusion

9. I conclude the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR