



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3363954

59B Mayplace Road East, Bexleyheath DA7 6EA

- 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 P Cussens against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/00073/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of garage and 1.8m fence to front of site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of garage and 1.8m fence to front of site at 59B Mayplace Road East, Bexleyheath DA7 6EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00073/FUL, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a private parking forecourt in front of a single-storey detached retail premises, positioned at the end of a two-storey terraced parade that includes ground-floor commercial uses and fronts an access road used for parking, which runs between Mayplace Road East and Barnehurst Road. The site forms part of a neighbourhood centre comprising similar parades featuring open hardstanding aprons used for incidental parking and ancillary activities, including the sale of goods such as motor vehicles and horticultural products, and the siting of associated structures including a cabin and pergola.
4. Located on the periphery of the neighbourhood centre, the site's western boundary adjoins a residential property where a high boundary wall provides a demarcation between the commercial and residential areas. The dwellings in this location are set back from the road, aligned with the parade, and incorporate open front parking. Some street-facing screening is present, including a prominent brick and railing boundary that fronts the property directly adjoining the site. A cantilever-style bus

shelter abuts the site's southern boundary, subtly reducing its open and outward-facing character towards the street.

5. The proposal involves the construction of a detached, flat-roofed single garage on the forecourt. The garage, to be used for storage purposes, would feature grey composite cladding and a single door opening on its eastern elevation.
6. Additionally, a 1.8m high fence is proposed between the garage and the back of the footway along Mayplace Road East, behind where the bus shelter is located. The fence would extend along the site's front boundary before terminating at the eastern end of the proposed garage.
7. Although positioned in a prominent location, the proposed fence would not appear incongruous, as its height and position would align with the front boundary treatment of the adjacent residential property and would be seen as part of the established line of boundary screening within the street scene. It would also be partially screened by the bus shelter. Within this context, the fence would not detract from or harmfully disrupt the open frontage character of the wider parade.
8. Although the garage would be located in an uncharacteristic position, its modest scale and flat-roofed design would ensure it remains largely screened from the road by both the proposed fence, with the bus shelter positioned in front, and the adjacent side boundary wall. While it would be visible from the east within the Neighbourhood Centre, its placement at the far end of the parade frontage, together with visual enclosure to the rear provided by the boundary wall, planting, and residential properties beyond, would limit any sense of disruption to the established visual character of the area. It would not appear incongruous and from this location it would also be seen within the wider context of the Centre which contains other forward sited features and structures.
9. For these reasons I conclude the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan and the Bexley Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2025) which seek to achieve high-quality and contextually appropriate designs.

Highway Safety

10. The garage and fence would be positioned near the junction of the access road with Mayplace Road East, where the Council considers they would obstruct visibility for vehicles joining the highway. Visibility (to the right) is already constrained by the bus shelter and an adjoining light column resulting in drivers having to slowly edge forward to see past these features before entering the highway. On my site visit, I observed eastbound traffic on Mayplace Road East, travelling towards the site, slowing in proximity to the junction with Barnehurst Road and the zebra crossing, positioned on a raised table just beyond. It appears likely that this represented typical driver behaviour, and that it assists in providing time for drivers approaching the site to see vehicles edging out of the access road. As the bus shelter sits forward of the proposed development, the existing visibility constraints would remain unchanged with the development not materially altering the situation.
11. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the development would not result in harm to highway safety. Accordingly, the development would comply with Policy T4

of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP10 and DP24 of the Local Plan (2023) and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to uphold highway safety.

Conditions

12. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council with the exception of the requirement for matching materials which is unnecessary as the materials are specified on the plans and have not attracted any specific objection. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out following the approved plan, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. While the stated use of the garage is for storage, its design could facilitate vehicle parking. As such I have imposed a condition requiring the provision of pedestrian visibility splays at the entrance to the garage. I have adapted the wording proposed by the Council to refer specifically to the garage rather than 'car parking areas'. I have also identified where the splays should apply and specified a time when the condition should be complied with, without which the condition would be imprecise and potentially unenforceable. In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area and based on the role of the fence in screening the garage, I have also imposed a condition requiring the erection of the fence prior to the first use of the garage and its retention thereafter.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 121/25/1000 Rev. B.
- 3) Prior to the first use of the garage hereby permitted, the access to it shall be provided with those parts of 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian visibility splays (to be measured outwards from either side of the garage door opening) which can be accommodated within the site in both directions. The pedestrian visibility splays shall be maintained free of all obstacles between heights of 0.6m and 2.0m above the level of the adjoining road.
- 4) The 1.8m fence hereby permitted shall be erected prior to the first use of the garage and shall thereafter be retained.

End of Schedule