
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st of July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3358822

319 Brampton Road, Bexleyheath DA7 5SA

- 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 R Bates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application ref is 24/02350/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Existing garage conversion to a two storey granny annex with the new roof'.
-

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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The host dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached property, with a catslide roof to the front elevation. It has a detached single storey outbuilding within its rear garden as well as a detached garage. The garage is accessed from Okehampton Crecent. The wider area is distinctly residential in character and dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the site on Brampton Road and Okehampton Crecent are mainly two-storey. The garage sits within a part of the street characterised by the space between the dwellings on Brampton Road and those on Lansdowne Avenue and Gipsy Road, with their rear gardens backing on to each other. Outbuildings are generally modest in height appearing subservient to their hosts. This hierarchy in scale gives order and consistency to the street scene and positively contributes to a spacious pattern of development.
5. The extended building's two-storey scale together with the provision of windows at first floor level would have the overriding appearance of an independent dwelling rather than an outbuilding subservient to the host dwelling. While the appellant suggests the proposal would not exceed the height of the surrounding built forms and would optimise site capacity, its height, bulk and mass would be at odds with the generally modest scale of neighbouring outbuildings and the visual relationship

of these structures with their hosts. Therefore, and even accounting for the use of sympathetic materials and joinery, the development would be an unduly dominant and incongruous addition. It would detract from the order, consistency and pattern of development at this location.

6. Thus, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) which require that all development is of a high-quality design, protects local character and optimises capacity where development is of the most appropriate form that responds to a site's context .

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR