



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/25/3358537

96 & 98 Woolwich Road, Belvedere DA17 5EN

- 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 Ethan Collins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application ref. is 24/01830/FUL.
 - The development proposed is side and rear ground and first floor extensions and loft conversions to pair of semi-detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form differs from that on the decision notice and appeal form, but the latter states that it has not changed.
3. Whilst the decision notice usefully refers to the roof alterations, it is not clear that the change was agreed by the applicant and so I have used the original.
4. It was clear on site that the proposal has been partially implemented as shown and described in the application. I have dealt with the appeal as part-retrospective.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of:
 - the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 100 Woolwich Road, with particular reference to outlook and overbearing effect, and
 - the proposed access on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers.

Reasons

Living conditions

6. The appeal site contains a modest pair of two-storey semi-detached houses with hipped roof and original two-storey rear outrigger, also with hipped roof but lower eaves. Single-storey flat-roofed rear extensions and a side extension to no. 96 were partially demolished at the time of the site visit. The main house is about 1.3m from the boundary with no. 100 and the outrigger about 1.6m.
7. The rear elevation of no. 100 is north-facing and extends back a metre or so less than the subject. One first-floor window, three ground floor windows and a door in

the side elevation of no. 100 face the boundary. A fence occludes the bottom half of the windows in the porch, but the first-floor window, and a door and windows to what appears to be the kitchen are about 1.5m from the boundary.

8. The proposal would extend the side of each house to the boundaries and the rear by almost a metre, both at two storeys. It would also extend by almost 2m further back to the rear at a single storey, albeit a metre taller than previously. The ridge of the main roof would be raised by about a metre and that of the outrigger by about 2.5m. The eaves of the outrigger would be raised by about a metre.
9. The gap between the houses affords the north-facing rear rooms and garden of no. 100 an appreciable amount of natural light. The proposal would close it and add significant bulk at height on the boundary. This would occlude windows in the porch, darken other rooms with windows facing the boundary significantly and greatly increase the sense of enclosure in those rooms and spaces adjacent.
10. This would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 100, contrary to Policy DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023), which requires development to ensure that existing properties' outlook and natural daylight are protected.

Effect of proposed access

11. The properties have front gardens of just under 5m in length, but bay windows reduce this to about 4.5m across part of the width. The submitted plans clearly show proposed driveways and accesses to which the Council's highways officer has not objected. An appropriately worded condition could ensure that landscape details, including elevational details of boundary treatments would be acceptable. Consequently, I do not consider that the proposed access would cause harm.

Other Matters

12. Local residents have expressed concerns relating to whether the proposal would be used as a house in multiple occupation (HMO), whether the parking would be adequate, and privacy and noise impacts. I note that one representation, whilst quoting the correct reference number, referred to a proposal at no. 94.
13. The proposal is not for an HMO and an Article 4 Direction would require a further application to use the properties as HMOs. The proposed parking complies with maxima in policy and the Council's highways officer has not objected. I am also satisfied that there would be no privacy or noise impacts to neighbours.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR