



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/25/3361619

Park Lodge, 2 Chislehurst Road, Sidcup, Bexley DA14 6DP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by The Beckman Group against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/01987/PRIORU.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey upward extension to provide 3 residential units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would constitute permitted development under Class A of Part 20, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO), with particular regard to the impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring premises.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a flat-roofed three-storey residential block on the western side of Chislehurst Road, set back behind a parking forecourt and landscaping. To the north is Park House, a four-storey block with south- and west-facing elevations towards the site, and to the south is Carrington House, a similar-sized block. The area is characterised by mid-rise flats in landscaped settings. The site lies just outside the boundary of the Sidcup Conservation Area.
4. Condition A.2(1)(g) requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring premises. Both main parties have relied on technical analysis of daylight and sunlight in accordance with BRE guidelines¹. The appellant's Daylight and Sunlight Assessment report (prepared by Base Energy) shows full Vertical Sky Component (VSC) compliance for all tested windows. However, VSC is only one measure and does not account for the timing or duration of sunlight.
5. The Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) results are more relevant in this case, particularly for the south- and west-facing windows of Park House. The

¹ BRE Guide Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022).

appellant's own figures show that Window 48 would experience a reduction in winter sunlight from 5% to 4%, falling below the BRE's recommended minimum of 5% for winter APSH. Several others, notably Windows 53 and 54, would be reduced to exactly 5% in winter and would lose more than 20% of their previous winter sunlight. According to the Council's analysis, Window 53 would fall from 9% to 5%, a reduction of around 44%, while other windows in Park House (47–50) would experience winter APSH reductions of between 22% and 44%. The BRE Guide (para 3.2.7) advises that such reductions are likely to be noticeable and potentially significant, particularly where both annual and winter APSH fall below 0.8 of their former value.

6. The appellant has provided estate agent marketing floorplans for Flats 13 and 17 of Park House, alongside elevation drawings identifying window numbers. The Council has expressed caution in placing weight on these plans, as they have not been independently verified. Nevertheless, if taken at face value, they indicate that some affected rooms are dual aspect. The presence of more than one window on different walls can mitigate the effect of a loss to one window, but the extent of mitigation depends on the size, position, and orientation of the alternative window.
7. In Flat 17, window 53 serves two west-facing bedrooms with no other external windows. Therefore, these single-aspect habitable rooms rely entirely on this orientation for light. Windows 44 and part of 47 serve the lounge, which also has a main east-facing window unaffected by the proposal. In Flat 13, windows 59 and 61 serve the lounge, which also has a large unaffected north-facing window. Other affected windows, such as nos 50 (bathroom) and 56 (kitchen), do not serve habitable rooms.
8. Under BRE guidance, loss to dual-aspect rooms generally carries less weight as alternative light sources can mitigate the effect, but no such mitigation exists for the single-aspect bedrooms in Flat 17. Here, the sole windows (53) would see winter APSH fall from 9% to 5%, representing a 44% loss, with no alternative light source. Whilst this meets the BRE's suggested minimum for winter sunlight, the guidance is clear that its figures are advisory and should be applied with flexibility according to context. In this case, the combination of meeting only the bare minimum BRE level and the substantial proportional loss in available winter sunlight to a habitable bedroom that already receives limited seasonal light indicates a materially harmful loss of amenity, notwithstanding numerical compliance with the guideline.
9. Even allowing for dual-aspect mitigation in some rooms, the magnitude of loss to single-aspect habitable rooms is such that there would be a material and harmful reduction in sunlight reaching them during the winter months, diminishing their useability and comfort. The reduction in light would noticeably reduce the brightness, warmth, and overall quality of these spaces at a time of year when daylight is already limited, leading to a poorer standard of living for the affected occupiers.
10. The appellant has referred to the decision at Broadway House, Trinity Place, Bexleyheath. However, only limited details of that case have been provided. From the information available, it appears to relate to a different urban context, with a different relationship between buildings and the location and orientation of affected windows. On that basis, I am not persuaded that the circumstances are directly comparable, and in any event, each proposal must be assessed on its own merits.

11. I find that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of Park House by reason of loss of light. Given it would adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring premises, it would conflict with the requirement in Condition A.2(1)(g) of the GPDO. For these reasons, the proposed development would not constitute permitted development under Class A, Part 20 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the appellant's points that the scheme would deliver three additional dwellings, make efficient use of a sustainably located site, and employ a set-back and lighter materials to reduce visual impact. These factors are noted, but they do not outweigh my conclusion that the proposal fails to meet the requirements of Condition A.2(1)(g) of the GPDO, which specifically seeks to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring premises.

Conclusion

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

Thomas Courtney

INSPECTOR