



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/25/3364644

56 Lessness Avenue, Bexley, Bexleyheath DA7 5SJ

- 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 & Mrs Pain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/01719/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of detached two storey two bedroom dwelling with associated soft and hard landscaping, bin storage, cycle storage and car parking facility.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a detached outbuilding to the rear of a nursery, which is the last property in a parade of shops in an otherwise residential area. The proposed dwelling would front onto Powys Close, which consists of a mix of bungalows and two-storey buildings with a range of designs and exterior materials. The properties are set back from the street with driveways and front or side gardens, which contribute to a pleasant and open character.
4. The proposed dwelling would be situated in very close proximity to the rear and southern boundaries of the plot. Whilst Nos 1 and 3 Powys Close are also in close proximity to their respective rear boundaries, they also have generously-sized side garden areas which provide a sense of spaciousness. The appeal site is significantly smaller than the plots at Nos 1 and 3, and the proposed garden area would be modest in size. Together with the proximity to the rear and southern boundaries, this would result in the proposed dwelling appearing cramped within its plot.
5. Although the adjacent Wilkinson House is also situated in close proximity to its side boundaries, the set-back of this building from the road contributes to the spaciousness of the street scene. The proposed dwelling would have significantly less of a set-back from the road.
6. The proposed dwelling would have a symmetrical appearance and the hipped roof would match the roof form of the nearby dwellings. Given the range of materials in

the street, which includes render, cladding and brick, the proposed render and cladding would not appear out of place in the street.

7. Although the existing outbuilding has a functional and utilitarian appearance, it is in keeping with the other outbuildings to the rear of the parade of shops and therefore has a neutral effect on the street scene. However, the cramped appearance of the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
8. The proposed dwelling would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), insofar as they require development to respect the existing character and context, contribute positively to the local environment, and ensure that the layout and massing contribute positively to the street scene.

Other Matters

9. I note the concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance, and in determining the appeal I have only had regard to the planning merits of the case.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. The provision of one additional unit would make a small contribution to the existing supply. Economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house, although these would be limited by the scale of the scheme. The planning application form states that proposal would also provide a self-build dwelling, although there is no mechanism, such as a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), before me to secure the dwelling as self-build. I have no evidence before me to demonstrate that the Council is not meeting its housing supply or self-building housing requirements. Although the appeal site is a brownfield site and even if the site is underutilised, for these reasons these benefits would be limited and would not outweigh the harm identified above.
11. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR