



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3368141

55 Parkhurst Road, Bexley DA5 1BA

- 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 Duncan Stannett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/00823/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as ground floor rear kitchen and family room extension and extended veranda with stairs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 53 and No. 57 Parkhurst Road (No. 57), with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, positioned within a run of predominantly detached houses that are generally evenly spaced but closely grouped. While architectural styles vary, the dwellings share a broadly consistent scale, massing and form.
4. To the rear of the appeal property is a single-storey addition with a hipped, mono-pitched roof. The structure spans the full width of the dwelling, terminates flush with the main flank elevations and provides access to a raised rear patio
5. The appeal site's patio directly adjoins the shared boundary with No. 53, which is defined by a medium-height wall and fence. From the rear No. 53 sits at a lower ground level, which makes the boundary wall appear relatively prominent on that side, despite some planting in front. A patio serving No. 53 lies close to the boundary wall and is accessed from a fully glazed end elevation of a conservatory immediately adjacent to it.
6. The appeal property and its patio are separated from No. 57 by a side access path along the shared boundary, marked by a high timber fence that steps down slightly near the patio end, where additional screening is provided by deciduous trees in

the neighbouring garden. No. 57's rear elevation broadly aligns with the appeal property but is set in from the boundary to form a hard-surfaced side area beside a single-storey flank wall. That flank contains a top-glazed door and a double-casement window serving a main living space, which also benefits from extensive rear glazing; obscure-glazed bathroom windows face the side area and passage. At my site visit, the inset side area appeared lightly used for garden storage and adjoined a more actively used patio to the rear, as shown by outdoor furniture.

7. The proposed extension at No. 55 would increase the depth of the rear single-storey element across the full width of the existing patio, with a corresponding enlargement in the depth of the raised patio. It would be constructed with a flat roof, replacing the existing hipped mono pitched roof and sitting slightly below its current maximum height. The roof would incorporate two roof lanterns, each inset from the respective flank walls.
8. When viewed from No. 53, the flank elevation of the proposed extension would appreciably increase the massing currently formed by the boundary wall, producing a greater sense of enclosure to the adjoining patio and a more visually oppressive external space with reduced natural light. The conservatory's end elevation would chiefly outlook onto the blank face of that wall, creating a constrained, oppressive internal environment and materially reducing daylight such that the room's use and enjoyment would be diminished. Taken together, these effects would result in a material deterioration of the occupiers' living conditions.
9. Although the appellant has referred to an extant planning permission for a part single-storey/part two-storey rear extension at No. 53 (Ref: 24/02255/FUL granted 15 November 2024), no evidence of commencement or contractual commitment is before me, and I saw no indication of works having started at my site visit. I therefore afford that permission only limited weight and find that it would not outweigh the harm identified.
10. The proposal would modestly increase the sense of enclosure when viewed from the hardstanding to the side of No. 57 and reduce some outlook from the side-facing windows. However, having regard to the offset of the development from the common boundary, which would mitigate any unacceptable overbearing impact, the observed use of the side and rear outdoor areas, and the availability of primary outlook from the principal rear-facing windows, I find the effects would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 57 such as to warrant dismissal of the appeal on this ground alone.
11. I have also considered the concerns raised about loss of daylight to No. 57. Given the northerly position of the extension relative to No. 57 and the ample glazing serving the main living space, the evidence does not demonstrate an unacceptable reduction in daylight. The obscure glazed windows serve non-habitable rooms which are less sensitive. I am satisfied therefore that no undue harm would arise in respect of this matter.
12. Had the appeal been allowed, I would have required some additional screening to the flank of the extended raised patio abutting No. 53 and to the side boundary with No. 57, for the duration of the patio, to prevent unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring gardens. I am satisfied that such mitigation could be secured by an appropriately worded condition without unduly affecting the neighbouring occupiers.

13. I therefore conclude that whilst the proposed development would be capable of being made acceptable with respect to the living conditions experienced at No. 57, it would unacceptably harm the same for the neighbouring occupiers at No. 53, with particular regard to sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) and the Design & Development Control Guidelines: Residential Extensions SPD which amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development safeguards the residential amenity of existing occupiers.

Other Matters

14. The site lies immediately adjacent to the Parkhurst Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the frontages of properties on the south side of Parkhurst Road. I inspected the site from principal public vantage points within the conservation area on Parkhurst Road, from which the proposed rear extension would not be visible. Having regard to those publicly accessible viewpoints and the limited intervisibility, I find no harm to the setting or significance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

15. As it would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 53, I conclude the proposal would not comply with the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR