



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3367396

84 Darwin Road, Welling, Bexley DA16 2EG

- 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 D Chongbang Limbu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application ref is 25/00653/FUL.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations incorporating front and rear dormer, demolition of existing rear extension and front porch to erect single-storey rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations incorporating front and rear dormer, demolition of existing rear extension and front porch to erect single-storey rear extension and front porch at 84 Darwin Road, Welling, Bexley DA16 2EG in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 25/00653/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no's SA/SP/07/1/00, SA/SP/07/1/01B, SA/SP/07/1/02, SA/SP/07/1/03, SA/SP/07/1/04, SA/SP/07/1/05, SA/SP/07/1/06, SA/SP/07/1/07.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension, dormers and front porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The flat roof area to the single storey extension on drawing title "Proposed Loft Floor Plan" shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of a further permission from the Local Planning Authority.

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Darwin Road is predominately characterised by two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings of a similar architectural design, although many of the dwellings have been altered/and or extended with rear dormers, loft conversions, front, side and rear extensions. The appeal site is situated on a triangular shaped corner plot on the junction of Darwin Road and Huxley Road with a side and rear garden and detached garages. It appears as an anomaly in the street scene as a single storey detached dwelling.
5. The Council appears to raise no objection to the proposed rear dormer, single storey rear extension and front porch. I too find these elements of the proposal acceptable, as they would not be incongruous features or harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or street scene.
6. The Council is concerned that the proposed two front dormers would be out of context with the surrounding area.
7. The proposed front dormers would have a pitched roof, reflecting the pitched roof of the porch and ground floor bay windows. The top of the dormers would be positioned below the existing roof ridge, and they would be well set back from the eaves. The depth would be subservient within the roof slope and the width of each dormer would be narrower than that of the ground floor windows. They would not appear as dominant or overbearing features within the roof slope. The positioning of the dormers would be symmetrical to the front door and ground floor windows, central to the existing roof ridge and therefore would appear balanced and proportionate within the roof slope. The use of hanging tiles to clad the dormer cheeks and front would visually integrate the dormers into the existing roof.
8. During my site visit I observed that although front dormers are not a characteristic feature within the surrounding area, the appeal dwelling does not follow the prevailing built form and uniformity within the street scene. It is therefore to a noticeable extent differentiated from its surroundings. Given this context, the proposal for front dormers on the appeal dwelling would not appear discordant in the street scene.
9. The London Borough of Bexley Design and Development Control Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2004 (SPD) seeks extensions to be subordinate and respect the character of the existing building and states that, if possible, dormer windows should face to the rear. Whilst the proposal would not strictly accord with the guidance in the SPD given that the dormers are proposed to the front, they would be subordinate to and respect the character of the existing dwelling.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. It would accord with policies D11 and SP5 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) which seek high quality design and proposals that contribute positively to the street scene, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

11. A neighbouring resident raised concern regarding loss of light to the side and first floor landing window of their property. Given the modest overall scale, design and layout of the proposal, the separation distance and orientation of the buildings, I

consider that the proposal would not result in significant loss of light to the neighbouring property.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
13. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing building is imposed.
14. The development incorporates a flat roofed area that adjoins a dormer window and is close to the neighbouring property. A condition is necessary to ensure the flat roofed area is not used as a balcony thereby preventing overlooking of the neighbouring property.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR