



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3374033

12 Derwent Crescent, Bexleyheath, Bexley DA7 4NH

- 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 J Sandhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/01542/FUL.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with alterations to roofline, rear dormer and three rooflights to front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated on a residential street characterised by a coherent pattern of detached and semi-detached bungalows. These dwellings are consistently set back from the highway and follow the curved form of Derwent Crescent, resulting in an orderly and unified street layout.
4. The prevailing character of the street is defined by an uninterrupted sequence of modest, low-rise, buildings featuring hipped roof forms. This consistency in roof form, combined with the restrained scale of the dwellings, provides the street with a strong sense of order and coherence. The curvature of the crescent enhances this effect, producing a rhythmic alignment of similarly proportioned bungalows that together create a well-balanced townscape. Although a small number of properties display variations in ridge height or minor roof alterations, these remain subordinate and do not materially interrupt the overarching uniformity that contributes positively to the area's established character.
5. The appeal proposal seeks to undertake a hip-to-gable enlargement to both roof flanks, raise the main ridge height and introduce a rear roof extension part projecting over the existing flat-roofed elements. While the footprint of the dwelling

would not increase, the cumulative effect of these alterations would materially increase the bulk, massing and overall visual presence of the building. Rather than reading as a subordinate addition, the enlarged roof structure would appear visually dominant and incongruous. This would also be disproportionately large in comparison to the building as a whole, thereby diminishing its architectural integrity. The use of matching materials would not be sufficient to mitigate this harm.

6. Although the host dwelling is set back from the street, the increased ridge height and the introduction of gabled elements would nevertheless be readily perceptible from views along the gently curving alignment of Derwent Crescent. Within these viewpoints, the proposal would interrupt the prevailing roofscape rhythm and introduce an intrusive feature at odds with the established pattern of hipped roofs. The proposal would therefore result in appreciable harm to the established street scene and the wider townscape character.
7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The development would therefore conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023), which require well-designed development that maintains a strong sense of place and respects local character. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance contained within the Design and Development Control Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document, which aims to create well designed environments, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of achieving well designed places.

Other Matters

8. The Council concluded the proposal would not result in harmful living conditions to neighbouring occupiers and based upon the evidence before me, and my observations on site, I concur. However, compliance with such policies would be a neutral matter in the balance and does not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.
9. While there were no objections from neighbouring occupiers to the proposal, this is not a reason in itself to allow development which is visually harmful.
10. I have been referred to other examples of similar extensions elsewhere. However, I do not have the full circumstances that led to those schemes being permitted, and while I acknowledge hip to gable alterations are present within the wider area, none of these examples are within Derwent Crescent where the pattern of hipped roofs forms a distinctly uniform roofscape. On the evidence before me, I cannot be satisfied that they provide a direct or relevant comparison. I have, in any event, determined the appeal based on its own planning merits.
11. The appellant refers to an earlier refusal for similar works at the site on grounds of excessive bulk. While this context is noted and the current scheme may be smaller in some areas, my assessment is confined to the specific merits of the current proposal I have not found it to be acceptable. I also acknowledge the appellant's desire to extend the property to meet family needs, however, such personal circumstances do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area.

Conclusion

12. The proposal does not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR