
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3369967

125 Danson Road, Bexley DA5 1DG

- 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 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Ms Chand Bibi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/01308/GPDE.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension, demolish existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the Order), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1 (f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1 (g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply - or that the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.
5. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 states that where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises.
6. The principle of the development is established by the Order, and the provisions therein do not require regard be had to the development plan.

7. An objection to the proposed development was received from the owner or occupier of an adjoining premises. As a result, the prior approval of the local planning authority was required. Prior approval was refused due to the effect of the proposed development on the amenities of an adjoining property, with particular regard to daylight, sunlight, and outlook.

Main Issue

8. Therefore, the main issue is whether or not prior approval should be granted having regard to the effect of the proposed development on the amenity of the adjoining premises.

Reasons for the Recommendation

9. The appeal property is a detached residential dwelling on Danson Road. There is a single storey rear extension and a double storey side extension with single storey rearward projection at the appeal property. Both Nos 123 and 127 are detached residential dwellings located close to and either side of the appeal property. No 123 has an outside amenity space laid to hardstanding directly to its rear elevation, whilst the rear elevation of No 127 has a single storey rear extension.
10. The land to this part of Danson Road slopes gradually downwards from south to north as well as sloping gradually downwards from the road west to east. This means that to the rear of the appeal property the finished floor level of the rear extension is well above the ground level of the rear garden. In addition, No 123 is slightly lower than the appeal property.
11. The boundary treatment between the appeal site and No 127 is a closed board fence at approximately 1.8 metres(m), whilst the boundary to No 123 is formed by part of the single storey side extension at approximately 3m in height, part brick wall and part closed board fence at approximately 1.8m. No 123 is positioned at an angle to the appeal site, meaning that the boundary of the appeal site does not follow its building line and its footprint is set forward meaning that the rear patio area is roughly in line with the existing rear extension.
12. The proposed rear extension would protrude from the rear wall of the original house by 8m, with a maximum height of 3.15m, with the eaves at 3m. Whilst the proposed extension would be setback from the boundary of No 123, the setback would get smaller as the extension extends rearwards due to the shape of the plot. The proposed extension would protrude above the boundary treatments on either side by approximately 1.2m and would add mass and scale close to the boundary.
13. I have had regard to the Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment for Surrounding Properties. Given the overall size, scale, and siting of the proposed development, it would not adversely affect daylight or sunlight to either adjoining property. I also accept that there would only be a minimal adverse effect on overshadowing at No 123 during limited periods. However, Policy DP 11 of the Bexley Local Plan sets out that proposal should ensure that appropriate levels of privacy, outlook, natural daylight, and other forms of amenity are provided.
14. The height of the proposal, when combined with the proximity to the adjoining properties and level of projection of the extension from the rear of the appeal property, would have a dominant and overbearing impact on No 123 which would significantly harm the outlook for occupants. Similarly, but to a lesser degree

compared to No 123 due to ground height and proximity, the proposal due to its height and overall projection would have a dominant and overbearing effect on No 127.

15. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining premises.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR