



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by J Glasin RIBA SCA MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/25/3375625

156 Sutherland Avenue, Welling, Bexley DA16 2NH

- 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 K Emumejakpor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 25/01551/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and erection of single storey detached outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the outbuilding at 156 Sutherland Avenue, Welling, Bexley DA16 2NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01551/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 Proposed Block Plan and Proposed Location Plan, and drawings 009, 010, 011, and 013, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application form states that building works commenced in June 2025. I saw during my site visit that both the construction of the rear extension and the outbuilding have commenced, but are not yet completed. The external walls and roofs had been constructed, but no windows or doors had been installed, and the extension and outbuilding remained unfinished. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.
4. The rear extension is clearly severable from the outbuilding, as it is physically and functionally independent. Therefore, under section 79(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, I have the power to issue a split decision in this case.

Main Issue

5. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants at 158 Sutherland Avenue, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

6. The site is in a residential area along Sutherland Avenue. The street is predominantly characterised by two-storey terraced houses with pitched roofs and private rear gardens. Some of the properties have rear extensions, dormer extensions, and outbuildings.
7. The building is set between 154 and 158 Sutherland Avenue. The boundaries are defined by painted timber fences, with a tall fence to No 154, and a low fence to No 158. The adjoining building at No 158 does not have a rear extension, but it has a small timber outbuilding set to the back of the rear garden. No 154 has a rear extension, and a small greenhouse within the back garden, but no other outbuildings.
8. The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension and a single storey detached outbuilding.

Rear extension

9. The construction of the rear extension has begun under planning permission 24/01395/FUL, which was a permission for erection of a part 1/ part 2 storey rear extension and erection of a front entrance porch. However, the Council has confirmed that the extension currently under construction at the appeal site exceeds what had been previously permitted.
10. The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the building and would not be visible from Sutherland Avenue. It would be single storey in height with a flat roof. It would have full height windows facing the rear garden. There would be no windows on elevations facing neighbouring properties. There would be a terraced area in front of the extension, and steps leading down to the private garden of the appeal site. The extension would be slightly set back from the boundary with No 154, but would be built up to the boundary with No 158.
11. The proposed extension would be larger than the extension permitted under the previous approval. The Council has confirmed that the depth of the proposed extension would be some 1.7m longer than the previous approval. The height of the permitted and proposed extensions would be the same.
12. The design of the proposed extension would differ little from the previous approval, and this would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding this, it would exceed the established building line of the neighbouring extensions.
13. The Design and Development Control Guidelines 2.3.2 (1) states that a single storey rear extension should not normally exceed 3.5m in depth from the original rear elevation. In this instance, the extension would be 5.2m in depth from the original rear elevation, which would exceed the recommended guidelines significantly.

14. No. 158 does not have a rear extension. The introduction of the proposed extension would create a long single-storey wall running along the shared boundary with No 158. This would result in an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants at No 158 due to loss of light to the rooms at ground level and to their garden, and in obstructed outlook from their rear windows and garden. Therefore, the increased depth of the proposed extension would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 158.
15. No 154 has a rear extension, somewhat shallower in depth than the proposed extension. Since both houses would have extensions, and the proposed extension would be slightly set back from the boundary with No 154, it would not result in an adverse effect on the living conditions of occupants of No 154.
16. An objection has been raised by a neighbouring occupant regarding potential loss of privacy due to overlooking from the proposed extension into the neighbouring property. The proposed extension would not have any windows on elevations facing neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposed extension would not cause harm in respect of privacy.
17. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 158 with particular regard to light and outlook. This would conflict with Policies DP11 and SP5 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) and the Design and Development Control Guidelines, which seek to ensure good design and protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Outbuilding

18. The proposed outbuilding would be positioned at the end of the rear garden and would not be visible from Sutherland Avenue. It would be a detached single-storey building with a flat roof. It would have one door, three full-height sliding-folding doors, and a small window, all of which would face the rear garden of the appeal property. The finished materials would match the main building on the appeal site.
19. Due to the restricted size and height of the proposed outbuilding, the restricted views to the private garden of the appeal property, and its position at the rear of the property, the proposed outbuilding would not have an adverse effect on neighbouring occupants at either No 154 and No 158, with particular regard to light and outlook.
20. An objection has been raised by a neighbouring occupant regarding potential overlooking and loss of privacy from the proposed outbuilding into their garden and dwelling. The proposed outbuilding would not have any windows on elevations facing neighbouring properties, its height would be limited to a single storey, and it would be positioned at the far end of the rear garden. Therefore, given the restricted view at a low viewpoint, this would not cause harm to neighbouring privacy.
21. The outbuilding would only be slightly taller than what would be achievable under permitted development rights. Furthermore the proposed use as a home gym and store would also likely be achievable under permitted development. Concerns have been raised regarding the potential for the outbuilding to be used for purposes other than a home gym and store. However there is no evidence to suggest that the outbuilding will be used for any alternative use.

22. I therefore conclude that the proposed outbuilding would not harm the living conditions of occupants of No 158, with particular regard to light and outlook. It would therefore be in accordance with Bexley Local Plan (2023) policies DP11 and SP5, and the Design and Development Control Guidelines.

Conditions

23. The conditions are related to the relevant part of the development hereby permitted, which is the outbuilding. The standard time condition is imposed for the avoidance of doubt. The condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The condition for the materials is necessary to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is maintained.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

J Glasin

INSPECTOR