



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/25/3374165

121-123 Bellegrove Road, Bexley, Welling DA16 3QS

- 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 Sah Gaziler against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/02530/FUL.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and conversion of upper floors into 6 1 bed flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises extensions to the roofs and outriggers of 121 and 123 Bellegrove Road. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
3. The application form states the development started in October 2024. During my visit, I noted that the roof extensions were complete and that they accord with the application plans before me. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the terrace,
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers of the roof level flats at 121 and 123 Bellegrove Road, in respect of internal floorspace; and
 - whether the proposal meets the sustainability and climate resilience objectives of the development plan.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site comprises two adjoining buildings that front Bellegrove Road and form part of the 'Station Parade' terrace. No. 121 contains a dry-cleaning business at ground-floor level, while No. 123 accommodates a nail salon at ground floor. Both premises include residential accommodation on the upper floors.

6. Although some buildings within the terrace have been subject to roof-level alterations, the prevailing built form is characterised by rear dormers within the main roof slopes, with the roofs of the rear outriggers remaining undeveloped. As a result, the terrace retains a notable consistency in form and architectural rhythm, which contributes positively to its traditional character and cohesive appearance.
7. The upward extensions to both outriggers constitute an incongruous addition that materially disrupts the established uniformity and architectural rhythm of the terrace. Notwithstanding the use of hung tiles to assimilate the works into the existing roofscape, the terrace's consistent form renders the resultant increase in bulk and massing readily perceptible. As a result, the extensions fail to uphold the traditional proportions of the built form and give rise to a visually intrusive development. Accordingly, the works materially diminish and erode the cohesive character of the terrace.
8. Although it is asserted that the extensions have a limited impact on the public realm, they are nevertheless visible from Kelvin Road, the rear access to the terrace, and the rear elevations of the dwellings on Darwin Road. As a result, the extensions result in a discernible and harmful visual impact that undermines the established character of the rear of the terrace.
9. Reference is made to a part-two, part-one storey rear extension and roof alterations at 231a Bellegrove Road as an example of development extending over an outrigger. However, this property does not form part of the same terrace and is not experienced within the same visual context as the appeal site. As a result, the example is not directly comparable and cannot justify extensions that would materially diminish the established uniformity of the terrace.
10. For the above reasons, the development unacceptably effects the character and appearance of the terrace. It is therefore contrary to Policy DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan 2023 (Local Plan) so far as it requires the scale and massing of proposals to be complimentary to the surrounding area and to contribute positively to the street scene.

Internal Floorspace

11. Policy D6 of the London Plan requires all housing developments to provide adequately sized rooms that meet the minimum internal space standards set out in the Plan. Although the appellant asserts that the flats comply with these standards, the submitted drawings indicate that the two roof-level units fall markedly below the minimum floor area required for one-bedroom, one-person dwellings. As these standards represent the minimum standard that applicants are encouraged to exceed, the shortfall is significant. This is because it results in units that provide a cramped and unacceptable living environment for future occupants.
12. For the above reasons, the development conflicts with Policy DP11 of the Local Plan and Policy D6 of the London Plan. Collectively these policies require housing to meet appropriate internal accommodation standards.

Sustainability and Climate Resilience

13. Policy DP30 of the Local Plan requires that minor development proposals aim to achieve net zero carbon, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and minimise both annual and peak energy demand in line with the London Plan energy hierarchy.

Residential conversions, refurbishment, extensions and changes of use are also required to achieve BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment Excellent or another appropriate sustainability measure.

14. The appeal does not address, evidence, or demonstrate how the proposal complies with Policy DP30. No sustainability or carbon-reduction information has been provided. Consequently, the development fails to meet the requirements of Policy DP30 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

15. Although the site benefits from good access to both road and public transport networks and the development makes use of previously unused loft space, these factors do not diminish the requirement for development to integrate appropriately with its surroundings. Nor do they negate the obligation to provide suitable internal accommodation standards or to comply with the sustainability and climate-resilience objectives set out within the development plan.

Conclusion

16. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR