



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/17/3182710

6 Briar Hill, Purley CR8 3LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kirit Chouhan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 16/06080/HSE, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2017.
 - The development proposed was originally described on the application form as '2 floor side/rear extension, orangery and 2no Lych Gates'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single/two storey side/rear extensions at 6 Briar Hill, Purley CR8 3LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/06080/HSE, dated 30 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P/P2 dated 05/17.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the northern elevation.
 - 4) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. Although the description in the banner heading above refers to Lych gates, the plans on which the Council determined the application do not show such development. Nor does the description of development on the Council's decision notice or the appellant's appeal form make reference to the gates. I have therefore used the Council's description of development in the decision above as it is on this basis that I have determined the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Webb Estate and Upper Woodcote Conservation Areas.

Reasons

4. Briar Hill lies within the Webb Estate and Upper Woodcote Conservation Areas (WUCA). The area comprises of large detached properties of various designs, set well apart in generous plots. This, together with the presence of mature landscaping and trees, creates a spacious and sylvan character.
5. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAA) states that the Webb Estate was a purpose built residential suburb designed by William Webb following his 'Garden First' principle. The landscaping, in particular the specimen trees and other planting is the most important feature of the estate and takes priority over the buildings. Webb laid out a series of covenants to ensure the integrity of the estate remained intact, the most important ones of which have been incorporated into the CAA. The significance of the WUCA is derived from the above as well as its historical influence in terms of the UK's town planning and landscape history.
6. The proposal comprises a single storey orangery to the rear and a two storey side and rear extension which would in part be built on the footprint of the existing garage. The overall design is of a high standard, responding to and respecting the detailing, fenestration, eaves height and roof form of the existing building. Whilst the enlargements would be substantial, for the most part they are situated to the rear of the building and as such the increase in mass would not be particularly evident from Briar Hill.
7. The two story extension would extend down the side of the house and would be noticeable from the street. However, the extension would be no wider than the existing garage and would maintain the required 3m gap to the common boundary so that the sense of space would not be unduly compromised. The design of the extension would mirror that of the two storey extension on the southern boundary and its set back from the principal elevation would ensure a degree of subservience.
8. Overall, whilst I acknowledge that the extensions are of a considerable size, they would integrate well in the context of the existing dwelling and its generous plot. For the aforementioned reasons they would not detract from the 'garden first' principles of the estate or adversely affect the character and appearance of the WUCA.
9. I therefore conclude that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy UC3 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policies SP4.1 and SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013), Policies 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan. These seek, amongst other things that proposals pay special attention to scale, height and massing and historic building lines, that open spaces, trees, hedgerows and other landscape features contributing to the character of the area are retained and protected, that development is of high quality which respects and enhances Croydon's varied local character, is informed by the distinctive qualities of the relevant places of Croydon and that

development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance.

Conditions

10. Having regard to the Council's suggested conditions, it is necessary to require the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. That requiring details of materials is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. A condition controlling the insertion of additional windows on the northern elevation is necessary in order to protect the privacy of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR