



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: 27th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/17/3182458

82 Welcomes Road, Kenley CR8 5HE

- 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 Marios Christodoulides against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 17/02352/FUL, dated 9 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of new 3 bedroom detached family dwelling house with parking for 2/3 cars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including its effect on protected trees.

Reasons

3. Welcomes Road comprises a mix of dwelling types, sizes and designs. The presence of mature trees and landscaping, together with houses set well apart and in generous plots creates an attractive sylvan and distinctive semi-rural character to the locality. The appeal site is a prominent corner plot on the junction of Welcomes Road and Simone Drive. With the exception of a single storey garage building, it is undeveloped and has become grown over by self-seeded trees and shrubs. More mature and substantial planting is located along the front boundary including a yew tree. The plots between the appeal site and Mary Hill Close to the south consist of chalet style dormer bungalows of a simple design with cat slide roofs and dark bricks sympathetic to their wooded surroundings.
4. The proposed two storey dwelling with hipped roof would front onto Welcomes Road utilising the existing access from Simone Drive. It would be an L-shaped property constructed in brick and render with a tiled roof. A 2m close boarded fence is proposed to the perimeter of the site.
5. The Council point out that the appeal site has a width of approximately 10.2m which is significantly less than others in the area which are normally around 20-30m. By virtue of the prominent corner position, development on the site would be particularly noticeable, especially when approaching from the north

along Welcomes Road. To my mind, the dwelling would be read primarily in the context of the adjacent chalet bungalows. However, the dwelling fails to respond or pick up cues from any of the design or detailing of the neighbouring dwellings, its rendered walls of stark contrast to the dark brick of the adjacent properties and sylvan character of the locality. Its proximity to the boundary on Simone Drive and its forward projection of the principal elevation of 82 Welcomes Road would exacerbate its incongruity. Whilst noting a three bedroom dwelling would not be out of character per se, for the aforementioned reasons, the proposal would be an unsympathetic and visually intrusive development at odds with the context of the locality.

6. The site is subject to a blanket Tree Preservation Order. The wooded nature of the site makes a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area. The appellant refers to an Arboricultural Report, however I have not been provided with a copy. Furthermore, the Council state that whilst such a report was prepared for a previous application on the site pertaining to a different proposal, an updated report for the current proposal has not been submitted. Therefore, I have no substantiated evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would not adversely affect protected trees on site and their contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area and I find conflict with Policies 3.5, 7.21, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies SP4.1, SP7.4, SP4.2 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies (2013) and saved Policies UD2, UD3, NC4 and H2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006). These seek to ensure that, amongst other things, the design of all new housing developments enhances the quality of local places, that development should make a positive contribution to local character, is of a high quality and should reinforce and respect existing development patterns, plots and building frontage widths, heights and proportions of surrounding buildings. That development should enhance biodiversity across the borough, improve an area's visual or physical connection with natural features and contribute to a positive relationship between the urban structure and natural landscape features, that trees and woodlands should be protected, maintained and enhanced and that valued trees especially those protected by Tree Preservation Orders are protected.

Conclusion

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

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR