
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2018

by Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/18/3200034
36 Brighton Road, Purley, CR8 2LG

- 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 Cllr Simon Brew against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 17/02166/FUL, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is to subdivide the rear garden and to develop the rear portion to create two new family dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. After the planning application was determined, the Council adopted a new Local Plan, the Croydon Local Plan 2018 (2018 Plan). This has replaced all the policies in both the Croydon Local Plan 2006 and the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 which are cited on the decision notice. The Council has set out those policies of the 2018 Plan which it now considers to be relevant to my determination of the appeal and the appellant has commented upon their relevance. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the policies in the 2018 Plan.
3. Similarly, I have taken account of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), dated July 2018, which was published after the application was determined. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment upon the implications of the revised Framework and I have had regard to the comments received.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. No 36 Brighton Road is a semi-detached property at the junction of Brighton Road and Purley Rise. Purley Rise runs along the side of No 36 and continues along the back of the plot. It is proposed to construct two new dwellings to the rear of the existing property in its garden area, one behind the other. They

would each have pedestrian only access from the stretch of Purley Rise which joins Brighton Road, and they would present their side elevations to it.

6. Whilst on a very busy Red Route, the stretch of Brighton Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is primarily residential in character. The buildings vary in respect of their type, age and size, but most are of a conventional style and finished in commonly used materials such as brick, render and tiles. Nothing stands out as being particularly unusual. Purley Rise, both to the side and rear of the site, is also residential in character and, away from the Red Route, it is quiet, green and spacious.
7. The proposed new dwellings would be of an overtly contemporary style with shallow, mono-pitched roofs, large windows and an essentially boxy appearance. They would be finished with dark timber cladding and an aluminium parapet which would be at odds with the more traditional palette of materials described above. The dwellings would not be noticed from Brighton Road but their presence would be obvious in the relevant stretch of Purley Rise, notwithstanding that they would be screened to some extent by the lie of the land and by boundary planting. From here, they would appear cramped and incongruous, crowded into the rear garden of a property which they in no way resembled.
8. A couple of properties similar to the type proposed have already been built to the rear of the dwellings fronting Brighton Road, although these can only be glimpsed between the buildings. The properties themselves are also largely hidden from view in Purley Rise because they are built into the steeply sloping land. However, large hard surfaced parking areas have been constructed above them on Purley Rise and these contrast markedly with the green, well landscaped front gardens which prevail. Therefore, while these examples might indicate a trend for more modern development in the area, they neither reflect nor define its character and they do not justify the appeal scheme.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Thus it would conflict with Policies SP4.1 and DM10 of the 2018 Plan insofar as they seek high quality design which respects local character.

Other Matters

10. The application was made on the basis of favourable advice from Council Officers and was recommended for approval to the Committee. The Committee overturned the recommendation and although this is understandably frustrating for the appellant, the Committee's decision was right for the reasons I have already given.
11. The proposed development would provide two additional dwellings and national policy in the Framework very clearly supports the Government's objective of boosting the supply of housing, including by bringing forward small sites. However, there is nothing to suggest any shortfall in the Council's housing land supply and so this benefit would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. Interested parties have raised concerns related to traffic, parking and the provisions of restrictive covenants but, in light of my findings in relation to the main issue of the appeal, my decision does not turn on these matters.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this. Consequently I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR