
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2019

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/19/3220186

2 Upper Woodcote Village, Purley CR8 3HE

- 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 Steve Morgan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 18/04246/HSE, dated 24 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is two storey front and single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two storey front extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 2 Upper Woodcote Village, Purley CR8 3HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/04246/HSE, dated 24 August 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Existing floor plans and elevations 3814, Proposed two storey front and single storey rear extensions 3814 and Location plan 3814/3, insofar as they relate to the single storey rear extension.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing house and the Upper Woodcote Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 2 is an attractive, two storey semi detached house with an existing two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions, set back behind a front garden. It is located in the Upper Woodcote Village Conservation Area which is part of the wider Webb Estate Conservation Area.

4. The *Webb Estate and Upper Woodcote Village Conservation Areas Appraisal and Management Plan* (CAAMP) describes Upper Woodcote Village as an interesting and well-preserved example of a model village set within the Webb Estate built in the early 1900s. The whole estate was designed by William Webb on the basis of 'garden first' so that the garden and landscaping would take priority over the building, with the houses not 'introduced for their architectural merit, but rather to show how any simple and restrained style of building may be made more attractive by Garden First methods'.
5. The houses within the estate are set within sizeable plots to adhere to the 'garden first' principle and are of a variety of designs. This is true of the appeal property, which while not of particular architectural merit, is an example of a simple building that is attractive in its garden setting and as such it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
6. The proposed front extension would be set back from the main front elevation of the building but forward of the recessed, two storey part of the existing building. It would have a part flat/part pitched roof which would extend out from the pitched roof of the existing building. New windows, larger than those in the existing elevation, would be introduced at first floor level. While the extension would be set back from the main front elevation, its size and shape, particularly with regard to the proposed roof and its relationship with the existing roofs, plus the introduction of large upper floor windows, would diminish the simplicity of the original design of the house. This would harm the character and appearance of the house.
7. In the context of the pair of semi detached houses, while these properties are not identical as viewed from the front as No 4 has a modest single storey front extension and large first floor windows to the original side projection, there is a degree of symmetry to this pair of houses that gives them a pleasing appearance. I consider that symmetry would be unbalanced by the introduction of the extension as it alters the roof shape and brings the entirety of that side part forward.
8. From my site visit, I consider the proposed front extension would be clearly visible both above the front boundary hedge and through the gates into the property from Upper Woodcote Village. It is also possible to view enough of the semi detached pair of properties that the imbalance that would arise from the front extension to No 2 would be noticeable which would harm the character and appearance of this pair of properties. This degree of alteration to the property both individually and as a pair would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
9. I consider the two storey front extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and the conservation area. It therefore conflicts with Policies SP4.1, SP4.13, DM10.1, DM10.7, DM18.1, DM18.2 and DM18.4 of the Croydon Local Plan (CLP); Policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.9 of the London Plan (LP) and the Webb Estate and Upper Woodcote Village CAAMP which seek among other things to ensure high quality design, protection of local character and the protection and conservation of heritage assets.
10. The harm to the significance of the conservation area would be less than substantial and therefore it is necessary, in accordance with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, to consider any public benefits from the proposal. I do not consider there are any public benefits that would

outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

11. The single storey rear extension would be a full width part flat/part pitched roof extension incorporating large glazed doors and would replace an existing single storey extension. This extension would not be visible from the street so its more contemporary design with large areas of glazing would have little impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Where the extension butts up against the single storey extension to No 4, it would finish below the ridge line of the pitched roof of that extension. While this would result in a mismatch with the height of adjoining extension and a slightly awkward appearance, the extension does not project beyond the neighbour's extension so its visual impact would be limited to No 2. I do not consider this would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing house.
12. I therefore conclude that the single storey rear extension would not harm the character and appearance of the existing house or the conservation area. It would therefore comply with Policies SP4.1, SP4.13, DM10.1, DM10.7, DM18.1, DM18.2 and DM18.4 of the CLP; Policies 7.4, 7.6, 7.8 and 7.9 of the LP and the Webb Estate and Upper Woodcote Village CAAMP.

Other Matters

13. The Council's decision referred to Policies DM18.5, DM18.6 and DM18.8 but as these policies relate to locally listed buildings, local heritage areas and war memorials, I do not consider them directly relevant to the proposal.
14. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties that have received planning permission in the conservation area. However, I do not have the details of the circumstances of these cases before me and in any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.
15. The appellant requests that a split decision be considered. As the proposed front and rear extensions are both physically and functionally severable I consider a split decision would be possible.

Conclusion and Conditions

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the single storey rear extension.
17. In this respect I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.
18. However, in relation to the two storey front extension the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

Inspector