



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 APRIL 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/23/3320174

11 Little Woodcote Lane, Purley CR8 3PZ

- 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 Mr Serajah McNevin against the decision of London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 21/03422/FUL.
 - The development proposed is subdivision of site, erection of detached dwelling house of two storeys plus habitable loft on land to the side of No. 11 Little Woodcote Lane, including electric vehicle charging points, landscaping and all associated site works, and re-using existing vehicular access, crossover, and off-street parking.
-

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.

Reasons

3. This part of Little Woodcote Lane is characterised by mainly semi-detached dwellings. Many have side additions and outbuildings, however these are generally single storey and retain a generous separation between the two storey dwellings with views through these gaps. This results in a positive open and spacious character to this road. On the opposite side of the road is mainly undeveloped green land with a few buildings, which contributes to this open character.
4. No 11 is part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings and has a large single storey side addition. The adjoining property at no 13 has a single storey element which appears to extend close to the shared boundary. As such the gap between these properties, particularly at first floor and above, makes a positive contribution to the important spacious character of this area.
5. There is a two-storey detached house at no 21A which has less separation from the neighbouring properties, especially above ground floor level. However, this arrangement is uncommon, and the overriding character remains spacious, particularly in the immediate surroundings of the appeal site.
6. The appeal scheme would remove the single storey addition and proposes a two storey dwelling between nos 11 and 13, subdividing the plot of no 11. The dwelling would reflect the height and detailing of the adjoining houses.

7. The proposed two storey massing plus gable end roof would be in close proximity to the two-storey side elevation with a similar gable end of the host dwelling, and close to the boundary with no 13. This would harmfully erode the important gaps between buildings at first floor and above and would unacceptably undermine the spacious pattern of development. This would significantly harm the open and spacious character of the road.
8. There is no dispute between the main parties with regard to the acceptability of the detail of the proposed appearance. However, the lack of harm in this regard is a neutral factor which does not weigh in favour of the development. There is also no dispute regarding the quality of the living conditions for future occupiers, car parking provision, or the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, this does not alter that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons set out above.
9. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to policies SP4.1, DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018, and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021. Collectively, amongst other things, these seek to ensure that developments deliver good design that positively responds to local character and respects the characteristics of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. The proposed development would provide one additional dwelling along with the social and economic benefits associated with this. However, taking into account the scale of the development, the benefits in this regard would be limited. As such these benefits would not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area identified above.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR