



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2019

**by Michael Simmons BSc(Hons) DipTP DipUD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 March 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/18/3216972**

**10 Devonshire Way, Croydon, CR0 8BR**

- 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 Ahmed Kamal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
  - The application Ref 18/03336/HSE, dated 4 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2018.
  - The development comprises the front porch and front walls.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch and front walls at 10 Devonshire Way, Croydon, CR0 8BR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/03336/HSE, dated 4 July 2018 and drawing number P/P2.

### Procedural Matter

2. The front porch and front walls have already been constructed and the application was retrospective. However, 'retention' as referred to in the decision notice, and the application and appeal forms, does not constitute an act of development. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought for the porch and walls, which is reflected in my description of the development.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. 10 Devonshire Way is a two-storey semi-detached property situated within a residential area. The area displays a range of house designs that includes a variety of front boundary enclosures, and different forms of porches and canopies above front entrances.
5. The porch subject to this appeal is set back from the front boundary to an extent that is not dissimilar to other porches and entrance features in the area. The Council states that the porch protrudes 1.45 metres from the principle elevation. This is not a significant amount bearing in mind the extent of the set back and thus it has limited visual prominence when viewed from the street.

Whilst it could be construed to be a relatively large porch, it does remain subordinate in scale to the building. Its detailed design includes a gabled roof that is a feature of the existing building, and materials which are in keeping with the existing building. Therefore, it does not present itself as an "obvious addition" as suggested by the Council.

6. For these reasons, the porch does not form an overly dominant feature on the building nor within the street-scene. Indeed, it is not untypical of the style of porches that are frequently constructed and is not out of keeping when compared with other development in the area. Taking these factors into account I found the porch to be respectful of the character and appearance of the existing building and its surroundings.
7. I note that the Council have not objected to the wall. However, the reason for refusal refers to "the proposals" and not exclusively the porch. The wall is not out of keeping with the variety of front boundary enclosures that exist along Devonshire Way.
8. Therefore, I conclude that development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal building or the surrounding area. Consequently, it accords with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (consolidated with amendments since 2011) and policies SP4.1, SP4.2 and DM10 of the Croydon Local Plan 2018 which seek to ensure developments' design is respectful of the character of the area. For this reason, it is also consistent with the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 2 on Residential Extensions and Alterations.

#### *Other Matters*

9. I have considered all the other matters that have been raised by local residents which are of limited weight and do not alter my conclusion on the main issue in this case.

#### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*MA Simmons*

INSPECTOR