
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/19/3227476
79A-81 Church Street, Croydon CR0 1RH

- 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 Remys Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 18/04551/FUL, dated 12 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is for alterations to the shop front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal relates to development that has already been undertaken.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to the ground floor commercial use of this building which is within the Church Street Conservation Area. The Council makes it clear that, although other alterations have been made, their objection relates to the roller shutter that has been installed.
5. I can see from the submissions that the previous shutter had some degree of visual permeability and that the one now installed has a 'pin-hole' design. This has resulted in a virtually solid appearance and the previous more open design has been lost. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and its SPG1 Addendum both advise against the use of solid or perforated external roller shutters in this location. The stated preference is for internal or open-link shutters.
6. I consider that the alterations made have resulted in a visually harsh frontage which has an unacceptable appearance within the conservation area. I acknowledge that the provision of an internal shutter-box is an improvement, but this is outweighed by the harmful effects of the solid appearance. I have taken account of the appellant's comments about security. Whilst I note that a solid shutter may be considered to be more secure, this needs to be weighed

against its harmful visual effects and within the conservation area I attach significant weight to these unacceptable effects. I have also taken account of the presence of other solid shutters in the vicinity but I have been provided with no details of their approval by the Council (if such exists) and the existence of other harmful features is no reason to allow unacceptable forms of development.

Conclusions

7. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies DM10, DM18 and SP4.1 of the Croydon Local Plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR