



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/D/20/3247121

4 Welcombes View, Coulsdon CR5 3FJ

- 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 Iam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref 19/05022/HSE, dated 23 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a proposed porch addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a porch addition at 4 Welcombes View, Coulsdon CR5 3FJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/05022/HSE, dated 23 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan @ 1:1250; block plan @1:500; existing plans 18/24-01 and proposed plans 18/24-02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Whilst the modern, detached houses on Welcombes View are similar in their appearance, they are not identical; subtle differences being evident in terms of materials mix, elevation and roof detailing of projecting bays and 'handed' versions of the prevailing house type. Within the residential cul-de-sac, open-sided porch canopies are common and are located in the angles between projecting bay and recessed main elevation.
4. The Council's 'Suburban Design Guide' (SDG) provides guidance in relation to porches, advising that those that are open to the street and an original feature forming part of the street's character should generally not be enclosed. The existing canopy would fall within the scope of the SDG's advice and its

replacement with an enclosed porch would fall foul of this guidance. However, although slightly larger than the existing canopy, the proposed porch would nevertheless respect the general character, appearance and prevailing pattern of canopies along the street.

5. To this end, the proposed porch would be broadly similar in its width to the existing canopy and would employ a similar lean-to roof with a hipped end, with roof tiles to match those of the existing house. That the proposed porch would project slightly forward of the already projecting two storey bay would be lost in longer views up Welcombes View, where the heavily articulated façades of the houses punctuate the street elevation with significant projection and recess.
6. Although the porch would differ from the prevailing style of open-sided canopy, it would respond to the general scale and appearance of the appeal property whilst its detailed design and choice of materials would respect and reflect those of the main house. The SDG does not expressly prohibit the enclosure of otherwise open-sided canopies, merely advising that they should not generally be enclosed. The proposed porch would not disrupt the prevailing character or appearance of No. 4 within the Welcombes View streetscene and would avoid harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, I am satisfied that it would secure the type of high quality design that Croydon Local Plan policies SP4 and DM10 seek to achieve, and upon which the SDG advises, and there would be no conflict with London Plan policies 7.4 or 7.6.

Conditions

7. In addition to the time limit and plans conditions suggested by the Council, which are necessary and reasonable in order to provide certainty, a condition to ensure the use of matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR