



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

by S Burch BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L5240/W/25/3375605

3 - 7 South End, Croydon, CR0 1BE

- 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 Noor Jhaveri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Croydon.
 - The application Ref is 25/01034/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for the creation of a new restaurant frontage, including new glazing and doors, new finishes and new awnings to front elevation. The addition of new kitchen plant equipment and external enclosure to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the creation of a new restaurant frontage, including new glazing and doors, new finishes and new awnings to front elevation. The addition of new kitchen plant equipment and external enclosure to rear of property at 3 - 7 South End, Croydon, CR0 1BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01034/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The noise level from any air handling units, mechanical plant, or other fixed external machinery shall not be greater than 10db below the lowest measured background noise (LA90, 15 minutes) as measured one metre from the nearest affected window of the nearest affected residential property.

Preliminary Matters

2. It was evident from my site visit, and from the evidence before me, that the development has already been carried out. I have considered the appeal accordingly.
3. The appeal does not relate to advertisement consent. In the interests of precision, I have therefore removed the reference to illuminated signage from the description of development used in the heading above and from my formal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the shopfront on the character and appearance of the host building and the area, including the locally listed building at 1 South End.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to a property on South End. The ground floor of the property appears to be in use as a restaurant. The surrounding area comprises mainly commercial units at ground floor level and residential or office units on

upper floors. The building is mock Tudor style, however the surrounding area is relatively varied in architectural style and character.

6. The appeal property is located next to a locally listed building at 1 South End (No.1). The Council also state that the appeal property, although not listed, is considered a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). There is no statutory listing process for NDHA's nor any formal definition of them in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) indicates that non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places or areas identified by plan making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets. Whilst I am unaware as to whether the Council has followed the advice in the Guidance in identifying the buildings as such, the Guidance is clear that in some cases local planning authorities may also identify non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process on planning applications.
7. Paragraph 216 of the Framework states that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect NDHA's, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. No local listing entries, or similar, have been provided. Nonetheless, to my mind, the significance of the appeal property is derived from its mock Tudor style and detailing, which is most prevalent on the upper floors. The significance of No.1 is derived from its traditional features and materiality, which are also most prevalent on the upper floors.
8. Whilst the fascia is slightly larger than those at the neighbouring properties, the increased depth is negligible and relates well to the style and scale of the building. Additionally, it does not detract from the architectural merit of the upper floors and is similar in size to other shopfronts within the wider area.
9. The Council contend that the depth of the tiled stallrisers on either side of the window display is excessive, and the loss of vertical emphasis from the horizontal glazing panels breaks up the rhythm that was evident prior to the development. Whilst I accept that the frontage may differ to what was there previously, I consider that the new design offers a modern interpretation, and whilst somewhat contrasting with the upper floors, complements the overall style of the building and does not detract from its significance. The muted orange tiles and timber boards positively relate to the traditional brick on the upper floors, offering a modern interpretation in terms of their tone, style and bonding.
10. There is limited substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the building was previously subdivided into individual shopfronts. In any case, I consider that the wider frontage at ground floor level is reflective of the pattern of commercial uses at ground level and residential or office uses on upper floors. I do not find harm in this regard. The awnings are relatively in keeping with the commercial character of the area and do not detract from the significance of the host building or neighbouring locally listed building at No.1.
11. Overall, I consider that the scheme ensures good design and respects the scale, character, materials and features of the existing building. It therefore does not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. In this regard, it also does not result in harm to, and would preserve the setting of,

the locally listed building at No.1. The scheme therefore complies with Policies DM10, DM11 and DM18 of the Croydon Local Plan and Policies D4, D8 and HC1 of the London Plan. Collectively, amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure high quality design that responds positively to the existing character of an area and preserves the setting of heritage assets. I also find no conflict with the Shopfront and Signs Supplementary Planning Guidance No.1 in this regard.

Conditions

12. I have attached the suggested condition relating to noise levels from any air handling units, mechanical plant or other fixed external machinery, in the interests of the living conditions of neighbours. Given the development has already taken place, a condition relating to time limits or approved plans is not necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

S Burch

INSPECTOR