



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2019

by A Thompson BSc BTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/19/3226295

22 Dene Tye, Pound Hill, Crawley, RH10 7TS

- 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 J Nayler against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2018/0831/FUL, dated 5 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension over existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two storey and part first floor front extension over the existing garage, re-clad existing dormer window with dark grey boarding and install two windows on the western flank elevation at 22 Dene Tye, Pound Hill, Crawley, RH10 7TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2018/0831/FUL, dated 5 November 2018 and 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: J400-150 RevB.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's description of development¹ more fully describes the extent of development that is proposed and was used by the appellant on his appeal form. Accordingly, I have adopted this description, rather than the description set out on the application form, in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of 22 Dene Tye (the host property) and the surrounding area.

¹ As set out in the Council's decision letter for application CR/2018/0831/FUL dated 12 February 2019

Reasons

4. Dene Tye is a pleasant residential road, comprising mainly detached properties of similar age, but varying in scale, design, materials and plot layout. Many of the properties appear to have been extended and modified since construction.
5. The host property has previously been extended, including through the provision of a substantial dormer in the cat slide roof on the left hand side of the property, when viewed from the road. Because of the staggered building line of the dwellings along this part of Dene Tye, the right hand side of the host property is set well behind the frontage of the neighbouring property, No 20 Dene Tye.
6. The recent addition of a substantial 2-storey gable front extension at No.20, immediately adjacent to the boundary with the host property, has added to the dominance and sense of enclosure No.20 creates in relation to the host property.
7. The front extension would project about 1.5 metres in front of the host property. It would not be prominent within the street scene, as it would be largely hidden behind the front gable of No.20 when the site is viewed from the west and would be set against, and subservient to, the flank wall of No.20 when viewed from the east.
8. The front extension would not be subservient to the host building and, to a limited degree, would change its character compared to the original building, and therefore not fully accord with the Design SPD guidance. But the scale and massing of the extension would work well within its context. It would ensure the extended building, as a whole, responded better to the layout of the site, than the current building, and reduced the over-bearing impact of the next door property.
9. Furthermore, by aligning the eaves level of the front extension with the roof level of the dormer (rather than with the eaves of the main roof which would not be readily visible from the street), and through the use of consistent cladding, the proposed design would also better integrate the unsightly dormer with the main building, and reduce its visual dominance, compared to the current design.
10. The scale and mass of the gable front extension would reflect that found on the next door property, but be less prominent in the street scene. The ridge of the gable would be slightly lower than the current ridge height, further reducing the visual prominence of the extension.
11. I note the Council's concern about the first floor window in the front extension not matching the proportions of the existing windows on the front elevation, however, I consider the scale of the window to be well judged given the overall dimensions of the front extension and not discordant with the proportions of the other windows on the front elevation.
12. Given the variety of materials already found on the front elevations of nearby properties, including brick, tiles, render and weather boards; and the muted colour of cladding that is proposed, I do not consider that the provision of dark grey cladding would be harmful to the character and appearance of either the host property or the area. On the contrary, the colour proposed should reduce

the visual prominence of both the new gable and existing dormer and provide an effective contrast with the other materials on the front elevation.

13. I find that the development would enhance the character and appearance of the host property and not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly it would accord with policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (the local plan). Although there would be a degree of conflict with Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (Design SPD), this would not be substantial and would be outweighed by the design benefits that would be achieved with the development.
14. The local plan policies, and the Design SPD, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development is well designed in a way that relates sympathetically to the character and appearance of the development site and the surrounding area.
15. There would be no conflict with the relevant design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

16. Some local residents are concerned that allowing this development might set a precedent for other front extensions. I do not share this concern, as each case must be considered on its own merits and there are a number of site specific considerations in this case which are unlikely to be found in many other properties. I also note that the proposed development would retain sufficient parking space for 2-3 vehicles, in line with the Council's standards.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude this appeal should be allowed.
18. In addition to the standard time limited condition, I have imposed conditions to require the use of matching materials, in the interests of safeguarding the appearance of the area, and to identify the approved plan, in the interests of certainty.

Anthony Thompson

INSPECTOR