
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2020

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/19/3240877

22 Barnfield Road, Northgate, Crawley, RH10 8HQ

- 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 Singh against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2019/0488/FUL, dated 1 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension following demolition of garage. Re Application Ref: CR/2019/0266/FUL'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal on:
 - i) The character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) The living conditions of the occupiers of No 24 Barnfield Road with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, brick-built dwelling. Despite having subordinate single storey side additions that join the properties, the dwellings in this part of the street have the appearance of semi-detached dwellings. They are built in a gentle curve along Barnfield Road. The two adjacent properties, No's 10-20, are set back from the road frontage to form a short cul-de-sac, resulting in the appeal property being a particularly prominent dwelling in the street scene. The neighbouring dwellings are similar, being largely two-storey houses of a uniform design with good proportionality and rhythm.
4. The property has an area of hardstanding to the front and a large rear garden enclosed by tall timber fences. It has a single storey garage to the side, which is flush with the main front elevation, extends just beyond the main rear wall and runs alongside the side boundary.
5. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey side and a part single, part two-storey rear extension. It would provide a dining area, extended kitchen/living areas on the ground floor, and a new en-suite bathroom and dressing room for the

master bedroom on the first floor. The Council did not raise an objection to the ground floor extension and from the evidence I have before me I have no reason to reach a different conclusion.

6. The two-storey side extension would have a small set back from the front elevation and would be set in from the side boundary by approximately 0.75 metres. It would wrap around the rear of the dwelling and be the full width of the property at ground floor, with the first-floor element being set away from the side boundary of No. 24. The rear projection would extend approximately 4.3 metres beyond the main rear wall at ground floor level for approximately half its width, reducing to a depth of 3.3 metres along the boundary with 24. At first floor level, the rear extension would be set away from the boundary by just over 3.9 metres. The single storey element would have a flat roof and the side extension would employ a hipped roof and the rear part would have a gabled roof which would tie in with the existing dwelling.
7. The Council has produced an Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (October 2016). It states that extensions with good design in mind, will relate appropriately to the parent dwelling's character and style, dimensions, of the parent dwelling and the character of the neighbourhood.
8. The appeal proposal would be, by virtue of its excessive bulk, scale and massing, an incongruous and discordant addition that would create an unacceptable unbalancing effect on the host dwelling and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to two other developments. One at a dwelling at 32 Barnfield Road, however this case differs as the scheme was for a single storey extension. A further scheme at 27 Woolborough Road, however I do not have the full planning history of this scheme and I cannot make any direct comparison with the appeal proposal.
10. Concluding on this main issue, the appeal proposal conflicts with the Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan (LP) (June 2019) (2015-2030) and the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (October 2016), which require, amongst other things, development to be make a positive contribution to the area and be of a high-quality urban design.

Living conditions

11. The SPD states that two-storey rear extensions should satisfy the '60-degree test' as a means to determine their acceptability in terms of overshadowing and loss of light.
12. The Council is concerned that the depth of the two-storey rear extension would marginally breach the '60-degree test' when measured from the nearest edge of No.24's first floor rear window. I note from the application plans that a diagonal line has been drawn from the middle of the first-floor window of the adjoining property, however I cannot be certain of what angle this is drawn at nor can I be certain of extent of any breach. Nevertheless, from my onsite assessment, the extension would be positioned a sufficient distance away from the rear window and would be at a depth that would not result in any significant loss of outlook or light, when seen from inside that property or from its garden.

13. Consequently, it would comply with Policy CH3 of the LP and the guidance contained within SPD, which require, amongst other things, development to retain a good standard of amenity for all nearby and future occupants of buildings.

Conclusion

14. Whilst the development would not cause unacceptable harm in terms of the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24, this does not overcome the significant harmful impact to the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.
15. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR