
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: 13 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/19/3239232

18 Woodlands, Pound Hill, Crawley RH10 3DL

- 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 and Mrs Dave & Allison Bryne against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2019/0530/FUL, dated 16 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the removal of existing single storey rear projection. Proposed two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 20 Woodlands, with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling. It is elevated above street level and has a garden area and driveway to the front. The dwelling is at a lower level than the neighbouring property, No 20, as the road slopes down to the junction with Worth Park Avenue.
4. There is a covered walkway along the boundary with No 20. It extends beyond the rear wall of the appeal property with the remainder of the boundary being a tall brick and wooden fence, which extends the length of the rear garden. The dwellings on Woodlands are two-storey detached dwellings of varying styles, many of which have undergone extensions.
5. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey rear extension. It would be built to the same depth as the existing main rear wall and would follow the main side wall of the appeal dwelling, effectively squaring off the house. It would be set away from the side boundary and would have a gabled roof which would tie in with the main roof, albeit with a lower ridge height. The extension would provide an open plan rear kitchen, dining and family room and an additional bedroom on the first floor.
6. The adjoining property, No 20, is also set in from its side boundary and there is a separation distance of less than three metres between the two dwellings. It

has numerous windows on the side elevation; however it is the window on the first floor which serves a bedroom that would be most affected by the appeal proposal. Whilst this window is at a slightly higher level to the first floor of the appeal property and looks onto the side elevation, it does have oblique views into the rear garden and onto the street. Its orientation would also allow light into the bedroom. However, the appeal proposal, by virtue of its size and massing, would significantly reduce the light into this bedroom. It would also result in an unacceptable loss of outlook as views from inside would look directly onto a large blank wall with oblique views to the rear being significantly reduced.

7. The Council has produced an Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (October 2016). It states that two-storey extensions on detached dwellings should not encroach into an area measured by drawing a 60° angle from the nearest edge of a neighbour's window. Whilst this guidance normally applies to rear extensions it is a useful guide and is applicable, in this instance, due to the windows on the side elevation of No. 20.
8. I am mindful that the appeal proposal would be constructed in materials that match the existing dwelling and that it would not be visible from the street. I also acknowledge that it would be built using sustainable construction techniques. However, none of these matters either alter or outweigh my conclusions on the main issue.
9. The proposed two storey rear extension, by virtue of its excessive scale and massing, would have a significantly harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 20 Woodlands Road with particular regard to loss of light and outlook.
10. The proposal conflicts with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Council Local Plan (2015-2030), 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.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR