
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/20/3250311

25 Bancroft Road, Maidenbower, Crawley, RH10 7WS

- 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 M Steer against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2019/0841/FUL, dated 21 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2-storey side extension over garage and loft conversion with front and rear velux.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 2-storey side extension over garage and loft conversion with front and rear velux at 25 Bancroft Road, Maidenbower, Crawley, RH10 7WS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2019/0841/FUL, dated 21 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos: 001A, 002A, 010E, 011E and 012C.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The application was amended through the submission of revised plans, which I have relied upon. These deleted an originally proposed rear dormer window.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a contemporary, two-storey, detached dwelling set within a residential estate development. The area comprises dwellings of varied types and sizes but with many repeat designs, all built from a mixed but consistent palette of materials. In keeping with the appearance of the other properties to this side of Bancroft Road at this point, No 25 has a 'barn style' hipped roof to one side. This roof design is repeated on a side attached garage. The appeal property has an extant planning permission (LPA Ref: CR/2018/0911/FUL) that includes the erection of a first-floor side extension over the garage. The approved scheme would repeat the roof form of the existing garage, with the raised ridge line proposed to be tucked just below the eaves to the hip end of the main roof. The appeal proposal seeks to vary the design of the approved side extension, making use of the loft space by raising the height of the roof.
5. Part 3 of the Council's *Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) – October 2016 gives guidance for, amongst other things, householder development. It accepts that side extensions to an existing property will be prominent by their very nature. The guidance however concentrates here on the need to avoid a terracing effect with an adjacent property, a matter which if of no concern in this instance due to the extension being set in from the side boundary of the plot by over 2m and recessed by around 0.6m behind the dwelling's front elevation.
6. In relation to side extensions the SPD does not express any specific need for an addition to be subservient or subordinate to the original dwelling. That said, in this instance the addition would be recessed, and the ridge would sit below the ridge on the main roof. As such, the form of the original building, including the shape of its hipped roof, would stand proud and would be clearly legible. Moreover, the side extension would be designed with a repeat hipped roof to match the appearance of the original and those nearby.
7. My impression overall is that the extension would appear simply as a slightly subservient sideways projection of the existing building, built with appropriately matching materials and detailing. It would be residential in scale and appearance, neither dominant nor discordant in relation to the host dwelling or its surroundings.
8. The Council's reason for refusal, as expressed on the decision notice, suggests that there is insufficient detail on the planning drawings to show how the partial retention of the existing barn hip element of the roof would be constructed. However, it is clear to my mind that the roof pitches involved would all match and tie in together. I am not persuaded that this element would be difficult to build.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials that are proposed to be used.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I find that the proposed extension would relate appropriately to the character and style of the existing dwelling and that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would display the quality of design required by Policies CH2: *Principles of Good Urban Design* and Policy CH3: *Normal Requirements of All New Development* of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030. For the same reasons I am satisfied that there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework as it relates to achieving well-designed places.
11. I have noted the Council's concern that the proposal could set a precedent for other similar extensions but in this instance I have found there to be no conflict with the development plan or national policy. Any future proposals for similar types of development would be considered on their own merits having regard to the specific circumstances of the case. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR