



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021

by Lee Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 JUNE 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/21/3271808

32 Swallow Road, Langley Green, Crawley RH11 7RF

- 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 Chris Toby against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2020/0708/FUL, dated 23 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is "Two storey side extension. Single storey rear extension. Front porch extension. Demolish existing outbuilding".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 1950s end of terrace dwelling with its main entrance on its side elevation, facing a small landscaping strip and footpath between the next row of terraced houses, typical of the 'new town' design approach within Langley Green. The proposed side extension would follow the existing roof form, replicating the existing side elevation gable end, but omitting any side elevation windows which appear to be a regular characteristic in the surrounding area. It would occupy the full width of the plot at ground floor level and be set in slightly from the side boundary at first floor level.
4. The proposed side elevation would occupy space that currently acts as an important separation gap between two rows of terraces at first floor level. This gap creates an open entrance to a footpath leading to another part of the estate, overlooked by side facing windows which create a welcoming environment. The effect of infilling part of this gap at first floor level with a blank elevation would not only reduce the pleasant openness of this break in the estate's built form, but would also create an oppressive side elevation, substantially enclosing the footpath when combined with the ground floor rear extension of considerable depth. This would be visible from the highway and would appear incongruous in the street scene, despite the appeal site being set back from the adjacent terrace.
5. The proposed porch to the front elevation would imitate a similar porch at the other end of the terrace. There are a range of different porch designs in the surrounding area and although there are remaining examples of the original entrance canopies of two specific designs present in the area, the loss of the

existing side entrance canopy and the erection of the proposed porch would not adversely affect any special characteristics of the locality that are worthy of protection. Similarly, the use of a soldier course above the front elevation ground floor window would not cause any unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the terrace, providing matching bricks would be used.

6. Notwithstanding this lack of harm, the proposed two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons I have given.
7. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Council's Local Plan¹ and the Council's Urban Design SPD². These require, amongst other things, residential extensions to respond to and reinforce locally distinctive patterns of development and to be of high-quality design relating sympathetically to their surroundings.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has provided a list of sites within Crawley which are claimed to have been granted planning permission for various extensions. The full details of those schemes have not been provided, but none of the addresses appear to be close enough to the appeal site to affect the character or appearance of its surroundings. Every case must be judged on its merits which, in regard to the main issue in this case, include its immediate context, and the details provided do not convince me that planning permission should be granted for the proposed development on account of the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Douglas

INSPECTOR

¹ The Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2033 (2015)

² The Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2016)