



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2021

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/21/3273013

77 Ewhurst Road, West Green, Crawley, West Sussex, RH11 7HH.

- 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 P Akhtar against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2020/0806/FUL, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Part of the appeal scheme proposes a rear extension, projecting some 2.5 meters from the rear wall of the dwelling. It is shown built over a single storey rear extension which has neither been built nor is part of the appeal scheme.
3. However, the Council states in its evidence that the ground floor extension has been the subject of an application through the householder prior approval system (Ref: CR/2020/0641/HPA), and it has concluded that prior approval is not required for it. Further, the Council advises that for the ground floor extension to benefit from the permitted development rights, it would need to be completed ahead of any of the proposed development before me being started.
4. Accordingly, in the event that I find the current proposal acceptable its construction would be subject to the ground floor extension having been lawfully implemented to the Council's full satisfaction prior to the proposed first floor addition being commenced.

Main Issues

5. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property, the pattern of development of which it is part and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 75 Ewhurst Road, in terms of its potential to appear over dominant

and overbearing and further to appear overbearing to the occupiers of number 79 while causing a loss of outlook, overshadowing and loss of light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal property, 77 Ewhurst Road, is a two-storey semi-detached house. The street scene is residential in character comprising spacious two-storey semi-detached houses with wide gaps between them.
7. The main facades of these pairs of semi-detached houses are asymmetric and incorporate a number of original key design features. Uniquely, other than relative minor alterations, replacement windows, insertion of roof windows etc the properties have on the whole retain their original design features. Further, the gaps between the dwellings have also generally been retained.
8. The appeal property, while retaining the original architectural features also maintains its original relationship to the neighbouring dwellings. Accordingly, as a result of helping to maintain the planned locally distinctive New Town development pattern and architectural design this dwelling along with its neighbours, makes a positive contribution to the established street scene.
9. The appellant proposes a first floor side and rear extension. The side extension, comprising a bedroom, would be built over the existing single storey garage/store which is close to the boundary of number 75. The rear extension, projecting some 2.5 meters from the rear wall of the dwelling would be constructed over a proposed ground floor addition, as yet not built, and would accommodate two shower rooms.
10. The proposed side extension, by reason of its proposed shallow pitched roof, in contrast to the existing roof pitch would denude the established three-dimensional form of the host property. In addition, the proposed first floor window facing the street by neither matching the size and proportions of the existing first floor street windows or contrasting with them would serve to erode the established fenestration pattern.
11. Further, the proposed first floor rear and side extensions would have two separate pitched roofs set at 90 degrees to each other. This would result in an awkward relationship between the two additions and the existing house causing harm to the form and architectural integrity of the host property along with the form and character of the house as extended. Accordingly, the extension as designed would thereby appear as an unattractive and incongruous addition.
12. Due to the size and position of the proposed side extension it would, if number 75 were to be similarly extended effectively infill the existing gap between the two dwellings. This in turn would cause harm to one of the established characteristics of the street scene.
13. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the pattern of development of which it is part and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area. To allow it would be contrary to the objectives of Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (Adopted December 2015) (LP), the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document Adopted October 2016) (SPD) and the

National planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development and the creation, retention or enhancement of successful places.

Living conditions

14. The proposed first floor side extension, due to it being set well back and just some 04 meters to the boundary to number 75 would introduce a prominent and bulky two-storey element clearly visible from both the garden and rear windows of the neighbouring dwelling. The visual prominence of the extension being significantly enhanced by its gable ended pitch roof. In addition to the first floor extension it is also proposed to form a loft storage area over the remainder of the existing garage roof.
15. In my judgment therefore the proposed side extension, when taken together with the provision of roof storage over the rear of the garage would have a substantial overbearing impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 75.
16. The Council are concerned that the 6.0 meter deep single storey rear extension, for which it has agreed that prior approval is not required, would, when taken together with the proposed first floor rear extension be unduly dominant and imposing. Thereby, resulting in an overbearing presence; loss of outlook; overshadowing; and loss of light.
17. The proposed first floor extension would only project about 2.5 meters from the rear wall of the main house and be set well away from the common boundary to number 79. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that the proposed first floor extension, which is before me, would to any significant extent add to any impact that the ground floor addition might have on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 79.
18. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the rear extension would not result in harm to the residents of number 79 as suggested by the Council. Nevertheless, the side addition would cause significant harm to the occupiers of number 75. Accordingly, to allow the proposed development would contrary to the objectives of LP Policy CH3, SPD and the Framework as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conclusions

19. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR