



---

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 September 2021

**by H Miles BA(hons), MA, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 September 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/W/21/3274090**

**42 Milton Road, Pound Hill, Crawley RH10 3AY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Aftab Baig against Crawley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref CR/2020/0727/FUL, is dated 13 November 2020.
  - The development proposed is a single storey front extension, two storey rear / side / front extension, single storey rear extension, raised roof to existing single storey rear side projection and demolition of existing garage to create fully detached dwellings.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a single storey front extension, two storey rear / side / front extension, single storey rear extension, raised roof to existing single storey rear side projection and demolition of existing garage to create fully detached dwellings is refused.

## Preliminary Matter

2. During the consideration of this appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 (the Framework) has been published. Both main parties have had the opportunity to submit comments on the relevance of the Framework to this case.

## Main Issue

3. This is an appeal against the failure to give notice of a decision within prescribed timescales. However, in its evidence the Council states that, had it been in a position to determine the application it would have refused planning permission. Its main concerns are harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene from the two storey extension.
4. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

5. This side of Milton Road, including no. 42 on a corner plot, is characterised by houses of a similar form and appearance. Whilst details such as materials differ, the properties share characteristics including a single full height projecting bay, pitched roofs and gaps between dwellings, particularly at first floor level. The pattern of development includes houses arranged in pairs with a greater separation on one side than the other. Although at their closest point houses may be less than 2m away, the set back on the opposite side results in

a sense of spaciousness in the streetscene. Some properties have been extended, and there are single storey side garage extensions at both no. 42 and no. 40. However, these are mainly subservient ground floor extensions which do not detract from the positive characteristics described above. Overall, there is a pleasing sense of consistency and openness to the streetscene.

6. There are two storey side extensions at 10 Milton Road and 19 Gatton Road. These are in line with the main front building line and therefore differ from that before me now. In any event these types of extensions are not so common as to form part of the overriding character and appearance of this area.
7. The proposal would create a two storey side and rear extension with a second full height projecting bay to the front elevation. This would be a dominant feature in the streetscene, and detrimental to the consistent character of the host dwelling and its neighbours. Furthermore, although it would create some limited separation at ground floor, the proposal would noticeably reduce the gap between no. 42 and the boundary at first floor level. This would unacceptably erode the gap between the neighbouring dwellings, harmful to the sense of openness and the attractive regular pattern of development. The proposed flat roof to the two-storey rear element would also result in a roof form which is incongruous and visually jarring.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this respect it would be contrary to policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley 2030 Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (December 2015) which require high quality design taking into account the significance and distinctiveness of the site and its context and locally distinctive patterns of development, amongst other things. As well as the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (October 2016) which includes guidance regarding good urban design for home extensions.

### **Other Matters**

9. The proposal would increase the internal space available at this dwelling creating a modern family house close to services and public transport, making effective use of this site, and contributing to the housing mix in the local area. Nonetheless, the existing dwelling appears to offer a reasonable size and condition of accommodation and given the size and nature of the development these benefits are limited in their scale. Occupiers are likely to contribute to the vitality of local facilities, although as the proposed development is an extension the effect on the use of local shops and services would be marginal. During construction the development is also likely to create economic benefits for suppliers and create employment, albeit these benefits would be temporary.
10. The proposed development would include water and energy efficiency measures. Nevertheless, I am not persuaded that the extension as proposed is required in order to implement such measures. There is no dispute in relation to the effect on biodiversity or the quality of the garden area. However, the lack of harm in these regards does not weigh in favour of the development.
11. On the other hand, I have identified environmental harm with regard to the permanent and highly visible harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the limited benefits do not outweigh this notable harm. Therefore, the proposal is not sustainable development in terms of the Framework.

## **Conclusion**

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*H Miles*

INSPECTOR