



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2021

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/21/3276172

Tollers Lodge, 79A Tinsley Lane, Three Bridges, Crawley, RH10 8AT

- 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 Mark Godfrey against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2020/0787/FUL, dated 30 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front and side extension at Tollers Lodge, 79A Tinsley Lane, Three Bridges, Crawley, RH10 8AT Coulsdon, CR5 2DQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2020/0787/FUL, dated 30 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01 Rev 0, 02 Rev D and 03 Rev A
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The Appeal site is located within an area where the varied range of dwelling types and designs and informal building lines all contribute to the diverse character and appearance of the locality. Many of the dwellings are built up to or close to their side boundaries and in the vicinity of the appeal site some of the dwellings have attached or detached garages to the front of them. Others have front canopy porches and front projections which stretch across at least half the width of the dwellings. Other front features include catslide roofs, dormer windows, projecting single storey gable and flat roofed extensions and balconies.

4. The appeal property comprises a modest sized bungalow with a fully hipped roof, irregular fenestration and a dormer window on its north facing roof slope. It is set back from the street scene behind a parking area, garage and tall brick wall, which enclose and screen the main private garden area from the street scene. The appeal dwelling is flanked to the north by a comparatively large chalet style house which sits closer to the road. This dwelling projects up to its side boundaries and has a large attached flat roofed garage projecting to the front of it. Immediately to the south of the appeal site is an access driveway, beyond which is another chalet style house which also sits closer to the road than the appeal dwelling. The driveway to the side of the appeal site serves a large detached house located to the rear of the appeal site.
5. Due to the modest size and recessed location of the appeal dwelling, together with the wall and garage to the front of it, the walls of the appeal dwelling are not visible from the street scene. The lower part of the roof of the appeal dwelling can only be seen from a short stretch of the road to the front of the dwelling. Where it can be glimpsed it is visually insignificant and unnoticeable. This is due to the prominence of the adjacent dwellings and the garage and wall to the front of the appeal dwelling.
6. Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP) Policy CH3 and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (Framework), seek to ensure that new development is of high quality design and relates sympathetically to its surroundings. The Crawley Borough Urban Design Guide 2016 (UDG), seeks to provide clear guidance on urban design. It advises that front extensions should not project across the full frontage of the property. They should be subservient to the host dwelling, only project 1.5 metres from the front wall of the dwelling and be in keeping with the character of the host property and the area. Side extensions should avoid creating a terracing effect.
7. The proposed single storey extension would wrap around the northeast corner of the dwelling. To the side it would project approximately half way down the side elevation and to the front it would project more than half way along the front elevation. The extension would be single storey with a shallow crown roof and would project 1.5 metres out from the dwelling. It would be constructed from external materials to match the host dwelling.
8. Whilst the design of the proposed extension is modern, it respects and is subservient in size, proportions and materials to the host dwelling, whilst being clearly distinguishable from it. The proposed full length windows would relate appropriately to the adjacent private garden area. As with the existing dwelling, the proposed extension would be extremely well screened from the street scene. Where it could be seen, it would be against the backcloth of the host dwelling. Due to its recessed siting, modest size and hipped roof the resultant dwelling would not have a terracing effect on the street scene. It is also noted that the proposal would not affect any trees identified on Tree Preservation Order No. P16.10.20. As stated by the Council, it would not materially impact on the root protection areas of any existing trees.
9. The Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching external materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. Both of these conditions are necessary to ensure that the extension respects the host building and in the interests of certainty.

10. I conclude that the proposal would respect and blend in appropriately with the host dwelling and the area. It complies with LP Policy CH3, the advice set out in the UDG and the Framework.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR