



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2022

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/21/3292097

5 Punch Copse Road, Three Bridges RH10 1RE

- 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 Mrs E Winder against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2021/0638/FUL, dated 27 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing flat roofed porch & canopy. Two new bay windows and front door with side lights & canopy over.
-

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 dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling, which in common with its immediate neighbours either side, has a centrally located, flat roof front porch, which projects out at an angle. The somewhat unusual design provides the dwelling with an entrance and also integrates further glazing and a second entrance door to one side. On the other side of the porch, set slightly away from it, is a window serving the front lounge. The building's appearance and the design of the porch is said by the Council to reflect the style of 1950's New Town housing in the area.
4. Other properties in Punch Copse Road are generally of similar size and appearance albeit some have been subject to minor alteration. There is a range of front porch designs, although few others are of the exact same style and design as that at the appeal property. Some have a similar style and/or fenestration pattern to that of the appeal property but are straight fronted rather than project at an angle. Others appeared to have been altered or extended. Most retain a flat roof design although there are a few examples where a dual or mono pitch roof has been used. Despite this variety, the front elevations generally display a consistency of appearance in terms of size, materials and window patterns, with the porches being a subservient feature.
5. The proposal would remove the existing porch together with the integrated front window and door and replace them with a single new central door and two new curved bay windows either side. A mono-pitch canopy would be positioned above the windows and door, running across the full width of the

dwelling's front elevation. These alterations would dominate the front elevation and disrupt the building's existing design and composition. They would go well beyond the minor changes which have already occurred elsewhere in the street, appearing incongruous and out of keeping with the neighbouring dwellings and the prevailing character of the street scene more generally.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. Accordingly, it would be contrary to the aims of Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan which, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development integrates with existing buildings and reinforces an area's character.
7. Furthermore, the proposal would also be contrary to the guidance in the Council's 'Urban Design' Supplementary Planning Document, 2016 which, amongst other things, advises that works to front elevations should be subservient to the rest of the house, not extend across the whole width of the property, and be in keeping with the character of the area and property.
8. The proposal would also be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I am mindful of the benefits these alterations would have for the appellant in terms of assisting with heat retention and allowing other internal changes to be made to the dwelling. However, the weight I could attach to these factors would not outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan that I have identified and to which I ascribe substantial weight.
10. The appellant notes that the works would be carried out to a high standard and that no neighbours objected to the proposal. However, these factors do not mean that the current scheme is acceptable and do not in any event absolve me from making an assessment as to its effects in regard to the main issue of the case.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene and would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR