



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/22/3292835

158 Weald Drive, Furnace Green, Crawley RH10 6NW

- 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 & Mrs J King against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2021/0749/FUL, dated 11 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and conservatory, erection of single storey front extension and part single storey/part two storey wrap around rear & side extensions with associated alterations including new timber cladding of front and rear elevation, creation of raised decking at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and conservatory, erection of single storey front extension and part single storey/part two storey wrap around rear & side extensions with associated alterations including new timber cladding of front and rear elevation, creation of raised decking at the rear at 158 Weald Drive, Furnace Green, Crawley RH10 6NW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2021/0749/FUL, dated 11 October 2021, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development used in the decision notice and the appeal form more fully describes the extent of that for which planning permission is sought and I too have used it in the heading to this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal premises is an existing detached, two storey dwelling. There is a variety of dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site although most are two storeys and have brick finishes with brown tiled roofs. The houses are generally set back from their site frontages and together with the spaces between them, the width of the road and grass verges, the area has a spacious character to which the appeal site contributes.
5. The appeal site is one of eight detached dwellings along this part of Weald Drive. However, given the positioning of these houses, and given their similarities in styling and palette of external materials to those used in the

- vicinity generally, these particular houses, whilst different by virtue of being detached, do not have a significantly greater presence in the street than other properties in the vicinity. Furthermore, like other houses in the area, some of these eight have been subject to alteration and extension, thereby further reducing their being seen as a distinct group within the overall street scene.
6. Whilst the proposed single storey front extension would extend across the full width of the existing frontage, it would integrate with the finished building. It would not dominate the frontage or appear unduly large or out of keeping with nearby properties. That the main entrance door would be relocated from the side to the front of the dwelling would similarly not be out of keeping with the dwelling itself or other houses in the vicinity. I am therefore satisfied that these works would not cause the sorts of harms to the front of the building or the wider street scene, which the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD) seeks to prevent.
 7. The two-storey side extension would reduce the gap at first floor level with No. 156 Weald Drive. Having regard to the positions of the dwellings, the height of the extension and the gap which would remain, the houses would still be read as separate buildings. In this instance the resulting appearance would not therefore create a terracing effect. The spaces between buildings clearly contributes to the character of the area but the proposal would not significantly diminish the spacious character of the area. Accordingly, the overall street scene would be preserved.
 8. Although the ridge of the side extension matches the height of the main roof ridge, given the stepped nature of the front elevation, the side elevation would integrate into the overall appearance of the dwelling. As a result, it would not appear overly dominant or have an overbearing impact within the street scene.
 9. Notwithstanding their objections regarding the side extension, the Council has not raised concerns in relation to the erection of the rear extensions; the effect of the proposal as a whole on the living conditions of neighbours, including those to the rear; the size of the retained garden; the decked area or the revised parking arrangements. Based on my own observations and the evidence before me I find no reason to conclude otherwise.
 10. Whilst a contrasting material can be a contemporary addition or a means to visually reduce a building's bulk, it can also sometimes be visually jarring. Given that the palette of main external materials used on houses in the vicinity contributes so strongly to the character of the area, I consider that in this case, a contrasting rendered finish would fall into the latter category. The appellants have indicated that they are agreeable to changing the proposed rendered elements to brick to match the existing dwelling. A condition to this effect would overcome this issue.
 11. Having had regard to the nature and scale of the works, the proposal would not have a significant effect in terms of water abstraction in the Sussex North Water Resource Zone upon the Arun Valley's protected Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar sites.
 12. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or wider street scene. As such, it would comply with Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan and the guidance in the SPD which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that

development in general is well designed and that works are in keeping with the character of the area and property.

13. The proposal would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

14. There will be some noise and disruption during the construction phase. However, this would be temporary and would not in itself be a reason to dismiss the appeal.
15. Concerns have also been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on property values. Such concerns are however outside the scope of this appeal.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition is required in the interests of certainty that lists the approved plans. As I have indicated, in order to protect the character and appearance of the wider area, a condition requiring the use of brick rather than render is also necessary.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions below.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 approved plans listed below:
2112-JNF-XX-ZZ-DR-A-100-P1 – Site Location & Block Plans
2112-JNF-XX-ZZ-DR-A-241-P3 – Proposed Plans & Elevations
- 3) Notwithstanding condition 2, no development above slab level shall take place until details of the finished materials to be used in the two-storey extension and single storey rear extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.