



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

by J Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/W/22/3294185

19 Langstone Close, Maidenbower, Crawley RH10 7JR

- 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 Mrs Marion Strachan against Crawley Borough Council.
- The application Ref CR/2021/0710/FUL, is dated 21 September 2021.
- The development proposed is Two storey front and side extension over existing garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for Two storey front and side extension over existing garage is refused.

Reasons

2. Having regard to the Council's main concerns and its purported reason for refusal, the main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
3. The appeal site is situated in a mainly residential area. Langstone Close is part of an estate where detached dwellings of varied styles are set back from the curving road and its related shared surfaces by front gardens and/or drives. The dwellings at 15 to 19 (consecutive) Langstone Close are reached by a shared surface from the roughly north east end of Langstone Close. The appeal dwelling and the dwellings next door at 18 and 20 Langstone Close have a stepped relationship with one another, which is important to the spacious suburban character of the estate, and to the local pattern of development.
4. The mostly 2 storey appeal dwelling includes a side gabled rear range and a front facing gabled wing with decorative features and a catslide roof, which integrates with the low-key gable roofed garage that projects well forward from the front of the dwelling. The dwelling also includes a shallow lean-to canopy over the front door and the projecting ground floor window, which also integrates with the garage roof. Due to its well-articulated form, traditional style and detailed design, the appeal dwelling makes a positive contribution to the street scene in Langstone Close, and to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The proposal would include a 2 storey gabled front extension, which would be over half the width of the dwelling and as deep as the existing garage. Because the proposal would partly overlap the existing front facing gable, it would look harmfully discordant, and the catslide roof, which is important to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, would be gone. As the proposal's scale,

form, siting and detailed design, including the inset storm porch with its narrow column, would be harmfully at odds with the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, it would look incongruous in the Langstone Close street scene.

6. Much of the proposal's bulky form would be at first floor level and above at the front of the existing dwelling, and its ridge would be as tall as the rear range, so the proposal would dominate the appeal dwelling in views from Langstone Close and the shared surface. Moreover, as the front of the proposal would almost line up with the dwelling next door at 20 Langstone Close, the important openness in the existing front garden and drive, which contributes positively to the local suburban character and to the pattern of development within the well-planned estate, would be unacceptably eroded.
7. The existing vegetation in the front garden could not reasonably be controlled by condition for more than a few years, so it could not be relied upon to partly screen the proposal in the long term. Whilst the proposal aims to make efficient use of land, and its benefits would include jobs during construction, they would not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the sense of place.
8. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy CH2 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) which aims to reinforce locally distinctive patterns of development, and LP Policy CH3 which seeks respect for context and high quality design, as well as the guidance in the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks well-designed places.

Conclusion

9. I have found that the proposed development would be contrary to the Development Plan when taken as a whole. The other considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not outweigh that conflict.
10. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reid

INSPECTOR