



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2022

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/22/3302481
52 Green Lane, Crawley RH10 8JP

- 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 Dhilp Bhatt against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2021/0893/FUL, dated 3 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing first floor flat roof dormer extension and replacement with part flat roof, part pitched roof with three duo pitched roof dormers at first floor level. Proposed ground floor porch to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the demolition of existing first floor flat roof dormer extension and replacement with part flat roof, part pitched roof with three duo pitched roof dormers at first floor level. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed ground floor porch to front elevation at 52 Green Lane, Crawley RH10 8JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2021/0893/FUL, dated 3 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not after than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Unless varied by other conditions of this decision, the development hereby permitted, insofar as it relates to the new porch only, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P100 A, P101a, P200A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the front porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed porch would not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling nor the local area. Having considered the proposal and visited the site I concur with that view. Accordingly, it is my view that the development proposed would not cause harm to the character and appearance to the dwelling and the local area and I shall make no further reference to this matter.

3. I find the proposed porch is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed roof alterations. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the porch.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area and that of the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a detached chalet bungalow located to the east of Green Lane. The building is constructed of yellow brick, with a dual-pitched roof of red tiles, which has three dormer windows to the front roof slope, and a large flat-roofed dormer extension to the rear. The property also has a single storey flat roofed rear extension which extends across its full width. The area is a residential area which features many similar chalet bungalow properties, some of which have been altered. I was able to see at my site visit a number of other flat-roofed dormer extension, including the immediately adjacent neighbours.
6. The proposal would extend the roof space through the removal of the existing flat-roofed dormer window which would enable the extension of the roof at ridge-height, to provide a flat roof with a pitch to eaves and introduce three dormer windows to the rear elevation. The development would remove the ridge point of the dual pitch and flatten the gable ends of the existing dwelling, providing a flat roof at the highest point of the dwelling.
7. Despite the use of matching materials, and the loss of the existing large flat-roofed dormer window, the overall roof extension would alter the character of the host dwelling, as a result of an unduly dominant extension which would be an incongruous feature. At my site visit I was able to see that the appeal site, including the existing gable ends and dormer window is visible from the street. Whilst I accept that there are large roof extensions to other nearby properties, the form and distinctive dual-pitch of the original roofs is maintained. The introduction of a flat roof to the appeal property would be an incongruous and dominant feature both to the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the local area.
8. The Council's Urban Design SPD¹ (SPD) states that roof extensions should not dominate by being too large, going on to state that flat roofs are generally discouraged unless they are in harmony with the existing dwelling. I acknowledge that the proposal includes loss of the sizeable flat-roofed dormer window and the insertion of the three pitched dormers to the rear, however I note that these would be larger than those located to the front elevation and the scale does not relate well to the windows below, and would contribute to the dominance of the proposals to the host dwelling.
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development to provide a roof extension with three dormer windows would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. This would be contrary to policies CH2 and CH3 of the Local Plan² and of the Urban Design

¹ Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document Supporting the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (October 2016)

² Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (December 2015)

SPD to which I have had due regard. These policies require (amongst other things) high quality design that reflects and responds to local character. As a result, the proposal would also be contrary to a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework which, in relation to new development, seeks to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR