



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/23/3326366

28 Findon Road, Ifield, West Sussex, RH11 0BJ.

- 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 Geoff West against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2023/0186/FUL, dated 21 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension following demolition of existing front projection. Bifold doors to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property 28 Findon Road is a two-storey mid terrace dwelling.
4. The houses in the terrace were designed and built with identical simple flat roofed projections towards the street, comprising the living room picture window and front door. Over time, as here the front projections have been altered and lean-to roofs added.
5. No 28 is one of a short terrace of four houses, only one of which has retained the original flat roof front projection. Notwithstanding, the varying lengths of the replacement front projections and slightly different fenestration designs, by reason of the depth of the extensions and the pitched roof form a degree of uniformity between the dwellings has been maintained.
6. The appellant proposes a replacement front projection. This would extend some 0.8m or so further towards the road than the existing to be demolished. The pitch of the new roof would be shallower than the existing. Further, the new addition would be of masonry construction and would not appear as a lightweight structure, it would also introduce a new variation to the fenestration pattern resulting in less glazing overall. Each of these matters might alone be considered to have a limited visual impact on the property and the terrace. However, cumulatively I conclude in respect of the main issue that

they would result in an incongruous and dominant addition that would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part and thereby the street scene.

7. In addition, the appellant proposes the insertion of Bifold doors in the rear elevation. The Council have found this alteration to be acceptable. From all that I have seen and read I also conclude that this element of the proposal would not cause harm to any matters of acknowledged importance.

Conclusion

8. I consider the insertion of bifold doors to be acceptable. However, the proposed front extension would cause significant visual harm to the host dwelling, the terrace and thereby the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, to allow it would be contrary to aims of Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (Adopted December 2015), the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted October 2016) and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework, in seeking, amongst other things, to secure good design for all new development.
9. In reaching my conclusion I have had regard to the benefits of the proposal for the appellant. I also appreciate that the development would not impact in any harmful way on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. However, in this case these considerations do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR