



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2024

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/23/3331761

36 Rosamund Road, Furnace Green, Crawley, RH10 6QF

- 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 M Whitby against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2023/0302/FUL, dated 18 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and front extension at 36 Rosamund Road, Furnace Green, Crawley, RH10 6QF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2023/0302/FUL, dated 18 May 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL/590/05 Block Plan; CBC 0002 Site Location Plan; PL/590/01 Existing Elevations; PL/590/02 Proposed Elevations; PL/590/03 Existing Floor Plans; & PL/590/04 Proposed Floor Plans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling at the end of a cul de sac with its side abutting an area of open space woodland. The locality largely comprises broadly similar semi-detached homes in an established estate residential format and in area of pleasing appearance not least given streetside trees and verges and the backdrop of the wider woodland at the end of the end of the street. The proposal is as described above and would result in appreciable extension of the property including a new two storey front gable projection.
 4. The Council is concerned that the overall quantum of extensions and the first-floor front projection would dominate the existing home in an unsympathetic
-

way and would unbalance the semi pair as well as appearing overly large and out of character in the streetscene generally.

5. Certainly, large scale and forward extensions in particular always need to be carefully considered. Taken in isolation, or if it were, for example, a more central part of a straight row of unaltered homes, I can appreciate why one might find this nature of scheme uncomfortable. However, taking the bigger picture, I find the situation here is not one where there is a need to be overly precious about scale, form, uniformity or symmetry. It is not always the case that extension work needs to be subservient and I would look at this more as remodelling. The fact that this dwelling is at the 'end of the run' alongside woodland is very pertinent to me. This larger home would in a small way turn the corner and would 'bookend' the view down the street. Seen against the backdrop of the woodland it would not stand out as alien and bearing in mind a larger than normal plot there is scope for a more substantial dwelling without any sense of cramped development.
6. Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2025-2030 are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they call for development to embody good urban design quality, embracing local distinctiveness and being sympathetic in scale, massing, materials and detailing relative to its context. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. Furthermore, whilst exceeding size *guidelines* the appeal scheme would also not conflict with the pertinent objectives of the Urban Design SPD which cannot be expected to cover every eventuality in detail.

Conditions

7. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with a requirement for works to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I would agree with this to provide certainty. The Council also suggests a condition relating to matching materials but as the application form and plans make this commitment, I would see this as unnecessary.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR