



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/23/3329094

124 Railey Road, Northgate, Crawley, RH10 8DB

- 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 A Mohammed against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref CR/2023/0233/FUL, dated 5 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing store & erection of single storey side/rear extension and creation of new entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing store & erection of single storey side/rear extension and creation of new entrance porch at 124 Railey Road, Northgate, Crawley, RH10 8DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2023/0233/FUL, dated 5 April 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: AM 03 Site Location Plan & Block Plan; AM 02 Rev B Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations; & AM 01 Existing Floor Plan & Elevations

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 an end of terrace two storey dwelling on a corner plot alongside a wide grass verge on the side return at Mead Road and opposite an open space area. The locality is an estate of established residential character
-

with a variety of terraced and semi-detached homes, some three storey flats in close proximity to the appeal property, and generally streets with verges and some roadside tree planting. The local components come together to create an area of pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above and as the Council puts it would embody a single storey wrap around side and rear extension.

4. The Council is concerned that this extension and the planned porch, separately and cumulatively, would be over-sized, unduly prominent, discordant and, given immediate and wider context, be representative of poor design.
5. Looking at the porch first; I would view this as a reasonable proposition. On the terrace of 4 homes there are 3 types of porch presently in situ and two feature a single pitch roof not unlike that proposed. The host dwelling has a relatively wide front elevation, lounge window and garden and to my mind this porch would not appear alien or excessive. Furthermore, it is well removed from the side and rear extension and in reality it would be read in its own right not cumulatively.
6. Rear extensions locally vary considerably in size and form and I am not persuaded that in scale or design this scheme would be seen as inappropriate. The combination of pitched and flat roof would be a reasonable design approach here and whilst there would be considerable glazing this is not unusual in the remodelling of homes at ground floor level and would in part be shielded by boundary treatment.
7. The side extension would in part be replacing a solidly built store of no aesthetic quality and would visually taper the two-storey end elevation down towards the edge of the plot. The grass verge here beyond the plot is by any measure exceptionally wide and I would not see this extension as intruding into the streetscene. Notably, even in extended form, the host property would lie behind the building line of the nearby frontage properties which run along Mead Road.
8. I would say that fair use is being made of the plot with the linkage of the rear and side extensions and my assessment is that this arrangement will look comfortable on the ground when two dimensions plans do not do it justice. I see no need, in this instance, for an end of terrace to entirely replicate mid terrace homes and in terms of end of terrace form, and by means of example, the equivalent to the east has a direct linkage to a 3-storey building. The space around, the filtered views with trees and the general typology of the estate can all successfully accommodate some variety in aesthetic terms.
9. 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 *illustrative 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

10. 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 and I would concur that this would be in the interests of visual amenity.

Overall conclusion

11. 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