



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/24/3338413

70 Maiden Lane, Langley Green, Crawley RH11 7QY

- 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 Dadalau against the decision of Crawley Borough Council
 - The application Ref: CR/2023/0694/FUL dated 28 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is erection of part single storey side extension and double storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - a) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the street scene, and
 - b) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbours at Nos 2 and 8 Swallow Road, with particular regard to loss of outlook and overshadowing.

Reasons

Issue a) Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house on the north side of Maiden Lane and within a predominantly residential area, with a mix of generally two storey semi-detached properties and short terraces. With very few exceptions the pattern of development in the local area includes open gaps between the pairs of semi-detached properties and the short terraces, together with generous grass verges to create a sense of spaciousness to the street scene.
4. The proposal would add a two storey side / rear extension and part single storey extension. At the front the extension at ground floor would line up with the front elevation of the existing house and step back at first floor level. There would be a gabled roof over the side extension, with a ridge line set down from the main roof ridge, with a lower hipped roof at the rear.

5. The proposed extension would extend to within 1 m of the adjoining property at Nos 2 and 8 Swallow Road, over two storeys and this would largely remove the open gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring property. This would result in a cramped appearance between the property as extended and the neighbouring property. This would detract from the more spacious pattern of development in the local area and would harm the street scene. A number of the properties have extensions and garages to the side but these are single storey only and do not remove the open gaps between the semi-detached pairs and terraces at first floor level and above.
6. The design approach has incorporated a number of different set backs to the elevations as well as the set down of the roof ridge level, together with the lower rear hipped roof. The combination of all of these would result in a convoluted design solution which would be visually discordant with the more straight forward and uncomplicated elevations of the houses as built. This would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property and would be visually discordant in the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the street scene. This would conflict with Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan (Local Plan), the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and in particular Section 12 all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Issue b) Living Conditions

8. The property to the immediate west contains two flats, Nos 2 and 8 Swallow Road; this property is set back behind the front elevation of the appeal property. The proposed extension would follow the front building line of the appeal property at ground floor with a set back at first floor, although the elevations would still sit further forward in comparison with the front building line of the adjoining building. There is no technical information before me, but on the basis of the plans and my site visit and taking into account the remaining outlook available from the front facing windows nearest to the appeal property, I do not consider that the scale of forward projection would be sufficient to adversely affect the neighbours in terms of loss of outlook. I am also satisfied that the extent of overshadowing as a result of the proposed extension would be very limited. It would not justify withholding planning permission in these regards.
9. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extension would not materially harm the living conditions of the neighbours at No 2 and 8 Swallow Road, with particular regard to loss of outlook and overshadowing. There would be no conflict with Policy CH3 of the Local Plan, the SPD and the Framework with particular reference to Paragraph 135 f), all of which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure a good standard of amenities for existing and future residents.
10. I am also satisfied that the living conditions of the other immediate neighbours would not be materially harmed, including in respect of overlooking and loss of privacy, loss of light and overshadowing and loss of outlook. The Council also did not refer to the effect on the living conditions of these other neighbours in their reasons for refusal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposed extension would not materially harm the living conditions of the immediate neighbours at Nos 2 and 8 Swallow Road. I have also noted that the proposal would seek to be sustainable both in its construction and use and that the property as extended would provide a better standard of accommodation for the Appellants. However, these findings do not outweigh the harm I have concluded to the character and appearance of the existing property and to the street scene.
12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR