



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/24/3345700

27 Tushmore Lane, Northgate, Crawley RH10 8JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Khalid Khan against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2023/0731/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of double storey rear extension with white render finish & white render finish to existing external walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was amended during the application process and my decision is based on the plans as determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached single storey property on the north side of Tushmore Lane and within a residential area with a mix of single storey properties, chalet dwellings and two storey houses, most of which are well spaced on generous plots and in a verdant setting. There is a large industrial area to the north of the properties on the northern side of the road. Although some of the dwellings have been extended and altered, pitched roofs remain a predominant and characteristic part of the pattern of development and street scene.
5. The proposed extension would remove the existing rear conservatory and would extend to the rear over two storeys. There would be a crown roof; a flat roof, projecting from the existing ridge line, over the extension and enclosed within a modest pitched roof, with raised eaves level, to the sides and to the rear. Two large, full length projecting oriel windows would be at first floor level at the rear with additional smaller windows at the side, in obscure glass, and rooflights on the existing front roof slope.
6. The design form of the proposed extension, particularly its overall depth together with the very large crown roof would add a very bulky addition to the

existing property. The proposed scale and massing at the rear would be overly dominant in relation to the proportions and form of the existing property. The massing of the rear extension would be exacerbated with the two very large oriel windows that would be out of scale and proportion to the remaining fenestration in the property. The extension as proposed would overwhelm the form and proportions of the existing property and would therefore harm its character and appearance.

7. There would be the addition of rooflights and the property would be rendered, but the front of the property would be largely unaltered in terms of its form. However, and contrary to the views of the appellant, I consider that the scale and massing of the two storey rear extension would be seen in street scene views when approaching from either the west or the east. In such views the bulky two storey addition with its large crown roof would be visually intrusive and would harm the more predominant pattern of development of traditional pitched roofs. As a result, it would harm the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. It would conflict with Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, the Council's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context. The Council has also referred to Policies CL2 and DD1 of the draft Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030, which is now at a very advanced stage of preparation and I can afford weight to these policies in accordance with the stage reached in the preparation of the Plan.

Other Considerations

9. There would be no harm to the amenities of neighbours and there would be no impact on long distance views. Issues relating to flood risk could be addressed by condition were there no other matters of concern and planning permission were to be granted. However, the absence of harm in respect of these matters weighs neutral in the planning balance and does not add weight in support of the proposals.
10. There is no objection in principle to an extension to the property to create improved accommodation, but this proposed solution would not accord with the local and national policy objectives to secure a high standard of design which respects the local context.

Conclusion

11. 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, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR

