



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2024

By N Perrins MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/24/3348097

1 Woodlands, Pound Hill, Crawley RH10 3DT

- 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 Dr M Uddin against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2024/0064/FUL
 - The development is for the creation of dormer on rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. The Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.
3. The Crawley Local Plan 2023-2040 (CLP2040) was adopted by the Council on 16 October 2024 and replaced the previous Crawley Local Plan 2015-2030 that was in effect on the date when the planning application subject of this appeal was determined. The former development plan policies referred to in the decision notice CH2 and CH3 are no longer in force or relevant to this appeal. The decision notice, however, also referred to the emerging policies DD1 and CL2 of the CLP 2040, which are now adopted and carry full weight.
4. As set out in the application form and as observed on my site inspection, the development has been completed and, therefore, retrospective. I have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling with dual pitched roof and large rear garden located on the west side of Woodlands. To the south of the site are the rear gardens of properties that front onto Worth Park Avenue. The character of the Woodlands and surrounding area is residential comprising mainly detached dwellings. There is consistency in the design of dwellings and use of materials with most properties using brickwork and red / brown tiled gabled roofs. Some

properties have been altered that provides variation within an otherwise uniform residential character.

7. The development has been constructed and comprises a rear dormer that extends almost the full width and height of the rear roof space. The dormer has been finished in dark grey cladding and window frames. The development has a flat roof, one full height window and two full height windows with Juliet balconies.
8. Policy CL2 of the CLP2040 requires all development to respond to and reinforce local distinctiveness. The Council's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD) provides additional guidance to supplement the policies of the development plan including containing guidelines for dormer roof extensions.
9. The SPD states that the development with good design in mind will relate appropriately to the parent dwelling's character and style, dimensions, materials and finishes of the parent dwelling and the character of the neighbourhood. The SPD also states that development should incorporate materials and colours that match the existing dwelling. With regard to dormers, the SPD states that they will only be permitted where they can be inserted without damaging the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area. Specific advice within the SPD states that dormers should be kept well below the ridge line, smaller than the overall width of the roof, away from the edges and take up no more than half the width of the dwelling.
10. The dormer is constructed across almost the full span of the roof and up to the ridge height of the host property. Due to its excessive height, width, depth and overall bulk, the development dominates the roof space within which it sits. The resulting effect is an overly prominent and top-heavy addition to the roof that appears at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Moreover, the windows are overly large and do not correspond to the size, type and position of windows on the lower floors of the appeal property. This creates a discordant and jarring appearance between the development and the lower floors.
11. The use of dark grey cladding and materials, whilst matching the colour palette of some existing detailing on the dwelling, does not match the key design features of the roof such as the tiles or brickwork. The materials used, therefore, accentuates the discordant, bulky and unduly prominent appearance of the development when viewed from the Woodlands street scene and the rear of properties to the south along Worth Park Avenue. Whilst there is some mature vegetation to the south, it does not have sufficient coverage to fully screen the development. On this basis the undue prominence of the development is detrimental to the character and appearance of the wider area.
12. The appellant states that the size of the dormer is no larger than what could be achieved under permitted development provisions¹. However, the evidence before me does not conclusively confirm whether this is the case or not. Moreover, it is not disputed by either party that the appeal scheme requires planning permission and is, therefore, not permitted development. In view of these circumstances, what could be constructed as permitted development at the property has no weight in this decision.

¹ As set out in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

13. I have also reviewed the examples provided by the appellant of other developments approved, built and under construction nearby. Whilst they demonstrate there is some design variation in the area, they are smaller in scale, less dominant and more subservient to their host properties than the development before me. These examples are, therefore, not directly comparable to the development in this case and consequently do not provide justification for the harm identified. I also note the support for the proposal from nearby residents, although this is a neutral factor in this appeal and does not outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.
14. The development, therefore, fails to meet the requirements of Policies DD1 and CL2 of the CLP2040. The development also does not comply with the guidance in the SPD or requirements of the Framework. Taken together, these seek to ensure dormers are of good quality design that respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area.

Other Matters

15. I have reviewed the concerns raised by objectors to the development relating to the retrospective nature of the proposal, drainage and impacts on privacy. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's consideration of these matters at the planning application stage and do not need to consider them further in this decision.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the development does not accord with the development plan and should be dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR