



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/24/3347984

Woodways, Balcombe Road, Pound Hill, Crawley, West Sussex RH10 7SY

- 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 and Mrs Heighton against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2023/0563/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of ground floor rear / side extension & replacement double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a ground floor rear / side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the replacement double garage and planning permission is granted for the replacement double garage at Woodways, Balcombe Road, Pound Hill, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 7SY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CR/2023/0563/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (i) Location Plan Drawing Number 05P Rev A, (ii) Site Block Plan Drawing Number 04P Rev A, and (iii) Floor Plans & Elevations Proposed Garage Drawing Number 03P.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as those shown on the approved plans and planning application form dated 23 September 2023.

Procedural Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. The updated Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.
3. I am aware that the Crawley Local Plan 2023-2040 (CLP2040) was adopted by the Council on 16 October 2024 and replaces 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 The former development plan policies referred to in the decision notice, CH2, CH3 and CH12, are no longer in force or determinative to this appeal. The decision notice, however, also referred to emerging Policies DD1, CL2

and HA1 of the CLP2040 that have since been adopted and now carry full weight in the determination of this appeal.

4. Amended plans were submitted during the planning application. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the appeal on the amended set of plans the Council listed in its decision notice.

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 within a spacious plot containing a garage, driveway and front and rear garden areas. The property is an attractive building that dates from the late 19th Century with decorative brickwork, gable projections, bay windows, open front porch and two decorative chimney stacks. The appeal property is connected to the adjacent dwelling, the Moat House.
7. The proposed development includes two component parts. The first is a single storey extension to the dwelling that would be set behind a new brick wall running perpendicular to the dwelling. The second aspect is a replacement double garage.
8. The information before me identifies that the property was included in the Council's most recent review of heritage assets¹ where it was concluded it has status as a non-designated heritage asset. The Council's review identified that the building is attractive with similar brickwork and architectural form to the adjacent Moat House and represents an impressive Victorian elevation to the street scape with its pedimented dormer windows and decorative chimney stacks contributing greatly to the locality. I understand that the appeal property has group value with the Moat House due to their similar detailing and historic association with the Worth Park Estate. The significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset, therefore, derives from its architectural quality, contribution to the street scape and historic associations including group value with the Moat House.
9. Policy HA1 of the CLP2040 states that proposals affecting the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be considered according to the scale of any harm or loss, and the asset's significance, in line with local and national policy. Paragraph 216 of the Framework states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the planning application and requires a balanced judgment to be taken having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
10. The proposed extension would project out beyond the existing side and rear elevations resulting in the loss of the existing stepped arrangement of the host property. The resulting extension, due to its excessive footprint and projection beyond existing elevations, would dominate the space it would fill at ground floor level and not appear as a subservient addition to the property.
11. The extension would also result in the loss of existing ground floor doors, windows and decorative brickwork. These features at present contribute positively to the

¹ Crawley Borough Council Non-designated Heritage Asset Review – Local Heritage List (Appendix A1) 2020

architectural quality of the building as they match and are consistent with similar details on the upper floors. The appeal proposal would replace these existing ground floor details with a different style of door and brickwork decoration, which would jar and not relate well to the existing decorative features that would be retained. The resultant effect in both scale and appearance would be a discordant appearing development between the ground and upper floors.

12. Moreover, the building would be sited on a raised platform and result in the height extending up to just below the upper floor windows. This would undermine the first-floor architectural features due to the proximity and scale of the proposal that would dominate the appearance of the rear of the property. The flat roof, with its two levels, would also not relate well to the existing roof form at the property.
13. The proposed wall would extend beyond the dwelling and screen the extension from most public views other than part of the proposed flat roof. The wall, however, would be around 3.3m in height that would of itself appear as a substantial addition to the property even whilst being set back from the front elevation. The wall would be constructed largely of brick that when combined with the height would present as an excessively large blank façade. The proposed elements of detailing within would be inconsequential to the overall appearance of the wall, which would appear as an unduly stark and dominating addition. Accordingly, the wall would not relate or assimilate well with the host property.
14. I acknowledge that the impact of the extension and wall would be limited in terms of public views and be contained mainly to within the site. The features of the pedimented dormers and chimney stacks highlighted in the Council's review and how they would appear in the street scene would also not be significantly impacted by the proposal. However, the building's significance as a non-designated heritage asset is not solely derived from these features; it is also due to the building's consistent existing architectural form and appearance that would be unacceptably changed by the proposal as described earlier in this decision.
15. Overall, the extension and wall would not be subservient or sympathetic additions to the property. The scale, form, layout, appearance and detailing would result in unduly dominant additions that would disrupt and alter the appearance of the dwelling. This would unacceptably harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset through loss of the building's architectural coherence and quality.
16. I have had regard to the appellant's family requirements, which I acknowledge. I also note the appellant's frustrations encountered with the planning process. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified to the non-designated heritage asset from the extension and wall, which would be significant due to the loss of period architecture features, excessive scale and incongruous appearance. I also note that the adjacent property at the Moat House is subject to a planning application for various works albeit this is a separate matter to the appeal before me and does not provide any justification for the harm identified.
17. To conclude, I find that, when considering all material considerations and applying a balanced judgment, the extension and wall would result in unacceptable harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. Accordingly, the extension and wall part of the proposal would be contrary to Policies DD1, CL2 and HA1 of the CLP 2040, which require development to be of high-quality design and to enhance heritage assets and settings. The proposed extension would also not

accord with the requirements of the Framework in terms of its design and impact on the non-designated heritage asset.

18. Turning now to the proposed garage, it would be located in the same location as the existing garage albeit larger in terms of footprint and height. The increase in scale can, however, be accommodated within the site comfortably without giving rise to any adverse impacts on the host property given the separation distance that would be retained. Due to the levels of the land the proposed garage would also not be prominent within the street scene or result in any material harm to it over and above the existing situation. Accordingly, the proposed double garage is acceptable and accords with Policies DD1, CL2 and HA1 of the CLP2040. As this could be constructed separately from the other part of the proposal, I determine that a split decision is appropriate and grant planning permission for the double garage subject to conditions, which are discussed in the following section.

Other Matters

19. An objection was submitted to the planning application identifying issues with a fence, landownership, access and drainage. However, I agree with the Council's conclusions on these other matters raised and do need to consider them further in this decision.

Conditions

20. I have considered which planning conditions are required having regard to the tests contained in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). It is necessary to include the standard time limit condition for the parts of the development that I have allowed. It is also necessary to attach a condition to specify the approved plans to provide clarity on what has been approved. I have also included a condition to require that the materials match those shown within the application information, which I conclude would be appropriate in design terms and necessary to control by condition to ensure they are constructed as proposed.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that a split decision is appropriate, and the double garage is allowed and granted planning permission, and the extension is dismissed and refused planning permission.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR