



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> March 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/24/3356817**

**37 Stafford Road, Langley Green, Crawley RH11 7LA**

- 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 Anita Manek against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is CR/2024/0485/FUL.
  - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 37 Stafford Road, Langley Green, Crawley RH11 7LA in accordance with the terms of the application, CR/2024/0485/FUL, 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: 24089 - PL-01, 24089 PL-02, 24089 -PL-03, 24089 -PL-04, 24089 -PL-05, and 24089 - PL-06.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property (No.39) with regard to light.

### Reasons

3. Stafford Road is formed of semi-detached properties of the same form with driveways in between. There is, therefore, a regularity and rhythm to the street scene. The front elevation of the appeal property appears to be unaltered, whereas many of the other properties have replaced the small open canopy over the front door with an enclosed porch.
4. The design and materials of the proposed extension would reflect the existing property. Extending the full width of the front elevation, it would be wider than additions to the other properties, which are generally entrance features located to the side of the main front window. Nonetheless, these vary in design, and I did observe a few properties with different additions, including those occupying the entire frontage and a two-storey projection. There is, therefore, a level of variation

and modification, and whilst the area would originally have had a uniformity, it has the capacity to accommodate some level of changes over time.

5. The Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) highlights that front extensions can be one of the most significant in altering the appearance of a property and guides against extending across the whole width. The proposal would, however, accord with the 1.5m depth restriction. Given the limited scale and integrated form of the forward projection, I do not find that it would dominate the existing property or be overly intrusive in the street scene to harm the overall pattern of development.
6. In conclusion, the proposed development would harmonise with the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, accord with policy DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023 to 2040, which, amongst other things, requires development to complement the existing setting and character of the area. There would also be compliance with the general provisions of the SPD, as a whole, and the National Planning Policy Framework, which support high-quality design sympathetic to local character, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

#### *Impact on the neighbour*

7. Extending across the full width, the extension would protrude forward adjacent to the front window to No.39. The parties advise that there would be an incursion into a 45-degree line taken from the edge of that window. I have not been provided with any technical details, but the extent of the projection accords with the SPD guidance and is also reflective of the scale of a porch permissible under permitted development rights. While part of the extension would be visible, given the limited massing and height of the projection, I do not find that the extension would be unduly imposing, and it would not be of a scale which would significantly restrict light to the room served by the large front window.
8. As such, I do not find that the development would fail to retain a good standard of amenity as required by policy DD1 and, therefore, would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

#### **Conclusion and Conditions**

9. I, therefore, conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and the plans in order to provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials of the approved development to match the existing property in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR