



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/25/3364253

The Wyatts Two, Radford Road, Pound Hill, Crawley, RH10 3NW

- 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 Mark Furlong against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2024/0265/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Radford Road comprises detached properties of various styles and forms. They are set some distance back with trees and landscaping to the road, creating a spacious and verdant character
4. The appeal property is a two-storey house currently under construction. Projecting from the front elevation is an integral, double garage with a pitched roof. The proposed carport is to be sited alongside, with a small gap between the two buildings. Together, these elements would create a significant forward protrusion.
5. There is some variation to the siting of the properties along Radford Road, and due to the size of the plots and intervening vegetation, a strong building line is not a visual feature of the area. It is, however, defined by the setback and openness to the frontages. As such, the proposal would be an incongruous feature, at odds with the established pattern of development.
6. The materials and design of the carport respond to the house under construction and would be appropriate for the locality. The planning approval for the new dwelling also includes a 1.8m high wall along the front boundary, which is yet to be built, and the road is situated on higher ground. Even so, the carport, which is to have a pitched roof, would not be fully screened.
7. While similar in form to the garage, this already creates a notable forward projection, but wherein a substantial setback is retained, the introduction of the carport would significantly diminish this. Together, these elements would have an extensive scale and massing, exacerbating the visual presence of built form in this

forward position, which would be both a visually intrusive element in the street scene and out of keeping with the character of the area.

8. The development would therefore be an unsympathetic addition to the host property and out of keeping with the character of the area. Thus, it would fail to accord with policies CL2, CL8 and DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040 which together require that development is designed to respect, protect, and enhance the character of the site and wider area, recognising its distinctiveness, pattern of development and with the scale and siting of development complementing its setting.
9. There would also be conflict with the general provisions of the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), October 2016, which promote high-quality design, including the relationship with the landscape, spaces between buildings and the public realm.

Other Matters

10. A carport may be a structure found in urban fringe locations, nevertheless, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits. While I accept that the need for the carport does not have to be justified, the proposal is for a further ancillary structure as part of a replacement dwelling. The site was previously occupied by a bungalow, and the efficient use of land must be balanced with the appropriateness of the development for the character of the area and its integration with its setting.
11. I have reviewed the proposal in relation to the Development Plan, and the absence of objections does not change my conclusions. Unlike its neighbours, the site's frontage currently lacks landscaping, and this development would have no direct impact on the existing green infrastructure. I have not been referred to any specific conflict with the Green Infrastructure SPD also referenced in the decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR