



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by **C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/25/3365572

10 Hazelwood, Gossops Green, Crawley, West Sussex, RH11 8DY

- 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 Robert Ellis Vietro-Burton against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2025/0053/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 10 Hazelwood, Gossops Green, Crawley, West Sussex, RH11 8DY accordance with the terms of the application ref CR/2025/0053/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: JBD/RH11/8DY/050 Rev A, JBD/RH11/8DY/051 Rev A and JBD/RH11/8DY/052 Rev A.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house within a wider residential estate. The house is set back from the road, as are other houses along Hazelwood, Filbert Crescent and nearby roads, with generous spacing between grouping of houses. This gives a spacious character to the area which derives from the overall pattern and layout of housing in the estate. There is a staggered building line along Hazelwood, so the appeal property and its attached pair of No. 12 are set further back than the adjoining pair of Nos. 6 and 8. No. 8 has been extended to the side, with Nos. 8 and 10 connected at ground floor on the same building line.
4. Policies CL2 and DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040 require, amongst other matters, all new development to be designed to respect, protect, build upon and enhance the positive aspects of the character of an area, and to be

of an architectural quality that complements its setting. The Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2016 provides guidance for preparing and submitting good quality development schemes to achieve successful spaces and places.

5. The SPD includes guidance for householder development, with specific reference for side extensions which states that to prevent a 'terracing effect' a 2m setback between a side extension and the adjacent property should be kept. The SPD further says that where a side setback is not suitable the side extension may be set in from the front elevation. The development guidance in the SPD says this solution may not be appropriate in all cases, and will be considered on a site by site basis.
6. The proposed extension would continue the existing building line at the property, with no setback. Whilst this would not be consistent with the general approach sought by the SPD, in this instance it would be an acceptable design. As noted earlier, No. 8 has been extended to the side with a setback extension which, due to the staggered building line on this side of Hazelwood, is positioned on the existing front building line of No. 10. This means that the proposed extension to No. 10 would continue that same building line, so meaning there is a continuous building line from the extended No. 8 through to No.12.
7. I acknowledge that, in filling in this gap on the same building line, there would be a run of buildings that would be of consistent scale and form. However, this would not give rise to a terracing effect that is harmful to the character of the area: as noted, the spaciousness in the area derives from the good setback of properties from the road and generous spacing between groups of houses, and the proposals would have little effect on that character. Conversely, if the proposed extension to No. 10 was to be setback from the front elevation of the house then that would lead to an oddly-designed row of houses whereby the side extension would appear set-in from both adjoining houses
8. The extension is shown to have materials matching the existing property, which are brick, tile, stained timber and uPVC windows. I see no clear reason why the appellant should not be able to match those as they are common building materials, with the house and extension not shown to be of particular novel construction technique. A planning condition can ensure this.
9. For the above reasons, this is a case where the detailed requirement of the SPD need not be sought, as the design, scale and siting of the proposed extension would be suitable for the host property as it would respect and build upon the existing character of the area. The proposals would therefore satisfy the development plan policies referred to earlier.
10. The development would therefore not be harmful to character and appearance of the surrounding area, and planning permission is granted. I have attached conditions suggested by the Council requiring matching materials and for works to be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

C J Leigh
INSPECTOR