



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/25/3367354

30 Sheppey Close, Broadfield, Crawley, West Sussex RH11 9HB

- 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 Sofian Asif against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2024/0575/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two storey side extension and a rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Since the refusal of the original application, the appellant has submitted medical evidence in support of their appeal and a daylight/sunlight shading analysis. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on this evidence. I am therefore satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by the acceptance of this additional information.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of 32 Sheppey Close (no 32) and 22, 24, 26 and 28 Sheppey Close (no 22, no 24, no 26, no 28), with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site lies within an established residential area predominantly characterised by properties sharing a modest and consistent scale and appearance, set within proportionately sized plots. This creates a pleasant and coherent suburban pattern of development.

6. No 30 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the southern side of Sheppey Close. It features a cat-slide roof with a large dormer window and is broadly identical in appearance to its attached neighbour, no 32. The property occupies a plot that tapers to the north, resulting in a wider southern boundary and a narrower northern frontage. This configuration affords no 30 a south-facing rear garden and a generous wrap-around plot extending to the west. Beyond the western boundary of no 30 runs a pedestrian footpath with other properties sited on the other side, fronting onto the appeal site. This ensures that a generous gap is maintained between no 30 and these neighbouring dwellings.
7. Due to the excessive width and height of the two-storey side element, but also its limited setback, the extension would, when viewed from the road, unduly stand out as a disproportionate and incongruous addition which would fail to appear subservient to the appeal property. It would also unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, thus undermining their symmetry. From other viewpoints, including the footpath running along the appeal site and neighbouring properties, the combined scale and massing of the side and rear additions would cumulatively overwhelm the modest size of the original dwelling and harmfully disrupt the established character and pattern of development of Sheppey Close.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the hipped and lowered roof of the two-storey side element as evidence of subordination, highlighting that the extension would be finished in matching materials. However, given the overall excessive scale of the development, I do not consider these factors sufficient to mitigate the identified harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
9. The appellant has also cited several nearby developments in support of their proposal. However, aside from their proximity to no 30, none appear directly comparable in terms of scale, form or positioning. Furthermore, I do not have the full details of the circumstances under which they were approved, including the development plan policies in place at the time of their consideration. As such, I cannot be certain that a direct parallel can be drawn with the appeal before me. I therefore attach limited weight to these examples.
10. Concerns have been raised by the Council with respect to the proposed dormer window's size and bulk. However, from the evidence before me and my observations on site, these would reflect the existing fenestration patterns on the dwelling and the character of the wider area and in isolation would not be harmful.
11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, to which I attribute significant weight. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023 to 2040 (adopted 2024) (CBLP), the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2016) (SPD) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Amongst other things, these require proposals to include development form and architectural quality which complement the existing setting and character of the area, and seek to ensure that extensions relate appropriately to the parent dwelling's character and style and dimensions and are sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions – outlook and light

12. It is the Council's view that the single-storey rear element, by reason of its depth, would encroach upon the 45-degree line from the nearest window in the conservatory at no 32, resulting in a loss of light and an overbearing impact. However, during my site visit, I observed that the rear gardens of nos 30 and 32 are already separated by a tall boundary fence extending the full depth of the plots. Based on the evidence before me, the proposed extension would be of a similar height to this existing fence. Accordingly, I do not consider that the development would materially worsen the living conditions of the occupants of no 32 in terms of outlook, light, or visual dominance beyond the impact of the existing arrangement.
13. The proposed two-storey side addition would bring the appeal dwelling closer to nos 22, 24, 26 and 28. However, it would not occupy the full width of the plot, and a meaningful gap would remain between the extension and no 30's western boundary. This retained separation would help preserve the sense of space between buildings and overall maintain a visual break across the footpath. Moreover, the distance between the proposed western elevation and the principal elevations of the neighbouring dwellings would still exceed the minimum 10.5 metres required by the SPD, satisfying its spacing standards in relation to habitable-room windows and extensions.
14. The submitted plans show a 1.8-metre boundary fence along no 30's western boundary, which the Council accepts could be erected using permitted development rights. Positioned closer to the principal windows of nos 22, 24, 26 and 28, such a fence would enclose what is currently an open side of the site at ground-floor level. By comparison, the proposed two-storey side extension, set further away, would not cause a materially greater loss of outlook. The extension would therefore not appear overbearing, nor would it result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring occupiers.
15. As noted above, the appellant has submitted a daylight/sunlight shading analysis, which notably concludes that the proposed extension would not cause a harmful loss of light to nos 22, 24, 26 and 28. The analysis indicates only minimal additional shadowing, remaining within accepted parameters. In the absence of substantive contradictory evidence, and based on my own site observations, I see no reason to dispute these findings. As the extension would sit on the western elevation of no 30, but still east of the neighbouring dwellings, any shadowing would be limited to the early part of the day. Given the orientation and separation between buildings, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light for neighbouring occupiers.
16. Given the above, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of nos 32, 22, 24, 26 and 28, having particular regard to outlook and light. Consequently, it would therefore accord with the requirements of Policy DD1 of the CBLP, the SPD and section 12 of the Framework. Notably, these seek to ensure that development proposals do not cause unreasonable harm to the amenity of the surrounding area by way of overlooking, dominance or overshadowing and do not pose an overbearing impact on adjacent properties and create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

17. The removal of mature trees on the site's boundary does not form part of the appeal scheme, and the benefits that this may bring to the living conditions of neighbouring residents do not therefore weigh in favour of the proposal. The appellant has also referred to the proposal's efficiency and sustainability considerations and declared it would accord with prescribed parking standards and other development plan policies. However, these factors do not outweigh the identified harm or the conflict with other relevant policies.
18. The appellant explains that the proposed development is required to provide a ground-floor bedroom and accessible en-suite bathroom for a relative. I have therefore considered the personal circumstances and detailed evidence put before me by the appellant, and I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out in the Equality Act 2010. The Act sets out the relevant protected characteristics, which include disability.
19. Whilst the proposal would have no adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, it would cause unacceptable and permanent harm to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. And I have been presented with no substantive evidence to demonstrate that a development of that scale is required to meet the needs of the appellant's relative. Therefore, I do not find that they justify not outweigh the harm I have identified. The dismissal of the appeal is therefore necessary and proportionate.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole, and there are no other material considerations, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR