



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: 18th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/25/3366460

6 Kingscote Hill, Gossops Green, Crawley, West Sussex RH11 8QA

- 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 Harsimran Sidhu against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2023/0350/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a “proposed first floor east side extension over single storey living room. creation of new entrance canopy.”
-

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 Matter

3. The description of the proposed development as detailed in the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description included in the Council's decision notice, as it reflects the proposal more accurately.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property lies within an established residential area predominantly characterised by its pleasant suburban feel, with dwellings being typically set back from the highway behind open front gardens and grass verges. 6 Kingscote Hill (no 6) is a detached chalet-style dwelling with a front-facing gable end. Its distinctive character stems from the symmetrical A-frame roof, which slopes evenly from a central ridge running the full depth of the property. At ground-floor level, the house has a slight L-shaped footprint, with a projection extending from the eastern side elevation. The front elevation features two evenly spaced ground-floor windows and a centrally positioned first-floor window, creating a balanced fenestration pattern. A small dormer window is set into the western roof slope which, due to its modest size, sits comfortably within the overall A-frame design.

6. Located opposite the junction with Chatfields, the appeal property occupies a particularly prominent position, with its front and eastern elevations clearly visible from the highway. No 6 is one of four similarly designed chalet-style dwellings on this side of Kingscote Hill, which are arranged in mirrored pairs along a broadly consistent building line. Together, these four dwellings establish a strong and distinctive pattern of development along this stretch of Kingscote Hill, which contributes positively to the suburban character of the locality.
7. The proposal would involve adding a first-floor, flat-roofed extension above the projecting element on the eastern side of the property. Due to the distinctive A-frame roof form of no 6, the scale and box-like design of the new addition would sit awkwardly against the established roofscape of both the host property and its similarly styled neighbours. The result would be a bulky and incongruous feature that would detract from the otherwise uniform character of no 6 and the surrounding chalet dwellings.
8. The proposed ridge height would align with the dormer on the western roof slope and sit below the main central ridge, offering some degree of subservience. The additional internal space would be relatively modest. However, unlike the dormer, the extension would, due to its excessive scale and flat-roofed form, disrupt the largely cohesive appearance of the property and the neighbouring dwellings to the east. This visual harm arising from these design features would not be sufficiently mitigated by the presence of the existing chimney or by the proposed use of matching materials and detailing.
9. In addition, the proposal would see two windows to both the development's front and rear elevations. Their irregular positioning and differing sizes would conflict with the established fenestration pattern of the dwelling. This would amplify the visual imbalance caused by the extension, further detracting from the character and appearance of no 6 and, by extension, the wider street scene.
10. The appellant contends that no 6, being at the end of the row of chalet-style houses, serves as a transition between the chalet-style dwellings and the adjacent two-storey homes. However, the spatial separation between no 6 and the two-storey properties, combined with their perpendicular alignment, creates a clear visual break between the two groups. As a result, no 6 is perceived as part of the cohesive row of chalet-style dwellings, rather than as a transitional element. The proposed extension would therefore be read as part of this uniform group, where its incongruous form would disrupt the consistent character of the chalet dwellings and cause harm to their collective appearance.
11. The appellant has also referred to 12a Kingscote Hill (no 12a), a flat-roofed bungalow adjacent to no 6, suggesting it demonstrates a varied streetscape. However, no 12a is differently orientated and physically attached to a nearby two-storey dwelling, which causes it to read as part of the two-storey group to the east, rather than the uniform row of chalet-style properties of which no 6 forms a part. It is not comparable to the appeal proposal and I therefore attach very limited weight to this example.
12. In further support of the appeal, the appellant has also highlighted several other nearby extensions which they suggest set a precedent. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances under which those developments were approved and therefore cannot be certain that direct parallels can be drawn with the proposal

before me, notably regarding the development plan policies that may have been in place at the time of their consideration.

13. In any case, the cited dormer window additions at 7 and 9 Kingscote Hill relate to properties of a distinctly different style and character to no 6. These dwellings have a more traditional visual appearance and lack the distinctive chalet-style design of no 6. As such, these developments are ascribed very limited weight in the consideration of this appeal.
14. I have had regard to the appellant's claim that the proposal delivers sustainable development in line with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, the Framework makes it clear that good design is a fundamental aspect of sustainable development. As I have found the design would cause harm to the character and appearance of both the host property and the area, the proposal conflicts with this core principle.
15. Several economic, social and environmental benefits which would arise from the development have been put to me. However, these would be somewhat limited in scale and do not outweigh the harm I have identified. The absence of harm in relation to the loss of amenity of neighbouring properties, nor the lack of objections from neighbours is a neutral matter and does not weigh for or against the proposal.
16. The appellant has identified some local planning policies they consider the proposal to accord with, and the Council has not raised any conflict with those policies. Based on the evidence before me and my own site observations, I see no reason to disagree. However, compliance with certain policies does not outweigh the harm I have identified above and thus the conflict with the development plan as a whole.
17. I therefore conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, the appeal scheme would conflict with Policies CL2 and DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023–2040 (adopted 2024), the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2016), and section 12 of the Framework. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that new development respects the existing character and distinctiveness of both the site and the wider area, retains features that contribute to local character, and delivers extensions that relate appropriately to the parent dwelling and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. The appeal scheme would provide additional residential accommodation in a manner which would support home working and enable multi-generational living, but this is outweighed by the harm which I have identified. There are no material considerations which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. 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

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR