



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by A James BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3820/D/25/3371744

68 Bedivere Road, Ifield, Crawley, West Sussex RH11 0FY

- 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 David Noyce against the decision of Crawley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is CR/2025/0113/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a 'single storey rear extension. Two storey side extension with extension of existing side garage.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i. the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene;
 - ii. the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of 70 Bedivere Road, with regard to outlook; and
 - iii. the effect of the proposed development on parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 68 Bedivere Road is positioned within a modern housing estate. Within the estate there are examples of flat blocks, terraces, semi-detached and detached houses. There are a handful of simple building designs which have been replicated through the housing estate. This creates a strong sense of uniformity which contributes positively to the character of the area. Most of the properties on the estate have a single storey garage or double garage set back from the street.
4. 68 and 70 Bedivere Road are a semi-detached pair of dwellings. Directly next to 68 Bedivere Road is 66 Bedivere Road which is a detached property. Most of the properties are set back from the road with a landscaped front garden. The properties have a strong building line with regular roof forms. On the other side of the road, the street design is in essence reversed. This further creates a sense of balance and uniformity within the street scene, contributing positively to its character.

5. The proposal would introduce a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The dropped kerb would also be extended.
6. The proposed side extension roof has been designed so that the rear height is lower compared to the front. However, this would create an irregular roof shape which would appear incongruous when viewed from the street scene, in which properties generally have a consistent appearance.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed side extension roof would be set lower than the roof of the host dwelling. Nevertheless, it would still be very tall considering that most of the garages on the estate are single storey and well set back from the street. The scale and bulk of the side extension would unbalance the semi-detached dwellings and degrade the uniformity of the street scene.
8. Moreover, the bulky side extension being positioned near to the site boundary would create a terracing effect that would diminish the existing gap and the sense of balance within the street scene. Consequently, the side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.
9. It is agreed between the parties that the rear extension would have no effect on the appearance of the dwelling. I have no reason to take a different view. The lack of harm caused by the rear extension with regards to character and appearance is effectively neutral in my determination of the appeal.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene. This harm would not be negated by the lack of harm with regards to character and appearance of the proposed rear extension. Therefore, I consider the proposal would be contrary to the relevant provisions of policies CL2 and DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040. In summary, these policies seek to protect the character and appearance of the area through good urban design principles.

The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

11. Both Nos 68 and No 70 have symmetrical box bay windows with French doors at the rear. There is a close boarded fence which appears to line the boundary of the properties. The close boarded fence screens the majority of the outlook for the window that faces directly onto it from No 70. From the other windows, it is likely that occupiers of No 70 would have largely uninterrupted outlook of the sky and onwards down through the rear garden. I consider the other windows and French doors to have a good outlook which positively contributes to the living conditions of No 70.
12. The proposed single storey rear extension would run near to the boundary of No 70. It would be much taller than the existing close boarded fence. The outlook from the window which faces onto the close boarded fence would likely be worsened as a result. Due to the height, length, and proximity of the proposed rear extension it would also likely negatively affect the outlook from the windows and French doors that face onto the rear garden, appearing overly dominant. Altogether, this would create an increased sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 70, which would be harmful to their living conditions.
13. I acknowledge the appellant's reference to a lack of harm in respect of loss of privacy, sunlight, daylight or overshadowing. There is no dispute between the

parties on these matters, and I have no reason to disagree. The lack of harm in these respects is effectively neutral in my determination of the appeal.

14. It is also agreed between the parties that the proposed side extension would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No 66 and I have no reason to disagree with this view. Nevertheless, this also attracts neutral weight within my decision.
15. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers of No 70. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to the relevant provisions of policy DD1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040. In summary, this policy seeks to achieve reasonable living conditions through good urban design.

Parking provision.

16. The appeal site is within a suburban area where the predominant use is residential. No formal parking controls have been brought to my attention. The road has space for two cars to pass on the carriageway with visitor spaces at each end of the street. There are two existing parking spaces on the appeal site, one in the garage and one on the driveway. A third space is proposed by extending the dropped kerb. I note from my site visit that if a car was to park on the street it would reduce the width of the carriageway.
17. I have noted the Local Highways Authority have raised no objection with regards to highway safety but have indicated that the decision maker should consider the impact of on-street parking stress. They have indicated that 2.5 car parking spaces are required and that any overspill would need to be accommodated by on-street parking.
18. The appellant has stated that parking standards should not be applied in this case. However, Crawley Local Plan Parking Standard Annex indicates that in a case of an application to extend a dwelling, additional parking may be required in accordance with the parking standards. Therefore, it is reasonable to seek additional parking, especially in areas where there is likely to be increased parking stress.
19. The proposal includes widening the dropped kerb by two metres to create an additional permeable parking space, providing three off-street parking spaces. However, parking on a dropped kerb would not reasonably constitute off-street parking as some of the vehicle in that space would likely overhang the carriageway. Therefore, it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the additional 0.5 parking space could be achieved within the confines of the appeal site. The proposal would lead to an increase in habitable rooms which has the potential to lead to an increase in parking stress. Any additional on-street parking as a result of the proposed development would likely result in inconsiderate parking as individuals seek to park near the property where provision is limited.
20. It has also been suggested by the appellant that parking standards can be set aside because the appeal site is in a sustainable location and based on the appellants personal travel arrangements. However, policy ST2 makes it clear that car parking standards for residential development are based on the accessibility of the area, the levels of car ownership, and the size of any new dwelling. There is no substantive evidence before me that leads me to conclude that the appeal site

should be immune from the Council's established car parking requirements, particularly where harm has been identified.

21. Therefore, I find for the reasons stated above that the proposed development would harmfully increase parking stress in the area. Consequently, it would not comply with policies ST2 and DD1 of Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040. In summary, these policies ensure a reasonable standard of parking is achieved through good urban design principles. This is in a similar vein to the provisions of the parking standards set out in Crawley Local Parking Standard Annex.

Other Matters

22. My attention has been drawn to the development of a neighbouring property in respect of converting a garage. However, I do not have full details in respect of such works, including the planning history or balance. In any case I have determined the appeal on its own individual circumstances, based on the evidence before me.
23. I acknowledge that the development would result in positive social and economic benefits, including in respect of employment during construction. I also note that it would incorporate sustainability features, cycle parking, would be positioned in an accessible location, maintain a good standard of accommodation, would protect biodiversity and make an efficient use of land. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above. Moreover, there is no indication that similar benefits could not be achieved via an alternative scheme. Ultimately, these considerations do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issues.

Conclusion

24. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR