


Crawley Borough Council

Planning Committee

Agenda for the **Planning Committee** which will be held **Virtually - Microsoft Teams Live**, on **Tuesday, 1 September 2020 at 7.30 pm**

Nightline Telephone No. 07881 500 227



Head of Legal, Democracy and HR

Membership:

Councillors

J Purdy (Chair), R Sharma (Vice-Chair), L M Ascough, A Belben,
I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, M Mwangale, M W Pickett, T Rana and
P C Smith

Please note: in accordance with Regulations in response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, from April 2020 committee meetings will be held **virtually** via online video conferencing with committee members **in remote attendance only**. Any member of the public or press may observe a committee meeting (except where exempt information is to be discussed) via a link published on the Council's website **24 hours** before the scheduled start time. In order to allow committee members to take decisions without disruption, the **only** participants of this virtual meeting will be the committee members and the officers giving advice. Written statements submitted **in advance** of the meeting by supporters of or objectors to the planning applications on the agenda will be read to the committee.

Please contact Democratic.Services@crawley.gov.uk if you have any queries regarding this agenda.

Published 20 August 2020



Switchboard: 01293 438000
Main fax: 01293 511803
Minicom: 01293 405202 DX:
57139 Crawley 1
www.crawley.gov.uk

Town Hall
The Boulevard
Crawley
West Sussex
RH10 1UZ

The order of business may change at the Chair's discretion

Part A Business (Open to the Public)

	Ward	Pages
1. Apologies for Absence		
2. Disclosures of Interest		
In accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, Councillors are reminded that it is a requirement to declare interests where appropriate.		
3. Lobbying Declarations		
The Planning Code of Conduct requires that Councillors who have been lobbied, received correspondence or been approached by an interested party regarding any planning matter should declare this at the meeting which discusses the matter. Councillors should declare if they have been lobbied at this point in the meeting.		
4. Minutes		5 - 10
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 20 July 2020.		
5. Planning Application CR/2018/0891/FUL - EDF Building, Russell Way, Three Bridges, Crawley	Three Bridges	11 - 12
To consider report PES/354a of the Head of Economy and Planning.		
RECOMMENDATION to PERMIT.		
6. Planning Application CR/2020/0009/FUL - 11 Wordsworth Close, Pound Hill, Crawley	Pound Hill North & Forge Wood	13 - 22
To consider report PES/354b of the Head of Economy and Planning.		
RECOMMENDATION to PERMIT.		
7. Supplemental Agenda		

Any urgent item(s) complying with
Section 100(B) of the Local Government
Act 1972.

With reference to planning applications, PLEASE NOTE:
Background Paper:- Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030

This information is available in different formats and languages. If you or someone you know would like help with understanding this document please contact the Democratic Services team on 01293 438549 or email: democratic.services@crawley.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Monday, 20 July 2020 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

J Purdy (Chair)

R Sharma (Vice-Chair)

L M Ascough, A Belben, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, M Mwangale, M W Pickett, T Rana and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Mez Matthews Democratic Services Officer

Jean McPherson Group Manager (Development Management)

Marc Robinson Principal Planning Officer

Paula Slinn Legal Advisor

Jess Tamplin Democratic Services Support Officer

1. Disclosure of Interests

The following disclosure of interest was made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Interest
Councillor A Belben	6 – Planning Application CR/2020/0210/TPO – St Nicholas Church, Church Road, Pound Hill, Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – member of the Worth Conservation Area Advisory Committee

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by Councillors:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwangale, Purdy, Rana, Sharma and P Smith had been lobbied regarding application CR/2019/0322/FUL - The Gables Nursing Home, Ifield Green, Ifield, Crawley.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 29 June 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2019/0322/FUL - The Gables Nursing Home, Ifield Green, Ifield, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/353\(a\)](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed:

Demolition of existing buildings and structures and comprehensive redevelopment to provide a new care home with associated landscaping and access works (amended plans, noise assessment and flood risk assessment received).

Councillors Jaggard and Purdy declared they had visited the site. Although he had not visited the site recently, Councillor P Smith stated that he knew the site well.

The Principal Planning Officer provided a verbal summation of the application and informed the Committee that the hedge referred to in paragraph 5.12 of report PES/353(a), was not evergreen and that, although it retained its greenery throughout the spring, summer and autumn months, the level of screening it provided was reduced during the winter. The Committee noted that the application as a whole had been recommended for permission on the basis that the hedge would not always be there.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, two statements submitted by members of the public were read to the Committee.

The first statement (submitted by objectors Mr and Mrs Salsano) highlighted matters including:

- The potential for major flooding as the application site was in a flood plain.
- A loss of privacy due to windows of the proposed development overlooking their property.
- The assertion that the proposed viewing balcony would provide an unrestricted view of their daily life as it overlooked the lounge, kitchen and sunroom of their property.
- The hedge did not provide adequate all year round screening.
- Inadequate provision for parking allocated within the proposal.
- Concerns regarding noise levels generated by the redevelopment.

The second statement (submitted by Avison Young as the Agents acting on behalf of the Applicant - Country Court Care) highlighted matters including:

- In addition to seeking pre-application advice in relation to the proposal, the application had been further refined post-submission to address the issues raised.
- The proposal would provide modern accommodation, bringing the application site back into its former use as a care home.
- The proposal addressed the increased need to plan for growth in the elderly population, including those with specific care needs.
- The design of the proposed development addressed the historic flooding issues associated with the application site.
- The design of the proposal met Care Quality Commission standards and the design's sustainability credentials had achieved BREEAM excellence.
- The proposed windows facing the neighbouring property had been angled away from the property.
- The existing hedge along the boundary would further obscure the proposal from the neighbouring dwelling.

Agenda Item 4

Planning Committee (3)
20 July 2020

The Committee then considered the application in detail and raised concerns including potential overlooking of the neighbouring property (especially with regard to the proposed balcony on the north elevation of the proposed development), the implications of the proposed flood mitigation measures and the layout of the (courtyard) amenity space. In response to the various planning issues and concerns raised by the Committee, the Principal Planning Officer:

- Informed the Committee that the proposed balcony was small as its purpose was to provide residents with fresh air.
- Stated that no formal comments had been received from the Ecology Officer, therefore, as per standard procedure, a condition relating to an Ecological Management Plan had been included.
- Assured the Committee that the proposed design of the foundations included cavities which would allow any flood water to flow through. As such, water would not be left standing beneath the proposed development. The Committee was also informed that the surface of the parking area would be permeable to allow excess water to dissipate.
- Clarified that the proposed application provided an increase in amenity space compared to the layout of the current building, and informed the Committee that the location of the courtyards would provide screening against noise from a potential second runway at Gatwick.
- Additional outside amenity space would also be provided to the south and front of the site.
- Stated that the application did not identify the anticipated level of employment the development would provide.

Following further consideration by the Committee, concern remained regarding the potential overlooking of the neighbouring property by the balcony. Support was expressed that the balcony either be removed or that a screen be provided to retain the privacy for the neighbouring dwelling. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the application should be considered with the balcony or the application could be refused. Following consultation with the Principal Planning Officer, it was moved by Councillor P Smith (seconded by Councillor Jaggard) that the following additional condition be included relating to the installation of a privacy screen on the north facing balcony.

Additional Condition (Balcony – Privacy Screen)

“Prior to any occupation of the approved building, a privacy screen shall have been installed on the north facing balcony in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screen shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the privacy of neighbouring occupiers is protected in accordance with policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2020.”

No objection was expressed by the Committee and the additional condition was therefore declared to be CARRIED.

A recorded vote was taken on the substantive recommendation in accordance with the Council’s Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation to permit:
Councillors Irvine, Jaggard, Mwagale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, Sharma and P Smith (8).

Against the recommendation to permit:
Councillors Ascough and A Belben (2).

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to conditions set out in report [PES/353\(a\)](#), and the additional condition above.

5. **Tree Preservation Order Application CR/2020/0210/TPO - St Nicholas Church, Church Road, Pound Hill, Crawley**

The Committee considered report PES/353(b) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed:

T6 – Turkey Oak – fell, and T7 – Common Lime – fell.

Councillors Jaggard and Purdy declared they had visited the site. Although he had not visited the site recently, Councillor P Smith stated that he knew the site well.

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, two statements submitted by members of the public were read to the Committee.

The first statement (submitted by objector Mr John Cooban) highlighted matters including:

- The application to fell the trees did not solve the access problem to the church.
- The trees in question could provide 20-40 years more years of beneficial life if they were managed appropriately.
- Felling the trees could damage the roots (and health) of the remaining adjacent trees.
- Alternative access routes had not been properly considered.

The second statement (submitted by Mr Hal Appleyard as the Agent for the Applicant) highlighted matters including:

- The removal and replacement of the trees would have a negligible visual impact on the landscape and conservation area.
- The tree roots currently impeded access along the path to the church, causing a 'trip hazard', especially to those who were elderly or infirm.
- Pruning the tree roots would cause unsustainable harm to the trees.
- Relocating the path was not feasible given the position of existing graves.
- It was prudent to remove and replace the trees in question.

The Committee then considered the application in detail raising concern in particular about the loss of mature trees. Several Committee Members questioned whether an alternative option was possible which would enable retention of the trees. In response to the various concerns and queries raised by the Committee, the Group Manager (Development Management) advised the Committee that:

- Re-routing the pathway had been explored in the past and evidence had suggested that it was not a practical option. Given the age of the church the grave map was incomplete and did not include the early graves.

Agenda Item 4

Planning Committee (5)
20 July 2020

- The roots of trees T6 and T7, if felled, would not be dug out and would instead be left to decay so that the roots of the neighbouring trees would not be disturbed or damaged.
- The replacement trees would be planted close to the current trees but further from the path so they would remain part of the avenue once they matured, thus retaining the 12 Apostle principle.
- All twelve trees along the path to the church were subject to Tree Preservation Orders and, therefore, any tree works required submission of an application to the Council as the Local Planning Authority.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Irvine, Purdy, Sharma and P Smith (4).

Against the recommendation to consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Mwangale, Pickett and Rana (6).

Abstentions:

None.

The Officer's recommendation to consent was therefore overturned.

Following further consideration by the Committee, it was moved by Councillor Jaggard (seconded by Councillor A Belben) that the application be refused due to the amenity value and positive contribution provided by the two trees to both the approach to the church and the Worth Conservation Area. The Committee was of the view that the application had not demonstrated that the scheme for the proposed removal of those trees was justified.

A recorded vote was then taken on the proposal to refuse planning consent in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the Councillors voting for and against the proposal, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the proposal to refuse consent:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Mwangale, Pickett and Rana (6).

Against the proposal to refuse consent:

Councillors Irvine, Purdy, Sharma and P Smith (4).

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Refuse for the following reasons:

The two trees have amenity value and make a positive contribution to the approach to the church and to the Worth Conservation Area. It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the scheme for the proposed removal of the trees is justified.

Agenda Item 4

Planning Committee (6)
20 July 2020

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.39 pm

J Purdy (Chair)

Agenda Item 5

CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 September 2020
REPORT NO: PES/354(a)

REFERENCE NO: CR/2018/0891/FUL

LOCATION: [EDF BUILDING, RUSSELL WAY, THREE BRIDGES, CRAWLEY](#)
WARD: Three Bridges
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF 3 STOREY SIDE EXTENSION COMPRISING 12 X TWO BEDROOM FLATS (AMENDED DESCRIPTION & AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED)

TARGET DECISION DATE: 20 May 2019

CASE OFFICER: Ms D. Angelopoulou

APPLICANTS NAME: C/O DPA London LTD
AGENTS NAME: Mr Domenico Padalino

Purpose:-

A report on planning application CR/2018/0891/FUL on the EDF Building site was considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 24 September 2019. The application seeks planning permission for a three storey extension to the existing building to form twelve flats.

The current report sets out to update Planning Committee on the affordable housing proposals relating to this proposed extension to the EDF Building and to seek agreement to a variation to the Committee resolution in relation to the Section 106 agreement.

Background:-

The site to which this report relates is the EDF Building site on Russell Way. The original EDF building was the subject of a prior approval scheme (CR/2018/0015/PA3) for the conversion of the former office to residential comprising 42 flats, which has been implemented and is now occupied.

On 24 September 2019, Planning Committee considered a report on a subsequent separate planning application (CR/2018/0891/FUL) for the erection of a three storey side extension comprising 12 x two-bedroom flats.

The Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement and to a number of planning conditions. The resolution was in line with the recommendation presented to Planning Committee.

In relation to the Section 106 agreement, the agreed committee resolution was to secure

- “On site 4 Affordable Rented 2-bedroom Units;
- The tree mitigation (£15,400) infrastructure contributions; and
- Open space (£6,945) infrastructure contributions.”

Significant work on the Section 106 agreement has subsequently taken place and the document is nearing completion.

An issue has arisen in relation to the proposed affordable housing provision, which officers wish to make Planning Committee aware of and to address through this report.

The applicant had previously agreed to provide four Affordable Rented 2-bedroom units on site in accordance with the Policy H4 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the Affordable Housing SPD. As part of this process the applicant has approached five Registered Providers (RPs) from the

Agenda Item 5

Council's list of preferred RPs. Unfortunately, none of these RPs are interested in taking on the affordable units due to the number of units being too small. The applicant has provided supporting evidence of their attempts to attract an RP through email correspondence. One RP commented that they were normally looking for schemes of 20 affordable units or more and another that they were focussed on whole scheme developments.

The timing is unfortunate as it has affected the completion of the Section 106 agreement. The applicant has, however, offered to provide payment in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision.

Proposed changes

Given the lack of interest from the RPs for the on-site units, officers consider it necessary to update the Planning Committee and to seek agreement to a variation to the previous recommendation. The Local Plan Policy H4 requires 40% affordable housing from all residential developments, but it also states that: *'payments in lieu will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that there are robust planning reasons for doing so and provided that the contribution is of equivalent financial value.'*

Officers acknowledge that it is difficult to secure an RP for only four units within this building. Given the evidence demonstrating that the applicant has approached five RPs and the current market uncertainty, officers consider these to be exceptional circumstances and accept that payment in lieu is appropriate.

The Council's Housing Enabling and Development Manager was consulted. He commented that, if the proposed scheme were a Private Rented Sector (PRS) scheme, there would be no need for an RP and the units could be Discounted Market Rent within the PRS scheme. However, if the scheme is for market sale, he states that Discounted Market Sale units are a low priority at the moment, as there is good availability, and that the Council can make better use of the commuted sum for identified schemes to help address specific housing needs.

The applicant has subsequently confirmed that the proposal is for market housing, not a PRS scheme. As a result, the applicants and officers agree that the Section 106 agreement should now seek to secure a commuted payment in lieu of the previously proposed on-site affordable housing provision. In accordance with the Council's Affordable Housing Calculator, for this scheme of 12 units with 920sqm total floor space, the affordable housing contribution should be £322,000. The applicants have accepted this and agreed this is to be paid in two stages, with 50% at commencement and 50% on completion.

Officers therefore recommend a variation to the previous recommendation to allow financial contributions in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision. The amended recommendation is set out below, with the proposed amendment to the earlier resolution shown underlined.

Recommendation

That the Planning Committee resolves to:

PERMIT subject to the conclusion of the Section 106 agreement to secure:

- An off-site affordable housing contribution of £322,000;
- The tree mitigation (£15,400) infrastructure contributions; and
- Open space (£6,945) infrastructure contributions.

And also subject to the conditions set out in the committee report of 24 September 2019.

Background Documents

- [Committee report](#) dated 24 September 2019 for planning application CR/2018/0891/FUL

Agenda Item 6

CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 September 2020
REPORT NO: PES/354(b)

REFERENCE NO: CR/2020/0009/FUL

LOCATION: [11 WORDSWORTH CLOSE, POUND HILL, CRAWLEY](#)
WARD: Pound Hill North & Forge Wood
PROPOSAL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE & ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

TARGET DECISION DATE: 1 April 2020

CASE OFFICER: Miss S. Hobden

APPLICANTS NAME: Mr MacCanna

AGENTS NAME:

PLANS & DRAWINGS CONSIDERED:

Drawing Number	Revision	Drawing Title
11 WC 00	A	Site Location Plan
PLA001	B	Existing Elevations & Floor Plans
PLA002	B	Proposed Elevations & Floor Plans
PLA003	B	Existing & Proposed Block Plan
PLA004	B	Existing Parking Provision
PLA005	B	Proposed Parking Provision

CONSULTEE NOTIFICATIONS & RESPONSES:-

1. National Air Traffic Services (NATS) No objection
2. Arboricultural Officer No objection subject to conditions

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS:-

73 and 75 Park Way;
10 and 12 Wordsworth Close.

RESPONSES RECEIVED:-

Two letters of representation have been received from the same household. The first letter expressed concerns about the right of way across the shared driveway and that the position of the proposed extension would restrict car parking in front of the garage at no. 10. The appearance of the extension was not considered to be in keeping with the bungalows.

The second letter states that there is no longer an objection to the principle of the revised scheme, as the front wall no longer projects past the line of the existing detached garage. However, there are concerns regarding the long term use of the building and the number of vehicles/occupants that will be parking/living at the property. Concern is also raised that it could be rented out as short term accommodation. Furthermore, construction may cause further damage to the already damaged drive with large vehicles, obstruct the shared drive and create noise disturbance. In addition, it is not clear how the plumbing will work for the proposed bathroom and the appearance of the proposed extension.

Agenda Item 6

REASON FOR REPORTING TO COMMITTEE:-

The application has been called in by Councillor Peter Lamb.

THE APPLICATION SITE:-

- 1.1 The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow located at the end of Wordsworth Close, a cul-de-sac within the residential neighbourhood of Pound Hill. The bungalow has a brick plinth with rendered walls and a hipped tiled roof with projecting front gable on the front elevation. To the rear of the property is a single storey flat roof extension with pitched roof sides. Along the southern side boundary is a detached single garage and outbuilding. The property has a shared drive with 10 Wordsworth Close and a modest sized rear garden bounded by vegetation, sheds, an outbuilding and a garage.
- 1.2 The two pine trees in the front gardens of 9 and 10 Wordsworth Close, one of which is adjacent to the shared driveway with no.11, are protected by a Tree Preservation Order ref TPO 10/2020.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:-

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing detached garage and the erection of a single storey side/rear extension. The proposed extension would have a flat roof design with two roof lights and measure 3.1m in height. It would be set back from the front elevation of the house by 6.7m and would retain a gap in excess of 0.9m to the shared boundary with no.10. The proposal would measure 3m in width at the front, increasing to 4.1m in width to the rear. It would have a total length of 7.9m and would project 2.6m from rear elevation of the house. The proposal would have a window on the western front elevation, a WC window on the southern side elevation and a window and door on the eastern rear elevation. Internally the proposal would provide for two new bedrooms and a bathroom, as shown on the revised plans.

PLANNING HISTORY:-

- 3.1 The following applications relate to the application site:

CR/2015/0197/FUL	DEMOLITION OF DILAPIDATED GARAGE & ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION	PERMITTED
CR/2010/0424/FUL	PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	PERMITTED
CR/117/1979	ERECTION OF SUN LOUNGE	PERMITTED
CR/173/1955	PROPOSED 72 SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES	PERMITTED

PLANNING POLICY:-

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- 4.1 The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and that there are three overarching objectives - economic, social and environmental. These objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. At the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 4.2 The relevant paragraphs are:
 - Section 2, Paragraph 11 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development). At the heart of the framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Agenda Item 6

- Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) states the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Crawley Borough Local Plan (2015-2030)

4.3 Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Local Plan was adopted on 16th December 2015. The relevant policies are listed below:

- Policy SD1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development): In line with the planned approach to Crawley as a new town, and the spatial patterns relating to the neighbourhood principles, when considering development proposals the council will take a positive approach to approving development which is sustainable.
- Policy CH2 (Principles of Good Urban Design): New development proposals will be required to respond to and reinforce locally distinctive patterns of development and landscape character, consider flexible development forms that can respond to changing social, technological and economic conditions and provide diversity and choice through a mix of compatible development and uses that work together to create viable places that respond to local needs.
- Policy CH3 (Normal Requirements of All New Development): states all proposals for development in Crawley will be of a high quality in terms of urban and architectural design and relate sympathetically to their surroundings in terms of scale, density, height, massing, orientation, layout, details and materials. Development must provide and retain a good standard of amenity for all nearby and future occupants of land and buildings, and be able to meet its own operational requirements necessary for the safe and proper use of the site.
- Policy ENV6 (Sustainable Design and Construction): All development, including the alteration and extension of existing buildings, should consider how it may achieve the sustainability objectives in relation to carbon.
- Policy IN4 (Car and Cycle Parking Standards): requires proposals to provide the appropriate amount of car and cycle parking to meet its needs when it is assessed against the borough councils car and cycling standards. These standards are contained within the Urban Design SPD.

Emerging Crawley Borough Local Plan 2020 – 2035 (Regulation 19 Draft)

4.4 The Local Plan Review 2020-2035 has been the subject of consultation and therefore limited weight should be given to the following applicable policies:

- Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.
- Policy CL1: Neighbourhood Principle.
- Policy CL2: Making Successful Places: Principles of Good Urban Design.
- Policy CL3: Local Character and the Form of New Development.
- Policy DD1: Normal Requirements of All New Development.
- Policy SDC1: Sustainable Design and Construction.
- Policy ST2: Car and Cycle Parking Standards.

Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

4.5 The Urban Design SPD is a non-statutory document which supplements the policies of the Local Plan and is applicable to this application. It contains guidelines on the standards the Council expects for the design of extensions. In particular, it states that:

Agenda Item 6

Extensions

- *'An extension with good design in mind will relate appropriately to the parent dwelling's character and style, dimensions, materials and finishes of the parent dwelling and the character of the neighbourhood. Furthermore, when considering an extension it is important to think about the impact the development may have on your neighbours and the wider area'.*

Materials, Finishes and Detailing

- *'Development should incorporate materials and colours that match the existing dwelling'.*
- *'Extensions should consider existing roof pitches. A roof design that sits in harmony with the existing roof will usually be more acceptable'.*

Side Extensions

- *'As with a front extension, an extension on the side of a property will be prominent. Therefore, it is important that it should work successfully with its surroundings'.*

Rear Extensions

- *'Rear extensions can significantly impact the amenity of neighbouring dwellings by leading to overshadowing or a dominating appearance, but also have the potential to impact on the amenity of the parent dwelling by reducing the overall size of a rear garden'.*

Avoiding Overshadowing and Dominance

- *'Overshadowing or dominating neighbours' houses and gardens can be avoided by keeping rear extensions relatively small as compared to the size of the main buildings and the gardens in which they stand'.*
- *'One or two storey rear extensions will need to maintain a minimum distance of 21 metres between the rear windows of an opposing dwelling and the rear facing windows of the extension, in order to avoid any potential overlooking and privacy issues'.*

Maintaining Garden Depth

- *'A rear extension should not consume the entirety of a dwelling's private amenity space. A garden should be retained with a minimum depth of 10.5 metres measured from the extensions rear external wall to the property's rear boundary in length, in order to ensure adequate private outdoor space'.*

Light Angles

- *'A single storey extension should not encroach into an area measured by drawing a 45 degree angle from the nearest edge of a neighbour's window or door aperture'.*

Roofs

- *'The roof form above an extension will contribute to the appearance of the extension and the dwelling as a whole. A roof design that sits in harmony with the existing roof will usually be more acceptable. Roof extensions should not dominate by being too large and flat roofs are generally discouraged unless they are in harmony with the existing dwelling'.*

It also includes Crawley Borough Parking Standards. The minimum parking standards for this application are 2-3 spaces. The minimum dimensions set out in 'Manual for Streets' for perpendicular car parking are 2.4 metres in width by 4.8 metres in length.

Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Green Infrastructure SPD is a non-statutory document which supplements the policies of the Local Plan and is applicable to this application. It contains guidelines on the standards the Council expects for Crawley's Green Infrastructure assets. In particular, it states that:

- *'Existing trees can significantly contribute to the setting of new developments, and can give the impression of early maturity and increased design quality. Without appropriate consideration, existing trees and hedges can be easily damaged and lost through development. Damage can occur to trees through thoughtless construction practices, such as vehicle collisions and root severance, as well as through more indirect factors, such as changes in the surrounding ground levels, compaction of the soil*

Agenda Item 6

structure and contamination. One movement of a heavy vehicle over a tree's roots is enough to cause irreparable damage, while trenching and compaction can cause excessive damage to trees'.

- *'British Standard 5837:2012 (BS 5837:2012 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) provides clear guidance on how trees and hedges should be accounted for as part of developments to ensure appropriate retention, protection and management'.*
- *'A Tree Protection Plan should show how the retained trees and hedges will be physically protected during site clearance and construction of the development. It should be superimposed over a final site layout drawing and clearly indicate the precise location of all protective barriers and proposed hard surfacing'.*

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:-

5.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application are:

- Impact on the design and character of the dwelling, the street-scene and the wider area
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Impact on private amenity space
- Impact on parking arrangements
- Trees
- Other issues

Impact on the design and character of the dwelling, the street-scene and the wider area

5.2 The proposed extension would be located to the side and rear of the property. The extension would be set back from the front elevation by approximately 6.7 metres, in a similar position to the existing garage, but set off the boundary. The front of the extension would be visible from Wordsworth Close, with the main bulk of the extension being located to the rear of the dwelling. Given the irregular shape of the plot and the substantial setback, it is considered that the proposal would not be significantly visible to the public. As such it would not harm the character and design of the dwelling or the wider street scene. It would also have a modest flat roof design that would help to reduce the visual bulk and scale of the proposal, resulting in the extension appearing visually subservient to the bungalow. Its use of matching materials would also ensure it remains in keeping with the character and design of the bungalow and the street scene.

5.3 The proposal is considered acceptable in this regard and would comply with the relevant Local Plan policies, the design guidance contained within the Urban Design SPD and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

5.4 The neighbouring properties potentially most affected by the proposed development are 10 Wordsworth Close to the south (side) of the site, 12 Wordsworth Close to the north (side) and 73 and 75 Park Way to the east (rear) of the site.

5.5 With regard to 10 Wordsworth Close, the proposed extension would be single storey in nature and, although it would have a significant length of 7.9 metres, the extension would be set back from the front elevation of 10 Wordsworth Close by approx. 8 metres. There would be a distance of approximately 6.6 metres between the front corner of the extension and the side elevation of no. 10. As the garden plots splay away from each other the proposed extension would be read behind the neighbour's garage and set away from the shared boundary by approx. 1.1 metre at the front and 2.1 metres towards the back. It is not considered that any significant impact from the size, bulk or mass would result to no. 10.

Agenda Item 6

- 5.6 The proposed extension would have one window serving the WC on the side elevation. Any views from the window would be obscured by the existing detached garage at No. 10, therefore, given the positioning of the proposed extension and the orientation of the neighbour's house, there would be no direct overlooking. As a toilet window, it can be conditioned to be obscure glazed anyway, which would address any possible future issues if the neighbour's garage were removed. It is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of this property in terms of overbearing/loss of outlook/loss of light and is therefore acceptable.
- 5.7 In respect to 12 Wordsworth Close, the proposed extension, due to its siting 6.9 metres away from the shared boundary, its single storey nature, simple flat roof design and modest scale, would not impact the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of no. 12 by way of light loss, overbearing presence or privacy loss and is therefore considered acceptable.
- 5.8 Park Way lies to the east of the site. The proposed development would be sited further to the south of no. 75 and the extension would maintain a distance of 16.5m between the rear windows of no. 75 and the proposed extension. No. 73 is set to the east of proposal and the extension would maintain a distance of 16.7m between the rear windows of no. 73 and the rear elevation of the proposed extension. The single storey proposed extension would have a window and a door on the rear elevation.
- 5.9 The proposed extension would not maintain a separation distance of 21m as set out in the Urban Design SPD. However, given the position of the proposed extension in relation to nos. 73 and 75, the single storey nature of the proposal and the 1.8m high fence and vegetation along the rear boundary, there are no concerns of window to window overlooking and therefore the proposal would not cause a loss of privacy.
- 5.10 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of amenity impact and would comply with the relevant Local Plan Policies, the design guidance contained within the Urban Design SPD and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Impact on private amenity space

- 5.11 The proposed extension would retain a garden length of approx. 5.5m between the rear wall of the extension and the rear boundary with a width of approx. 14m and an overall garden area of approx. 97.1sqm. It is noted that the proposal does not maintain a garden length of 10.5m as indicated in the Urban Design SPD. However, given the greater width of the garden area, its irregular shape and the extension's position along the southern side boundary, it is considered that on balance adequate private garden space would be retained.
- 5.12 The proposal is considered acceptable in this regard and would comply with the relevant Local Plan policies, the design guidance contained within the Urban Design SPD and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Impact on parking arrangements

- 5.13 The proposed development would increase the number of bedrooms from 2 to 4. The parking standards for a 3 plus bedroom property in this location is 2-3 spaces. The proposed development would result in the demolition of the detached garage and consequently, one parking space would be lost. However, the site has existing space to the front and side of the property to accommodate three vehicles off-street. Therefore, the parking arrangements are considered acceptable and would comply with the car parking standards contained within the adopted Urban Design SPD.

Agenda Item 6

- 5.14 The neighbour has expressed concern that parking a vehicle in front of the proposed extension will obstruct no. 10 from being able to manoeuvre and park their car in front of their own garage. The applicant has provided a tracking plan demonstrating that the proposed extension would not obstruct parking in front of the neighbour's garage nor would the shared access be blocked. Furthermore, it should be noted that the size and position of the proposed extension has been amended which no longer projects past the line of the front elevation of the garage to be demolished. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable.
- 5.15 The proposal is considered acceptable in this regard and would comply with the relevant Local Plan policies, the design guidance contained within the Urban Design SPD and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Trees

- 5.16 The neighbouring property (10 Wordsworth Close) has two Scots Pine trees located in the front garden. One of these trees is situated very close to the shared driveway between the two bungalows. Both trees are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order ref TPO 10/2020.
- 5.17 The plans provided show no alterations to the existing driveway. Therefore, no objection is raised to the proposed development, provided that a Tree Protection Plan is submitted showing protective fencing running along the edge of the shared driveway past the Pine tree in order to protect the stem from being hit by construction vehicles and equipment. Furthermore, clarification on where and how the materials will be stored within the site will be required. If they are to be stored in the front garden area, a geo-textile membrane with plywood boards over the top should be laid.
- 5.18 Finally, the parking plans provided show no changes to the existing hardstanding area to the front of the site. Any future works including replacement or additional hardstanding would need to ensure that the roots of the preserved trees are not damaged and to preserve the health and appearance of these trees. This aspect is controlled via the legislation regarding TPOs.
- 5.19 The proposed development is considered acceptable in arboricultural terms and would comply with the relevant Local Plan policies, the guidance contained within the Urban Design SPD, the Green Infrastructure SPD and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF subject to conditions requiring the tree protection details mentioned above.

Other issues

- 5.20 The neighbour has raised concerns regarding the long term use of the building and the number of vehicles/occupants that will be parking/living at the property. Concern is also raised that it could be rented out as short term accommodation. Furthermore, construction may cause further damage to the already damaged drive with large vehicles, obstruct the shared drive and create noise disturbance. In addition, it is not clear how the plumbing will work for the proposed bathroom.
- 5.21 The proposed extension must be built/used in accordance with the approved drawings, which do not show the proposal being used as short term accommodation. Issues raised in relation to noise, access and bathroom plumbing are not planning matters. Noise issues are controlled under Environmental Health legislation. Likewise, obstruction/damage to private properties is a civil matter of which cannot be controlled through planning powers.

CONCLUSIONS:-

Agenda Item 6

- 6.1 The proposed extension would be publicly visible from Wordsworth Close, but would not have an adverse impact on the character of the existing dwelling, the street scene or the surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on private amenity space, car parking or neighbouring amenity. The proposed development would therefore accord with the policies outlined in the NPPF (2019), the Crawley Borough Local Plan (2015-2030) and the Urban Design SPD.

RECOMMENDATION RE: CR/2020/0009/FUL

PERMIT subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans as listed below save as varied by the conditions hereafter:
(Drawing numbers to be added)
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. The materials and finishes of the external walls of the proposed single storey extension hereby permitted shall match in colour and texture those of the existing dwelling.
REASON: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.
4. The WC window on the southern side elevation facing No. 10 Wordsworth Close of the single storey extension hereby approved shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and, apart from any top-hung vent, be fixed to be permanently non-opening.
REASON: To protect the amenities and privacy of the adjoining property, 10 Wordsworth Close, in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.
5. The three car parking spaces to the front of No. 11 shown on drawing no. PLA005 Rev B shall be retained and kept available for such use except with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To ensure adequate provision of parking clear of the highway and the shared access with no. 10 Wordsworth Close in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 and the car parking standards set out in the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document.
6. No development, including site works of any description or storage of materials and equipment, shall take place on the site unless and until the existing Scots Pine tree located in the front garden of No. 10 Wordsworth Close adjacent to the shared driveway between Nos. 10 and 11 has been protected by a fence, details of which have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plans/details and the fence shall be retained throughout the construction period. If any trenches for services are required in the front garden of No. 11 or along the shared driveway, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 25 mm or more shall be left unsevered.
REASON: To ensure the retention and protection of the adjacent trees that are important to the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2030.
7. No work shall be carried out on site until provision has been made available within the site, in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, for storage of materials and equipment associated with the development. The front garden and shared driveway shall be covered by a geo-textile membrane with plywood boards over the top. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved storage arrangements and the protection measures shall be retained throughout the period of work on the site.
REASON: To ensure the retention and protection of the trees that are important to the visual amenity of the area and to avoid obstruction to the shared access in accordance with Policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

Agenda Item 6

1. NPPF Statement

In determining this planning application, the Local Planning Authority assessed the proposal against all material considerations and has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions where possible and required, by:

- Liaising with members/respondents/applicant/agent and discussing the proposal where considered appropriate and necessary in a timely manner during the course of the determination of the application.
- Seeking amended plans/additional information to address identified issues during the course of the application.

This decision has been taken in accordance with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework, as set out in article 35, of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.

Agenda Item 6



ArcGIS Web Map



Crawley Borough Council
Town Hall, The Boulevard,
Crawley, West Sussex,
RH10 1UZ
Tel: 01293 438000

1:750

