

**REFERENCE NO: CR/2019/0550/FUL**

**LOCATION:** [25 BANCROFT ROAD, MAIDENBOWER, CRAWLEY](#)  
**WARD:** Maidenbower  
**PROPOSAL:** LOFT CONVERSION INCORPORATING A REAR DORMER AND ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER EXISTING GARAGE, ONE ROOF LIGHT ON REAR ROOF SLOPE AND THREE ROOF LIGHTS ON FRONT ROOF SLOPE (AMENDED DESCRIPTION & AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED)

**TARGET DECISION DATE:** 14 October 2019

**CASE OFFICER:** Ms D. Angelopoulou

**APPLICANTS NAME:** Mr M Steer

**AGENTS NAME:** PDK Architecture and Surveying

---

**PLANS & DRAWINGS CONSIDERED:**

Drawing Number	Revision	Drawing Title
001	A	Existing Plans
002	A	Existing Elevations
010	C	Proposed Plans
011	C	Proposed Elevations
012	C	Site Location & Block Plan

**CONSULTEE NOTIFICATIONS & RESPONSES:-**

<u>Type</u>	<u>Comment</u>
1. National Air Traffic Services (NATS)	No safeguarding objection.
2. CBC Drainage Officer	No objection.

**NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS:-**

BANCROFT ROAD: 24, 7, 26, 8, 6, 5  
TEMPLE CLOSE: 10

**RESPONSES RECEIVED:-**

Four letters of support have been received stating that the proposed changes will be aesthetically pleasing to the street.

**REASON FOR REPORTING TO COMMITTEE:-**

The application was called in by Councillor Kim Jaggard.

**1. THE APPLICATION SITE:-**

- 1.1 The application site relates to a two storey detached dwelling, located on the northern side of Bancroft Road within the neighbourhood of Maidenbower. The dwelling is brick built with a pitched, tiled roof which has a chimney to the west side and a barn hip to the east, with a small gable above the left hand, first floor window. The open front porch is covered by a mono-pitched, tiled roof which forms a cat slide roof above the attached garage, which also features a barn hip. A single storey rear

extension, permitted by CR/2018/0911/FUL, spanning nearly the full width of the main dwelling and garage, is under construction. The first floor side extension over the garage permitted under CR/2018/0911/FUL has not been implemented to date. To the front, there is a large hardstanding and driveway providing off street parking for at least three cars.

- 1.2 The dwelling and the development area lie within Flood Zone 3, with some of the rear within Flood Zone 2 and most of the rear garden beyond the Flood Zone.

## **2. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:-**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side extension over the garage, a loft conversion incorporating a dormer in the rear slope, and the installation of three front rooflights and one rear rooflight. The proposal has been amended since the application was submitted, by setting the extension back from the front elevation by 0.6m (previously 0.45m), setting down the extension from the main ridge by approx.0.3m (previously approx. 0.2m) and altering the roof design of the rear dormer from two small hipped dormers to a single flat roofed dormer.
- 2.2 The main roof would be altered to be a dual pitched roof with no barn hip feature. The proposed first floor side extension would be positioned on the eastern (side) elevation of the dwelling, above the existing garage. It would be set back 0.6m from the original front elevation and would retain a 2.1m gap to its eastern boundary. The proposed roof of the side extension would be designed with a barn hip and would be set down from the main ridge by 0.3m. The existing small gable on the front elevation would be replicated above the proposed first floor window on the front elevation over the garage.
- 2.3 The proposed rear dormer would have a flat roof, a width of 5.5m and would be positioned 1m below the existing ridge.
- 2.4 The proposal also includes the replacement of all existing side hung casement windows on the front and rear elevations with sliding sash windows as shown on the previously permitted scheme which has been partially implemented.
- 2.5 Internally, the proposal would provide three new bedrooms and two new bathrooms.

## **3. PLANNING HISTORY:-**

- 3.1 CR/2018/0911/FUL – Permit – Erection of single storey rear extension, first floor side extension over garage and replacement of front garden with driveway (revised description and amended drawings received) [Partially implemented].
- 3.2 CR/2019/0362/NCC – Permit – Variation of condition 4 (tarmac) pursuant to CR/2018/0911/FUL (erection of single storey rear extension, first floor side extension over garage and replacement of front garden with driveway) for changes to time limit.

## **4. PLANNING POLICY:-**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019 as amended in June 2019)**

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in 2019 states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
  - Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development. This section states that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives: an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations, and an environmental objective to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment. This includes making effective use of land and helping to improve biodiversity.
  - Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places. 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) (adopted December 2015)

4.2 The following Local Plan policies are relevant to this application:

- 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 in order to assist in the creation, retention or enhancement of successful places.
- Policy CH3: Normal Requirements of All New Development states all proposals for development will be required to make a positive contribution to the area; be of a high quality urban design; provide and retain a good standard of amenity for all nearby and future occupants of land and buildings; be able to meet its own operational requirements necessary for the safe and proper use of the site; retain existing individual or groups of trees; incorporate "Secure by Design" principles and demonstrate how the Building for Life 12 criteria would be delivered. Development proposals must adhere to any relevant supplementary planning guidance produced by the council including residential extensions.
- Policy IN4: Car and Cycle Parking Standards. Development will be permitted where the proposals provide the appropriate amount of car and cycle parking to meet its needs when it is assessed against the borough council's car and cycle parking standards. These standards are contained within the Planning Obligations and s106 Agreements Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) or any subsequent similar document.

#### Emerging Crawley Borough Local Plan 2020 – 2035 (June 2019)

4.3 The Local Plan Review 2020-2035 is at an early stage and therefore limited weight should be given to the following applicable policies:

- Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.
- Policy CD2: Making Successful Places: Principles of Good Urban Design.
- Policy CD3: Local Character and Design of New Development.
- Policy CD6: Normal Requirements of All New Development.
- Policy ST1: Development and Requirements for Sustainable Transport.

#### Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted October 2016)

4.4 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 public design and the design of extensions. In particular, it states that:

- *'An extension on the side of a property will be prominent and it is important that it should work successfully with its surroundings. The junction of a side extension with the existing building will have to be considered and resolved through good design.'*
- *'A design solution that can be used to prevent the 'terracing effect' will leave a 2 metre setback between the side extension and the adjacent property or site boundary. This solution may not be appropriate in all cases and will be considered on a site by site basis, based on the character of the area. Furthermore, where a side setback may not be suitable, it could be explored by setting the side extension in from the front elevation.'*
- *'Dormer windows will only be permitted where they can be inserted without damaging the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area. Dormers are best kept to the rear of the property and are not normally acceptable to the front. However, this will be assessed in relation to the local context.'*
- *'A dormer window should be kept well below the ridge line, smaller than the overall width of the roof and away from the edges. It is recommended that a dormer window be centred on the window lines below and that the dormer take up no more than half the width of the dwelling.'*

- *'Materials and detailing of dormers should be carefully designed to consider existing materials and scales of the dwelling and surrounding buildings. Dormers with flat roofs can often fit in well if they are clad in high quality materials and are designed and detailed with care.'*
- *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'.*
- *'Development should incorporate materials and colours that match the existing dwelling'.*
- *'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'.*

4.5 It also includes the Crawley minimum car parking. For 3 plus bedroom dwellings in this location, the minimum standards are 2-3 car parking spaces.

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:-**

5.1 The main planning issues in the determination of this application are:

- The design & appearance of the proposal and its impact on the dwelling, street scene & wider area
- The impact on neighbouring properties and amenities
- Parking considerations
- Flooding and drainage

### The design & appearance of the proposal and its impact on the dwelling, street scene & wider area

5.2 The main concern with this application is the impact that the proposal would have on the dwelling, the street scene and the wider area. The immediate streetscene is residential in character. The properties on the north side of Bancroft Road in the area bounded by Temple Close and Maidenbower Drive and the properties on the south side of Bancroft Road between Maidenbower Drive and Parker Close are generally well-proportioned detached dwellings in large plots with side garages which result in a substantial separation gap between the dwellings at first floor and loft level. These properties have a consistent appearance in terms of style and proportions, and the barn hip is a prominent design feature in the locality.

#### *First Floor Side Extension*

5.3 The proposed first floor side extension over the garage would be highly prominent within the street scene. According to the Urban Design SPD, extensions to a dwelling can have a big impact on the dwelling and the immediate street scene. They should therefore complement the house and the street scene, rather than standing out, by relating appropriately to the character and style, dimensions, materials and finishes of the parent dwelling and the character of the neighbourhood.

5.4 There are two concerns with this side extension relating to its bulk and the loss of the barn hip element of the roof. The extension would not have a meaningful setback (approx.0.3m) comparing to the substantial gaps over the garage at first floor level and would not be subordinate to the original dwelling and the streetscene contrary to the advice in the adopted Urban Design SPD. The overall design, scale, bulk and massing would appear dominant on the host dwelling and would fail to respect the scale, design and form of the original property. The bulk and mass of the proposed first floor side extension is considered excessive at roof level and out of proportion with the host dwelling.

5.5 The proposed first floor side extension would also result in the loss of the barn hip element of the main roof and therefore the main roof of the original dwelling would be turned into plain dual pitched roof. The barn hip element of the roof is a characteristic and prominent design feature in the locality and its loss is considered unacceptable. The proposed first floor extension would result in a discordant addition to the locality and would not respect the design and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding properties in the immediate streetscene.

5.6 As a result, the proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its design, scale, bulk, massing and prominence, would appear visually prominent and discordant, would have an adverse impact on the

design and appearance of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene, contrary to the Local Policies CH2 and CH3 and the Urban Design SPD.

- 5.7 The proposed first floor side extension would be set in from the adjacent property of No.26 Bancroft by approx. 2.1m which is in accordance with the guidance contained in the Urban Design SPD to prevent a 'terracing effect'. It would also be setback from the front elevation by 0.6m as amended and as such the proposal is not considered to result in a terracing effect.
- 5.8 It should be noted that a first floor side extension was recently approved under the application reference CR/2018/0911/FUL. This approved first floor side extension was the result of several amendments to the originally non-proportionate submitted scheme. The approved ridge of that extension is 1.65m lower than the existing ridge height of the main dwelling and 0.3m lower than the base of the barn hip of the main roof. The retention of the distinct barn hip of the main roof, together with the significant setdown of the extension and replication of the barn hip design of the existing garage roof, was considered to serve to reduce the potential bulk of the roof above the garage and produce a subservient appearance, such that the side extension was not considered to be out of proportion with the dwelling. However, this current proposed first floor side extension, as discussed above, is considered to be out of proportion with the host dwelling by reason of its design, scale, bulk, massing and prominence.
- 5.9 During the course of the determination of the application, the applicant was made aware of the concerns with this application as they were similar to the ones raised before under the application reference CR/2018/0911/FUL. To this response, the first floor side extension has been amended with a minor setback and setdown. The applicant also raised some examples approved in the neighbourhood of Maidenbower, however, none of them are directly relevant to this application as they are of different design and appearance and are not located in the immediate streetscene.
- 5.10 These examples are not precedents relating to this specific proposal which is not subservient to the main dwelling with no suitable design response, setback and setdown. The examples that the applicant raised had addressed the terracing effect and respected the form of the original property, by replicating the design and by significantly setting down and setting back the extensions (examples of No.7 Albion Close, No.10 Bosham Road that also has a staggered building line, No.34 Marshall Road). Some of the examples provided, such as Nos.13 Laud Drive, 2 Strand Close, 4 & 6 Adelphi Close, were approved several years ago under the previous Local Plan and design guidance. The applicant highlights the example of No.2 Newman Close, which has a similar setback (as the amended proposal – 0.6m setback) and setdown. However, this detached dwelling is of a different design with no characteristic barn hip and is located at the entrance of Newman Close. The roof form was replicated at the approved extension of No.2 Newman Close and therefore the proposal was considered acceptable. The Urban Design SPD clearly states regarding side extensions that they need to be considered on a site by site basis based on the character of the area and as explained above, the proposal is not considered acceptable in this instance.

#### *Rear Dormer*

- 5.11 The proposal has been amended by altering the roof design of the rear dormer from two small hipped dormers to a single flat roofed dormer. The proposed dormer is a large flat roof boxy design, which would not be a sympathetic alteration or addition to the property. Regarding the detailing and materials of the proposed dormer, the Urban Design SPD states that dormers should be carefully designed to consider the existing materials and scale of the dwelling and surrounding buildings. The Urban Design SPD also states that a dormer should be smaller than the overall width of the roof and advises that a dormer window is centred on the window lines below and that the dormer takes up no more than half the width of the dwelling. The proposed flat roof and boxy design of the dormer is not considered to be in keeping with the character of the original property as it would consume the majority of the rear roof slope, leaving a gap of only 0.4m on the eastern side. The proposal would be a bulky addition to the rear roof slope and would not comply with the Urban Design SPD guidance on being centred on the window lines below. In addition, although the dormer would be partially hidden from view, it would still be visible from Bancroft Road to both sides. The proposed flat roofed dormer, by virtue of its design, non-alignment with first floor windows, scale, bulk and massing, is considered to be too large and out of proportion with the host dwelling resulting in a top heavy appearance which

would have a detrimental impact on the design and appearance of the original property and surrounding area, contrary to the Local Policies CH2 and CH3 and the Urban Design SPD.

- 5.12 The applicant has stated in this regard that the proposed dormer and two front rooflights within the existing roof can be carried out under the permitted development rights for the property, and therefore it should be allowed by this planning application. Based on the submitted second floor plan, it appears that the loft conversion would need to be constructed along with the proposed first floor side extension as a single development and that would not be permitted development. Notwithstanding this, planning permission is sought for this dormer and this would therefore need to be assessed under the relevant Local Plan Policies and design guidance. It is therefore considered not to comply with these documents as detailed above.

#### *Rooflights & windows*

- 5.13 The proposed roof lights in the front and rear roof slopes would not be harmful to the street scene.
- 5.14 It is noted that the existing side hung casement windows would be replaced by sliding sash style windows as shown on the previously permitted scheme which has been partially implemented. The colour would remain as white. The surrounding properties have had some changes to their front windows; such as the adjoining No.26 Bancroft Road now has black windows etc. These replacement windows are not therefore considered to harm the appearance of the original property and the surrounding area to such an extent to warrant a reason for refusal on its own.
- 5.15 Overall, given the location of the dwelling within a prominent section of the road, the proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its design, scale, bulk, massing and prominence, would appear visually prominent and discordant, would fail to respect the scale, design and form of the original property and would have an adverse impact on the design and appearance of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene. The proposed flat roofed dormer, by virtue of its design, non-alignment with first floor windows, scale, bulk and massing, would adversely impact the design and appearance of the original property and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Local Plan Policies CH2 and CH3, the NPPF which seeks sympathetic and high quality design, and the guidance found within the Urban Design SPD relating to dormers and extensions.

#### The impact on neighbouring properties and amenities

- 5.16 The neighbouring properties at Nos. 24 and 26 Bancroft Road and 10 Temple Close would be potentially most affected by the proposed development.
- 5.17 The proposed side extension would be screened from No.24 by the host dwelling and the proposed rear dormers would be sited at a min. distance of approx. 4m from the neighbouring dwelling to the west. For these reasons, and given that no new windows are proposed in the west elevations, no undue overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impact would be considered to result in relation to the occupants of No.24.
- 5.18 No.26 Bancroft Road has a side garage adjoining the application site with a separation gap of 2.1m. While the proposed side extension would project 2m beyond the rear elevation of the garage at No.26, this element of the development would be in line with the rear elevation of the main dwelling at No.26. Given the separation gap and non-habitable nature of the garage building, the proposed side extension would not be considered to result in an unacceptable loss of outlook or light to the occupants of No.26. No windows are proposed along the east flank (side) elevation of the extension and the rear dormer and as such they would not result in harmful overlooking or loss of privacy on No.26.
- 5.19 The proposed extensions would be sited at a substantial distance from No.10 Temple Close (approx. 17m) and, due to the respective orientation of the properties, the proposed windows would face towards the rear garden of the rear neighbour, which would be substantially screened by the existing rear boundary close boarded wooden fence and mature trees. For these reasons, no overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy would result in respect of the occupants of No. 10.

5.20 Overall, in terms of neighbouring amenity, the proposal would not result in a harmful impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties and would accord with the relevant Local Plan Policies, the Urban Design SPD and the NPPF.

#### Parking and highways considerations

5.21 The proposal would result in the property becoming a 5-bedroom house. The front curtilage provides space for at least 3 cars and the single garage could accommodate another car. According to the Urban Design SPD the minimum parking standards for a 3 plus bedroom dwelling in this location are 2-3 spaces. As such the parking arrangements are considered satisfactory and would accord with the guidance for a dwelling of this size at this location, and Local Plan Policies CH3 and IN4 and the NPPF.

#### Flooding and drainage

5.22 The majority of the application site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 as identified on the Environment Agency Flood Maps and a Flood Risk Assessment was submitted with the application. The Council's Drainage Officer was consulted and advised that the scheme is acceptable since there would be no increase in the impermeable foot print area and would, therefore, comply with Policy ENV8 (Development and Flood Risk) or the relevant provisions of the NPPF (2019).

### **6, CONCLUSIONS:-**

6.1 In conclusion, it has been identified that there are some fundamental issues regarding the design and appearance of the proposal. Given the location of the dwelling within a prominent section of the road, the proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its design, scale, bulk, massing and prominence, would appear visually prominent and discordant, would fail to respect the scale, design and form of the original property, and would have an adverse impact on the design and appearance of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene. In addition, the proposed flat roofed dormer, by virtue of its design, non-alignment with first floor windows, scale, bulk and massing, would adversely impact the design and appearance of the original property and surrounding area. It is recommended to refuse planning permission for this application as the proposal would fail to accord with Local Plan Policies CH2 and CH3, the NPPF which seeks sympathetic and high quality design, and the guidance found within the Urban Design SPD relating to dormers and extensions.

### **RECOMMENDATION RE: CR/2019/0550/FUL**

**REFUSE** - For the following reason(s):-

1. The proposed first floor side extension and rear dormer, by virtue of their design, scale/massing, bulk and prominence, would appear visually dominant and discordant, would fail to respect the scale, design and form of the original property, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the visual amenities of the street scene. The proposal conflicts with the Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030, the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2016) and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy (2019).

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 agent and discussing the proposal where considered appropriate and necessary in a timely manner during the course of the determination of the application.
- Informing the applicant of identified issues that are so fundamental that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward due to the harm that would be caused.

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.



# ArcGIS Web Map



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

1:750







# ArcGIS Web Map

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



1:750

