

REFERENCE NO: CR/2023/0391/FUL

LOCATION: [69 ST MARY'S DRIVE, POUND HILL, CRAWLEY](#)
WARD: Pound Hill North & Forge Wood
PROPOSAL: RETROSPECTIVE SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION WITH HIP TO GABLE AND DORMER EXTENSIONS INCLUDING RETENTION OF ALTERATIONS TO WINDOWS, DOORS, ROOF TILES, TILE HANGING (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)

TARGET DECISION DATE: 29 August 2023

CASE OFFICER: Miss J Banks

APPLICANT'S NAME: Mr J Healey

AGENT'S NAME:

PLANS & DRAWINGS CONSIDERED:-

Drawing Number	Revision	Drawing Title
JH 23 01		Location Plan Site Plan & Photos 1 1250 1 200 A2
JH 23 02		Original House Plans Sections And Elevations 1 100 A2
JH 23 03		As Built Plans Sections & Elevations 1 100 A2

CONSULTEE NOTIFICATIONS & RESPONSES:-

None.

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS:-

49, 52, 54, 65, 67, 71, 73, 75, and 79 St Mary's Drive;
4 and 7 Byron Close.

RESPONSES RECEIVED:-

9 responses have been received in support of the application, from the properties at 49, 52, 54, 65, 73, 75, 79 St Mary's Drive and 4 and 7 Byron Close referring to the design and materials used on the subject property.

The immediately adjacent properties of 67 and 71 St Mary's Drive have submitted detailed objections to the application. Issues cited are:

- The size of the dormer and associated windows are too big and leads to overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light
- The materials and finish of the house
- Encroachment on the boundary at the roof join
- Not a cohesive finish to the dormer. Poor design in comparison with neighbouring examples
- Disruption caused during construction
- Energy efficiency
- Unfinished boundary wall
- Felling of trees in the rear garden.

REASON FOR REPORTING TO COMMITTEE:-

At the request of Councillor Kevan McCarthy, and that more than 4 letters of support have been received while the officer recommendation is to refuse.

THE APPLICATION SITE:-

- 1.1 The application site contains a semi-detached bungalow located on the west side of St. Mary's Drive, in the neighbourhood of Pound Hill. The property is brick built with full white rendering. It has a pitched, tiled roof with two front roof lights. Originally the property had a fully hipped roof with small gable on the side roof slope.
- 1.2 Works have recently been undertaken to the dwelling without planning permission – these comprise a single storey rear extension and a loft conversion with a hip to gable extension and a rear dormer. In addition, the red/brown roof tiles have been replaced with grey tiles. The rear dormer, side window and front roof lights have grey framed windows while the rear extension has white framed windows.
- 1.3 To the front of the property is an area of hardstanding with space for approximately 2 vehicles. A shared driveway (with no.67) runs down the southern side elevation and leads to a long, narrow rear garden which is bounded by an approx. 1.8m closeboarded fence. The rear garden is 40m in length and adjoins the railway line to the west. It contains a timber canopy structure towards the eastern end and a large brick-built outbuilding at the western end. The dwelling lies in flood zone 1 with the very western extent of the garden furthest from the house being within flood zone 2.
- 1.4 The property is in the Sussex North Water Resource Zone supplied by Southern Water.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:-

- 2.1 Retrospective planning permission is sought for the existing single storey rear extension and the loft conversion with hip to gable extension and rear dormer that has been carried out as well as the replacement roof tiles. Permission is also sought for the changes made to exterior rendering and window alterations.
- 2.2 The proposals were initially submitted under a certificate of lawfulness application (CR/2021/0602/192); however this application was never actioned due to being invalid. A subsequent enforcement enquiry (ENF/2021/0283) found that the works had already begun and required planning permission as they did not meet the permitted development requirements: the materials did not match the original dwellinghouse, the rear extension had been constructed above the eaves of the original house, adequate distance was not left between the dormer and the original eaves, and the dormer was erected partly on top of the rear extension. In addition, the rear extension was not in accordance with the plans submitted under CR/2019/0074/HPA, which proposed a lower height.
- 2.3 The single storey rear extension element projects out 6m from the rear elevation and stretches the full width of the house at 7m. It has a slightly sloping flat roof design with an eaves height of 3m and a maximum height of 3.1m. Internally it is a sitting/dining room, with patio doors and a window in the rear elevation and a window on the side elevation, all in white UPVC.
- 2.4 The hip to gable extension added a volume of 19.37 cubic metres to the roof. This extended the southern slope of the roof. It has been finished in grey slate tiles, with matching grey tile hanging on the gable end and a window with dark grey 'anthracite' frames. It also includes two dark grey 'anthracite' roof lights on the front facing slope.
- 2.5 The rear dormer extension has a volume of 34.44 cubic metres which, together with the hip to gable volume, creates a total additional roof space of 53.81 cubic metres. The dormer projects out from the roof by 4.1m and has a width of 7m. It has a flat roof design with a height of 2.4m. There are two rear facing windows made from dark grey 'anthracite' UPVC.

- 2.6 The front elevation of the property has been rendered in white to match the rest of the dwelling. The window frames on the front elevation are white UPVC while the front door is anthracite coloured UPVC.
- 2.7 This application follows the refusal of CR/2022/0497/FUL. The two schemes are identical, with the only changes being that the proposed alterations to the render/windows on the front of the dwelling are no longer proposed, but existing.

PLANNING HISTORY:-

3.1	CR/2000/0538/FUL	ERECTION OF CAR PORT	PERMIT
	CR/2019/0074/HPA	SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	PRIOR APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED
	(The current rear extension was not built in accordance with the plans approved under CR/2019/0074/HPA)		
	CR/2022/0497/FUL	RETROSPECTIVE SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION WITH HIP TO GABLE AND DORMER EXTENSIONS WITH ALTERATIONS TO RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY	REFUSED on the grounds of unsympathetic materials and windows used.

PLANNING POLICY:-

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework (as revised on 20 July 2021)

- 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. Development that is not well designed should be refused.

4.2 Crawley Borough Local Plan (2015-2030) (adopted December 2015)

The relevant policies include:

- 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 seeks 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.

4.3 Draft Crawley Borough Local Plan 2024-2040

The Local Plan Review 2024-2040 was approved for Regulation 19 consultation by Full Council on 22 February 2023. Public consultation has now concluded and the Local Plan was submitted for examination on 31 July. Appropriate weight should therefore be given to the following 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: Movement Patterns, Layout and Sustainable Urban Design
- Policy DD1: Normal Requirements of All New Development
- Policy DD2: Inclusive Design
- Policy SDC1: Sustainable Design and Construction

4.4 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

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:

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.'*
- *'Brick detailing and fenestration (arrangement of windows) also contribute to the appearance of a dwelling. Any development should reflect the existing dwelling by ensuring that new window apertures are of a matching size and situated in line with existing ones. If an existing building features brick detailing, this should be continued or reflected in an extension.'*

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° angle from the nearest edge of a neighbour's window or door aperture*
- *'A two storey extension should not encroach into an area measured by drawing a 60 degree angle from the nearest edge of a neighbours' 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'.*

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:-

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

- The impact of the design and appearance on the dwelling, street scene and wider area character
- The impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- Other matters subject to objection
- Water neutrality

The impact of the design and appearance on the dwelling, street scene and wider area character

5.2 St. Mary's Drive is a long road which consists of a wide variety of housing types. No.69 occupies a site to the west of the highway, in a row of approximately 20 similar semi-detached bungalows. Opposite this row is a stretch of larger, detached and semi-detached properties. Many of the bungalows in the row have undergone works, with dormer extensions being seen on a number of them, including both properties directly adjacent to the application site (nos. 67 and 71). Many also have hip-to-gable extensions, including no.67, though no.71 has maintained the original hipped roof. In this regard, the additions to the roof in terms of design or volume are not out of character with the varied street scene or character of the wider area. Similarly, many of the bungalows in the row also have single storey rear extensions.

5.3 The side elevations of the dormer, hip-to-gable and single storey rear extensions are visible from the street view of St. Mary's Drive as one approaches from the south, though they are no more visible than the same developments seen on adjacent properties. The rear of the property has a long garden which backs on to the railway tracks, so the single storey rear and dormer extensions are therefore not visible from any other streets. A garden depth of approximately 40m is also maintained. The mass of these additions therefore cause no significant detriment to the street scene or wider area character by way of size and massing and do not contradict guidance outlined in the Urban Design SPD.

5.4 With regard to the impact on the existing dwelling, the dormer extension is of a considerable size. With a width of 7m, it does contradict the recommendations set out in the Urban Design SPD that dormers should take up no more than half the width of the original dwelling. However, many other nearby properties also have dormer extensions of considerable width, meaning it is not so large that it is out of keeping with other dormers seen nearby, or overwhelming to the existing dwelling. It would therefore be contradictory of the Council to refuse on such grounds.

5.5 However, the materials used in the finish of the works are not considered appropriate to this semi-detached dwelling or the surrounding area. In particular, the grey tiles on the main roof (both front and back roof slopes) contrast significantly with the other property in the pair (no.71) which has maintained the original brown coloured tiling seen on the majority of houses on St. Mary's Drive. The grey tiling unbalances the appearance of the semi-detached pair of dwellings.

5.6 Grey tile hanging has also been applied to the gable end of the roof space on the side elevation from the ridge down to where it meets the eaves. This is considered an unattractive and unsympathetic addition to the street scene and is an incongruous feature when compared to the adjacent properties.

Continuing the render up the gable end would be more appropriate. This matter was discussed with the applicant prior to the submission of this application, but the tile hanging on the gable end remains as part of this application.

- 5.7 The existing anthracite UPVC windows seen on the rear dormer are not considered appropriate to the dwelling or surrounding area. They do not match the white windows seen on the rest of the house or those adjacent to it and create a dark and unattractive look to the dormer when viewed from the rear. The anthracite coloured roof windows and door for the front elevation are also considered unattractive and out of keeping with the surrounding street scene. As they are on the front elevation they are especially conspicuous in the street scene. Anthracite doors/windows are thus deemed wholly inappropriate at this site and go against guidance set out in the Urban Design SPD.
- 5.8 The white render seen on the front elevation matches that already seen on the single storey rear extension and is not uncommon in the street. Light coloured render was originally used on this dwelling. The white render is not unacceptable on its own, but it is often coupled with the red/brown roof tiling and white windows. The combination of white render with the grey tiles and proposed anthracite grey windows and door give the house overall a highly contrasting appearance to those in the rest of the row, especially its attached neighbour at no.71 and thus is considered to have a detrimental impact on the character of the street. The white UPVC frames of the ground floor windows also add to the incongruous contrast with the anthracite grey framed windows that have been installed and the grey front door. Furthermore, the retention of the white window frames at the front of the property do not address the unacceptable visual impact of the unsympathetic grey roof tiles, especially as this property is semi-detached and the attached dwelling has retained its brown/red roof tiling.
- 5.9 The size and massing of the extensions built do not cause significant negative impact to the existing dwellinghouse or to the street scene and therefore are considered to accord with the policies outlined in the NPPF (2021), the relevant Crawley Borough Local Plan policies and the Urban Design SPD (2016).
- 5.10 However, the combination of the materials used in the resultant dwelling, namely the roof tiles, gable end tile hanging and anthracite windows, white rendering, dormer tile hanging and anthracite windows, the rear extension and front elevation windows and the front door are not deemed to be appropriate to the house or street and has created an unattractive and unbalanced appearance, particularly when viewed with the attached dwelling at no.71.
- 5.11 The proposal is thus contrary to the policies outlined in the NPPF (2021), the relevant Crawley Borough Local Plan policies and the Urban Design SPD (2016).

The impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties

- 5.12 The hip-to-gable extension is built on the roof slope facing no.67; however, it is not considered to cause any harm to its amenities as it is not over dominant nor overshadowing. There is a window on the gable end which serves the first floor landing. This is opposite the side elevation of no.67 but is obscured glazed and non-opening and so it is not considered to cause issues of privacy. No.67 also has a matching hip-to-gable extension. The existing roof screens the hip-to-gable element from no.71.
- 5.13 A number of representations were raised in relation to the rear dormer, namely that it is large and causes overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. It is noted that the rear windows are large, but rear dormers could be permissible under permitted development and a number of other dwellings in the street have rear dormers, erected under these rights. However, in this case, the dormer requires planning permission and so this aspect has been assessed. Given the presence of other dormers, the one at no.69 is not deemed to be contributing to overlooking or loss of privacy any more than others in the row. The adjoining properties also have dormer extensions which overlook the garden of no.69 similar to how the dormer at no.69 overlooks the gardens of the adjoining properties. Nos. 75 and 73 also have similar sized dormers to that of no.69.
- 5.14 The single storey rear extension projects out by 6m which, while a significant addition to the back of the house, does not project out as far as either rear extension of the neighbouring properties. The extension of no.67 and the conservatory of no.71 both extend out further, and thus are not affected by the 45 degree rule or issues of overlooking. At 3m, the height of the extension is higher than the

adjacent conservatory, and thus does cause some loss of light. This is exacerbated by the extension being south of the conservatory. However as the extension does not project as far out as those of the adjoining properties, it is considered on balance that the extension does not result in significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The objection from no.71 expresses concern about the loss of light to their study, which is served by a roof light located close to the boundary with no.69. The dormer can be seen from this roof light but only when viewed from particular angles in the room. It is not considered that the dormer is so obstructive that it would cause significant detriment to the amenities of no.71, particular given the size and position of the roof light.

- 5.15 The development is shown to be wholly within the boundary of no.69.
- 5.16 The render and windows on the front elevations would not have an effect on the amenities of neighbouring properties beyond affecting the street view and character as mentioned above.
- 5.17 In terms of the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, the proposed development is considered to accord with the policies outlined in the NPPF (2021), the relevant Crawley Borough Local Plan policies and the Urban Design SPD (2016).

Other matters raised by objectors

- 5.18 Disruption caused during construction:
Complaints were made regarding the noise levels and conduct of construction workers during the building phase. Noise complaints are normally a matter for the Environmental Health division and in this case as the works are retrospective this matter is not a valid planning consideration.
- 5.19 Disruption caused by humming noise:
Complaint was made regarding noise coming from the bathroom of no.69. As agreed in the objection statement, this is not an issue for the planning department to consider, nor is the internal configuration of bathrooms.
- 5.20 Boundary issues:
A complaint was made regarding the removal of a boundary hedge in the front curtilage. According to the applicant, this was done in agreement with the previous occupier of no.71. This is a civil matter to be resolved between the occupiers. Complaints have also been made about the fencing in the front garden, which has alleged to be damaged by builders. Again this is a private property matter.
- 5.21 A complaint was made regarding the unfinished appearance of the side elevation of the rear extension as viewed from the conservatory of no.71. The current wall is block work, but it is proposed that it is rendered as per the rest of the property.
- 5.22 Felling of trees:
A complaint was made about the felling of trees in the rear garden in 2018/2019. As acknowledged in the objection, these trees were not subject to TPOs. The felling of these trees is not relevant to this application and there has been no breach of planning control in this regard.
- 5.23 Access gates to rear gardens:
A complaint was made regarding the bringing forward of the rear gate at no.69 to be further along the shared driveway with no.67. The boundary fence post has not been moved and so no encroachment has occurred, as the gate is wholly within the curtilage of no.69. In any event the extension of no.67 will have restricted access to their own rear gate too.

Water Neutrality

- 5.24 The Local Planning Authority received a Position Statement from Natural England on 14 September 2021. It raised significant concerns about the impact of water abstraction in the Sussex North Water Resource Zone upon the Arun Valley's protected SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. A screening assessment has now been undertaken, which concludes that the evidence shows that house extensions (excluding annexes and swimming pools) do not increase water usage and are therefore water neutral. The Local Planning Authority has therefore concluded that the rear extension, dormer and hip-to-gable extensions, and the render and front alterations do not adversely affect the integrity

of the protected sites and would not conflict with the obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

CONCLUSIONS:-

6.1 While the size and massing of the rear extension, dormer and hip-to-gable extensions as built are not considered to cause significant detriment to the dwellinghouse, neighbouring properties or the surrounding area, the materials used are considered to be wholly inappropriate. The use of grey tiles, particularly those extending down over the gable end and on the front facing roof slope, coupled with dark anthracite windows and white render are unsympathetic to the design of the existing house, those used on the attached dwelling at no.71 and to the character of the wider street scene. The development is therefore not compliant with policies CH2 and CH3 of the Local Plan (2015-2030), section 12 of the NPPF (2021), and paragraphs 3.5 and 3.9 of the Urban Design SPD (2016) and so is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION RE: CR/2023/0391/FUL:-

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The materials and windows used in the construction of the rear dormer, the hip to gable enlargement and the replacement roof tiles, and the alterations to the front elevation, are unsympathetic and inappropriate for the dwellinghouse and the street scene. The existing exterior appearance is of detriment to the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CH2 and CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 - 2030, the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

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:

- Providing advice in a timely and manner through pre-application discussions/correspondence.
- 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 has been caused.
- Providing advice on the refusal of the application to solutions that would provide a satisfactory way forward in any subsequently submitted 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.



ArcGIS Web Map



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

1:827

