SUPPORTING PLANNING STATEMENT

PLANNING APPLICATION FOR: THE ERECTION OF 1 NO. DETACHED 2-STOREY HOUSE WITH INTEGRAL SINGLE GARAGE

SITE AT: LAND ADJ TO NO.22 LANGLEY LANE, CRAWLEY, WEST SUSSEX, RH11 0NA

1. Introduction

This Statement describes the site, its surroundings and the proposal itself. The Planning Policy background is considered along with an assessment of the proposal in light of the relevant policy and all other material planning considerations. This Statement should be read in conjunction with the separate Design & Access Statement, prepared by the scheme architects, the Brunton Boobyer Partnership.

In addition to these documents, this application also comprises the following:

- Drawing no. 885 02 Revision A - Site and Block Plan
- Drawing no. 885 03 - Plans, Sections and Elevations
- Drawing no. 885 - Flood Map
- Memorandum on Tree Guidance (prepared by Arbortrack Systems Limited)

2. The Site & Surrounding Area

The site appears to be a vacant parcel of land distinctly separate from the adjacent houses of No’s 18 and 22. The numbering indicates that this plot (No.20) was always meant for a dwelling house. The application site is generally flat and level but with a slight mound at the front. It has a width ranging from 14.6m at the front to 13.2m at the rear.

The plot is located on the southern side of Langley Lane. No. 22 to the east is detached 2-storey dwelling, whilst No.18 to the east is a chalet bungalow.
The site was previously very overgrown having been left for a number of years without any attention. The site has now been cleared, with a number of poor trees and area of undergrowth cleared. Hedging to the site boundaries and a leylandii screen to the rear have been retained. An Oak tree that was subject to a Tree Preservation Order has been felled after being identified as dead and dangerous – this was agreed with the Councils Tree Officer. A replacement Oak tree is proposed to be planted along the site frontage.

Langley Lane is an attractive single lane road that comes to a dead end to the east before it reaches Ifield Avenue. The road comprises primarily individual dwellings of various size and appearance. Aside from No.18 the vast majority of properties on Langley Lane are 2-storey and detached. No.17, located opposite the application site, is a Listed timber framed cottage.

The character of the road generally is verdant, with plots having trees and hedging to their frontage. The road does not have a footway, and this coupled with the infrequent traffic activity combine to provide an informal and attractive streetscene, despite the predominance of buildings that are of little architectural merit when considered individually.
Fig 2 – Looking east along Langley Lane

Fig 3 – No’s 22 and 24, the former lies immediately to the east of the site
Langley Lane forms part of the Ifield area of Crawley. Ifield is a former village and now a neighbourhood of Crawley located to the west of the town. Within walking distance of the site are the allotments, Royal Oak PH and the Langley Corner Surgery on Ifield Green immediately to the east. A very short distance to the southeast on Ifield Drive are a variety of retail opportunities, in addition to a Post Office and the Ifield Medical Practice. A much larger variety of services are available in Crawley town centre, and this is ready accessible by local bus services, as are neighbouring towns and villages. Ifield station is located on the south side of the neighbourhood on the border with Gossops Green. Services run from here direct to Three Bridges Station and London Victoria and Horsham.

3. Planning History
Previous planning permissions for the provision of a house on this plot were granted in 1959 and again in 1986 – although it is understood that these consents were never implemented, and have subsequently lapsed.

4. Relevant Planning Policies

a. National Planning Policy
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012, and at that time the policies in the Framework came into use, with immediate effect. This guidance is now the most-up-to-date Government Guidance and replaces all planning policy statements/guidance that were previously in place.

The focus of the new NPPF is achieving sustainable development, the definition of which is summarised in paragraph 6 as being the whole of paragraph’s 18-219 of the Framework. Paragraph 7 goes further as it specifies that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Under the social role it states that the planning system should provide “the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment…”

Under paragraph 11, the NPPF confirms that planning law requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless
material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan.

Paragraph 14 is an important element of the NPPF. It states that: “at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking”. It details that objectively assessed needs, such as housing, have to be met unless “any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.” This is assessed against all the policies of the NPPF, as a whole, or specific policies relating to SSSI, Green Belt, Local Green Space, AONB, Heritage Coast, National Park, designated heritage assets, flood risk locations and coastal erosion. It also states that decision makers should be “approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay”.

The NPPF advises that a set of 12 core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking, and these principles are listed under paragraph 17. Although the NPPF omits the wording that was present in the draft which referred to the default position of “yes” to applications for sustainable development, it does retain the significant change that requires a response to market signals. Each of the bullet points are important, but of particular note is no. 4 where it details that high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and building should always be sought. At paragraph 5, it details that account should be had of the character of different areas, noting that developments should “take account of the different roles and character of different areas” and no. 10. which notes the importance of conserving heritage assets in a manor appropriate to their significance, so they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Finally, no. 11 requires development to be focused “in locations which are or can be sustainable.”

Section 4 is entitled ‘Promoting Sustainable Transport’. Under paragraph 28 it advises that different policies and measures are required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas. This section also highlights the importance of LPA’s and/or developers working with transport providers, and also that Travel Plans are key documents. With reference to car parking, paragraph 39, states that if a LPA
provides local parking standards, account should be had of “the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.”

Section 6 of the NPPF is entitled ‘Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes’. It seeks to “boost, significantly” the supply of housing, whilst placing more reliance on windfall sites as a source of housing supply. Realistic historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends are legitimate sources of supply. Paragraph 49 states “Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites”.

Under paragraph 53 the Framework accepts that development on garden land is acceptable provided it would not cause harm to the local area. There is no reference to minimum densities etc, and as such it is assumed that the relaxation in the June 2010 PPS3 has been retained by the NPPF.

Section 7 discusses the need for good design. Under paragraph 58 the NPPF provides what appears to be a clearer and more robust approach to design than in PPS1 paragraph 33 – 39. At point 4, this guidance notes the importance of responding to local character and history and the need to reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, whilst ensuring appropriate innovation is neither prevented nor discouraged. Further, at point 6, developments should be ‘visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping’.

The NPPF wishes to avoid unnecessary prescription or detail (paragraph 59), whilst the key criteria of scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials, access, relationship to neighbouring buildings and relation to the local area more generally remain. Paragraph 58 expands on this by stating that developments should: “function well and add to the overall quality of the area... establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit... optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses... respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime,
do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping”.

In addition, the NPPF notes that “although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment”.

It is noted that the crucial caveat of PPS1 paragraph 35 remains within the NPPF. That is that good design goes far beyond aesthetic considerations, with paragraph 61 specifically referring to “integration of new development into the natural and historic environment.”

Section 12 relates specifically to Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. At paragraph 131, this guidance sets our criteria for Local Planning Authorities to consider when determining planning applications, which includes at point 3 “the desirably of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”.

Finally, paragraph 137, states that “Local Planning Authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas …..and within the setting of heritage asset to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably”.

b. Regional Planning Policy

The South East Plan was adopted in May 2009 (also known as the Regional Spatial Strategy), and this has now replaced both RPG9 (Regional Planning Guidance for the South East) and the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011. As such it is the South East Plan that contains strategic planning policy guidance for this region. The policies are specifically of a general nature, aimed at providing guidance at the regional level. However, there are policies that are relevant, even to a small scale development such as that hereby proposed.

Policy SP2 (iv) stipulates that new housing development should be focused in locations close to or accessible by public transport. Policy SP3 is also particularly relevant, it seeks to concentrate development within or adjacent to the regions urban areas with an emphasis on previously developed land and also that
developments in urban areas, including urban infill/intensification are well designed and consistent with the principles of urban renaissance and sustainable development.

**Policy CC1** is an overarching sustainable development policy, which states that “the principal objective of the Plan is to achieve and to maintain sustainable development in the region”, with reference to reducing gas emissions, managing resource usage, preparing for climate change, and ensuring that the physical and natural environment is conserved and enhanced. **Policy CC4** outlines the objectives relating to sustainable design and construction within the region in the Plan period.

**Policy CC6** relates to character, and states that new development should “respect, and where appropriate enhance, the character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscapes throughout the region... using innovative design processes to create a high quality built environment which promotes a sense of place. This will include consideration of accessibility, social inclusion, the need for environmentaly sensitive development and crime reduction”.

Within the Plan period, the South East Plan confirms that Brighton & Hove is allocated for 7,500 homes (**Policy H1** refers). **Policy H5** relates to housing design and density. It states “Positive measures to raise the quality of new housing, reduce its environmental impact and facilitate future adaptation to meet changes in accommodation needs will be encouraged. Local authorities will prepare guidelines for the design of new housing in their areas that encourage the use of sustainable construction methods and address the implications of changing lifestyles for new housing design. In conjunction with the delivery of high quality design and in order to make good use of available land and encourage more sustainable patterns of development and services, higher housing densities will be encouraged, with an overall regional target of 40 dwellings per hectare over the Plan period.”

**Policy BE6**, entitled ‘Management of the Historic Environment’ is also relevant. This Policy states that support should be forthcoming for “proposals which protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment and the contribution it makes to local and regional distinctiveness and sense of place. The region's internationally and nationally designated historic assets should receive the highest level of protection. Proposals that make sensitive use of historic assets through regeneration, particularly where these bring redundant or under-used buildings and areas into appropriate use should be encouraged”.
c. Local Level Policies

The **Crawley Borough Core Strategy** was adopted in 2007, and forms part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the Borough. It continues to be the most relevant local planning policy document. The following policies are considered to be of particular relevance to this planning proposal:

**Policy H1** discusses housing targets for the Borough. It states “*The Core Strategy makes provision for the development of 4,040 net dwellings in the Borough in the period 2001-2016*” it is acknowledged that this provision is insufficient to meet either the Boroughs housing requirements set by the South East Plan, and consequently an early review of the LDF will therefore be undertaken in order to identify land where development can commence so as to meet future needs to 2026.

**Policy H3** is entitled ‘Housing Development Locations’ seeks to ensure that proposals for residential development will be located within sustainable locations, as part of an existing neighbourhood and which can be served by existing infrastructure.

**Policy H4** is entitled ‘Making Efficient Use of Land’ seeks to secure residential densities that maximise the efficient use of land.

**Policy EN5** discusses the need to ‘Protect and Enhance the Built Environment’ and makes it clear that all new development should be based on a thorough understanding of the context of the site and the surrounding area, whilst also being of a high quality.

This is particularly relevant due to the sites location within an ‘Area of Special Environmental Quality’ (ASEQ), which could soon be upgraded to Conservation Area status. An extract from the LDF Proposals Map is included below, which confirms that the site is positioned within the ASEQ and also within the built up area.
Policy T3 is entitled ‘Parking’ and seeks to ensure that new development takes into account the Councils agreed maximum parking standards and the need to maximise the potential for public transport use. Policy T1 stipulates that new development should meet its need for safe access.

Policy ICS2 seeks to ensure that development contributions meet the justifiable needs created by new development.

In addition to the above, it is also noted that currently the ‘saved’ policies of the Crawley Borough Local Plan (2000) also remain of relevance, particularly those listed below:

- Policy GD1 ‘The Normal Requirements of All Development’
- Policy GD2 ‘Development and its Setting’
- Policies GD5 and GD6 ‘Lanscaping and Development’
- Policy GD13 ‘Sustainability’
- Policy BN11 ‘Listed Buildings (setting)’
- BN21 ‘Tree Preservation Orders’
- Policy H5 ‘Infilling and Redevelopment’
- Policy H20 ‘Private Outdoor Space’
- Policy H22 ‘Design’
Policy BN10 refers specifically to Areas of Special Environmental Quality (ASEQ), and this states that development in such areas will not be permitted “if it will, individually or cumulatively, result in adverse changes to the character and appearance of the area or lead to the loss of important features such as trees and landscaping.”

It is also considered that Local Plan policies BN1 and BN2, which relates to development in Conservation Areas, can be given some limited weight due to the pending intention of the Council to re-designate Langley Lane as part of an existing Conservation Area.

d. Supplementary Planning Guidance

The following supplementary planning guidance documents are also relevant to this planning proposal:

- SPG3 – Standards for New Housing Development
- SPG4 – Standards for Private Outdoor Space
- SPD - Planning Obligations and S106 Agreements

5. Application Appraisal

a. Principle of Development

The site is located within the built-up area of Ifield, which forms part of the wider Crawley conurbation, and therefore the general planning policies advise that the principle of development is accepted, subject to the criteria of other relevant policies. In general terms, and in accordance with Policy H3 of the Core Strategy, the proposed house will be located within a sustainable location which forms part of an existing neighbourhood and is served by existing infrastructure.

b. Impact on the historic character of the area

It is fully appreciated that the historic character of the area is of upmost importance, given the sites location within an established Areas of Special Environmental Quality (ASEQ), as defined within the current Development Plan. It is also appreciated that No.17, which lies diagonally opposite the site to the
northeast, is a Listed Building. However, these factors should not prevent all future development, and given the site's location within the built-up area boundary, the principle of development should be accepted.

In 2010, Crawley Borough Council commissioned Alan Baxter Associates to undertake a Heritage Assessment of the borough. This concentrated around the existing ASEQ and Locally Listed Buildings. The report concluded that some areas of Crawley were worthy of Conservation Area status, including Langley Lane. The report describes this road as follows:

“The Domesday Book recorded a settlement at Ifield in 1086, and although the original nucleus of the village is to the west, Langley Lane and Ifield Green also contain ancient buildings; a cottage of c.1475 and four 17th century buildings survive in Langley Lane. There are five Listed buildings in Langley Lane, including one at Grade I and another at Grade II*, which indicates that this area possesses buildings of national interest. There are also historic associations with the Quaker religion... the character is more mixed in Langley Lane where there has been some postwar infill, there is a strong case for extending the Ifield Conservation Area to protect the historic and architectural interest of the area. However we recommend that the postwar housing at the northeast end of Langley Lane (currently protected by the ASEQ) is excluded because it has a different character from the rest of Langley Lane and is not of equal historic and architectural interest; this area should not be retained as an ASEQ either... Langley Lane has clear landscape value: it is an unpaved lane with mature trees and hedges. Many of the houses are detached, well-spaced, set back from the road, in spacious landscape settings. However, the area is primarily of historic and architectural interest, so we suggest that designation as a Conservation Area is more appropriate than as an ASEQ.”

Consequently, it is understood that it is the Council's intention is now to re-designate Langley Lane as part of the existing Ifield Conservation Area, and this could take place imminently. The Council undertook a public consultation in November 2012, and is now welcoming comments on the suggested changes to the boundaries of the Conservation Areas – the final date for comments is 30th January 2013.
However, at the time of writing this change has not been formally accepted, and therefore only limited weight can be given to this intention and the subsequent planning policy change. In any case, it is acknowledged that the ‘test’ for considering planning applications in such locations is that for proposals to be accepted they should demonstrated the development proposals will preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. In this instance, the design of the new dwelling is in keeping with the established character of neighbouring buildings in terms of its form, massing and general design, and consequently it can be seen that that the proposed new house will preserve the character of the area. However, the design is well considered, and the proposal provides an opportunity to improve the visual quality of the streetscene via the high quality design and enhanced landscaping opportunities to the front boundary when compared with the existing site circumstances. In these regards it is considered that the proposed development will demonstrate an enhancement of the future Conservation Area.

It is noted that there is an abundance of modern infill development evident within the wider Ifield area, and as is noted above, the principle of redevelopment is accepted in general terms.

The proposed new dwelling is of a wholly appropriate, high quality design, and as such would not be out of keeping with the historic character of the streetscene in this former village location, which now forms part of the wider Crawley conurbation, and as such this infill building would not be to the detriment of the visual quality of the locality. In addition, the proposed design solution would create a pair of new cottages that would not harm the setting of the nearby Listed Building of No.17. The historic character of this part of Ifield and its surrounding streets will be preserved by this proposal.

The intention is to be unobtrusive, whilst being appropriate to the setting of the site, with an overall emphasis on respecting the form of the Listed Building and other neighbouring properties, without competing with them visually. The building will be inserted into a large gap in the streetscene, however it will maintain significant distances to No’s 18 and 22 to either side of the plot. Consequently the development will not appear cramped or oppressive. The number of door and window openings to the new building are kept to a minimum, whilst the roof pitch and detail is of a traditional vernacular style. The proposal will have a symmetry and simple appearance that respects the location of the site, and more importantly,
respects also its relationship with the adjacent dwellings, including the Listed Building.

Fig 5 – No.17 Langley Lane, is a Listed Building

The features described above, together with the separation distance and the proposed traditional materials that will be utilised during the construction of the building, will ensure that the design of the building will be appropriate to its location, and the setting of the Listed Building will be fully respected and enhanced by the proposed development. Consequently, it has been shown that the proposal fully complies with Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy, and saved Policies BN10 and BN11 of the Local Plan, and also the intentions of the NPPF will be complied with in this regard.

The overall intention is to provide a modest family home of appropriate form and scale that will make an efficient use of a vacant and unkempt site within the established urban area. The site benefits from a road frontage onto an adjacent highway. It is considered that the proposal would allow this to occur without harming the essential important characteristics of the Area of Special Environmental Quality (soon to be a Conservation Area). The design and materials are consistent
with the importance of perpetuating a “sense of place” within Ifield, and it is considered that the proposal also satisfies saved Local Plan policy BN1 and BN2, which relate to development within the Boroughs Conservation Areas.

c. Density

Current policy and guidance advises that development should make the most efficient use of previously developed land. Policy H4 of the Core Strategy states that “residential proposals below 30 dwellings per hectare will only be considered acceptable in exceptional circumstances where it is clear that development of 30 or more dwellings per hectare will have a detrimental impact on the amenity, character and environmental quality of an area.” It is noted that the NPPF has subsequently replaced all PPS’s and PPG’s. However, the overriding thrust of PPS3 ‘Housing’ in relation to small scale housing developments in sustainable, urban locations such as this, has been retained by the new NPPF (paragraph 47, bullet point 5 refers).

The following table provides a comparison of the densities of this site and immediately neighbouring properties to the east and west on Langley Lane:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House no/Plot</th>
<th>Plot width (metres)</th>
<th>Plot size (square metres)</th>
<th>Residential Density (dwellings per hectare)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“No.20” (the application site)</td>
<td>15.6m</td>
<td>663m²</td>
<td>15.8 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.22</td>
<td>16.5m</td>
<td>733m²</td>
<td>13.6 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.24</td>
<td>14.2m</td>
<td>620m²</td>
<td>16.1 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.26</td>
<td>14.8m</td>
<td>641m²</td>
<td>15.6 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.28</td>
<td>12.5m</td>
<td>526m²</td>
<td>19.2 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.16</td>
<td>15.5m</td>
<td>706m²</td>
<td>14.2 dph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.18</td>
<td>14.8m</td>
<td>673m²</td>
<td>14.9 dph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that in the wider area of Langley Lane there are an abundance of varying plot widths and overall sizes, with some larger plots to the east and north (opposite), and some smaller to the west. However the above table clearly demonstrates that this proposal would not create a plot that is smaller or out of
character with those immediately neighbouring, to which the proposed plots relates closest with and will be compared against. This is further confirmed by the fact that the proposed layout provides a dwelling that fronts onto Langley Lane in a similar position to adjacent housing, with notable gaps between the new house and the side boundaries of the plot being maintained. Additionally the development complies with the Councils standards on garden sizes for new development.

A further consideration should be given to the fact that the historic numbering of plots on this southern side of Langley Lane included this plot as No.20 – despite there being no house constructed. Clearly the intention was always for this area of land to accommodate a house – but, for reasons unknown, until now this has not come to fruition.

The proposed density for this application is therefore evidently entirely consistent with other nearby development. It does not constitute an overdevelopment, and is appropriate given the established form and layout of other housing in the immediate locality. The proposal therefore complies with the relevant planning policies, including Core Strategy Policy H4, Crawley Borough Local Plan Policy H5 and AH1, and Government guidance contained within the new NPPF.

d. Design
The proposed house takes its cues from others along Langley Lane, whilst maintaining an element of individuality. The house will be 2-storeys, with an attached single garage to its west side with a cat slide roof over with side facing dormer. To the rear is a single storey projecting element. The proposed house is to have red/brown brick walls, red/brown plain roof tiles and tile-hanging and casement window frames. It is considered that these features will give the house a rural ‘cottage’ feel whilst being very low maintenance and enable it to fit in with the overriding vernacular of the lane.

There will be a two storey gable-fronted element that will introduce a vertical feature. The windows and door will have brick arches and stone cills. Ornate bargeboards will provide interesting details. The roof will be clad with plain tiles. The upper part of the front elevation adjacent to the gable section will be finished in plain tiles with rows of ornamental club tiles. Inspiration has been taken for the
design from local buildings. The massing of the building is composed to minimise its volume and to give the appearance of a modest dwelling.

The proposed materials are all traditional and in keeping with those used elsewhere within the Conservation Area. As such, the result is a dwelling that has a Sussex vernacular design, whilst not appearing as a pastiche. The new house would be an individual dwelling house, of an appearance that will provide visual enhancement when taken in its edge of town/village context.

It is also felt that the scale of the proposed building is suitable to the setting of the site, taking into account the neighbouring buildings. The cat slide to the west side of the new house provides for a graduation in roof heights between the proposed house and No.22 (both 2-storey), and No.18 to the west (bungalow with converted roofspace). This is shown below on the streetscene elevation:

![Fig 6 – Proposed Streetscene Elevation](image)

The design will be to a very high standard, with modern sustainable construction methods utilised. Externally the appearance of the building proposed is suitable for the level and type of accommodation proposed, and the positioning of the new dwelling.

This is a one-off proposal for a new family home in this characterful lane, and our approach has been to provide an appearance that will maintain a traditional form and appropriate aesthetic. The result will be a development that will maintain and preserve the overriding important characteristics of Langley Lane, and as such will be in accordance with Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy, and saved Policies GD2, H22 and BN10 of the Local Plan. Although Langley Lane is not yet included within the Conservation Area, attention has been given to the Ifield Village Conservation Area Statement.
e. Residential Amenities

The nearest neighbouring properties to be affected by this proposal are located broadly to the east (No.22) and west (No.18) of the proposed new dwelling. The site layout as proposed provides notable distances to both side boundaries, which in turn allows good separation to these closest neighbouring dwellings. The positioning and footprint of the new house is broadly in line with these adjacent properties, and the height of the proposed house is similar to that of No.22. The result is that the new 2-storey house will not be overdominant upon its neighbours, and nor will it create any loss of light or overbearing effect.

The proposed first floor side facing windows are all shown to be obscure glazed in order to preclude any opportunity for overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. In this regard a restrictive condition could be imposed if the Council consider it necessary.

The separation distances to neighbouring properties can all be considered to be generous, and the scale of the proposed dwelling which is consistent with the majority of other properties along Langley Lane ensure that any impact on neighbours' is not significant. Consequently, it is considered that that the proposed new house will not materially harm the residential amenities of immediately neighbouring properties, particularly by reason of loss of privacy, overbearing effect, or overshadowing. In addition, it is not considered that the use of the proposed new individual dwelling would create excessive noise, disturbance or activity.

f. Landscaping / Trees

The site was subject to a Tree Preservation Order – Langley Lane No.2 TPO, 1986. This is an area TPO that covers specific trees along Langley Lane. Only one tree on the application was covered by the TPO – specifically an Oak close to the site frontage.

In order to allow a site survey to be undertaken, this previously overgrown and unkempt site was cleared late last year (2012). At that time it became evident that the TPO was in very poor health and was in fact dangerous. The applicant instructed James Bell or Arbortrack to liaise with the Councils Arboricultural Officer. It was agreed that a 5 day notice for felling be submitted to the Council due to the trees unsafe condition. This was duly granted, and the tree has been felled. In accordance
with the requirements of the notice, it is the applicant’s intention to replant a new tree along the site frontage, the position of this is shown below:

![Proposed Site Layout and Landscaping](image)

**Fig 7 – Proposed Site Layout and Landscaping**

This plan details that the replacement tree will be an Oak adjacent to the highway. Together with the other frontage landscaping that is proposed, this tree will therefore enhance the sylvan qualities of the AESQ, and establish a plot with similar visual qualities to those neighbouring. The proposal therefore will accord with the principles of policy ENS of the Core Strategy, and Policies G5, G6, BN10 and BN21 of the Local Plan.
g. **Energy efficiency**

Planning Policy Statement a Planning and Climate Change: Supplemental to PPS1 was published in December 2007. This PPS on climate change supplements PPS1 by setting out how planning should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change and take into account the unavoidable consequences. The PPS expects new development proposals to take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption (i.e. passive solar design).

It is the applicant’s intention to incorporate measures into the construction of the proposed dwelling that are in accordance with the Government’s objectives on energy efficiency and sustainability. In particular the emphasis will be on reducing the consumption of non-renewable resources in both construction and use proposed. The application therefore proposes a new dwelling that would be constructed in full compliance with the general objectives of Policy GD13 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan, and ‘Planning and Climate Change’ supplement to the former PPS1.

h. **Car Parking**

This application proposes to provide a new access off Langley Lane, and provide a front courtyard parking/turning area and an integral single garage. Together this provides a parking provision of 2 spaces to serve the new residence. The dwelling proposed would have space to provide cycle parking also (within the garage).

Therefore, having regard to standards for parking provision contained within the Councils infrastructure SPD, and the advice given in the NPPF (formerly PPS3 and PPG13), it is considered that the level of car parking proposed to serve the site is wholly appropriate in this instance, and therefore the proposal accords fully with Policies T3 of the Core Strategy.

i. **Compliance with Dwelling Size SPD**

The proposed 4-bed unit would have a gross floor area and private garden space in excess of the minimum requirements set out by the Councils within their adopted space standards SPG’s.
5. CONCLUSIONS

The proposal meets all the necessary policy requirements, and as such it will cause no harm whatsoever to interests of acknowledged importance.

It will provide a new dwelling house on a vacant parcel of land within the built-up area. The proposed house has been sensitively designed to ensure it will be of an appropriate form and size, with new landscaping proposed, including ample space and gardens surrounding the new building. Cumulatively these measures combine to ensure that the proposal will preserve and enhance the character of Langley Lane.

The footprint of the new dwelling is not significantly different from that of neighbouring 2-storey housing. The new building is of a high quality appearance being set back from the road and of a scale commensurate with neighbouring properties; and consequently the visual qualities of the area and the character of the ASEQ will clearly be enhanced by this proposal.

The positioning and size of the property ensures that no adverse impact would be resultant upon neighbouring properties. An adequate level of car parking is proposed on-site, and there will be no highway safety concerns arising from the formation of a new access onto Langley Lane.

Essentially the intention is to provide an attractive and appropriate, family house set in an attractive, low density location. The design and sustainability measures incorporated will ensure the property is of a very high standard, and will be an enhancement of the character of the Area of Special Environmental Quality (ASEQ). If the area is upgraded to Conservation Area status, then the proposal would still be wholly appropriate.
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