
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2016

by Lesley Coffey BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/15/3138974

60 Wanderdown Road, Brighton, East Sussex BN2 7BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Harding against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2015/02967, dated 12 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is an extension to existing garage and new landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of Wanderdown Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set back from the road and situated at a slightly lower level than the adjacent footpath. The existing garage projects forward of the dwelling and is about 2.3 metres in width. The appellant states that due to its narrow width the existing garage is unable to accommodate a typical family car.
 4. The proposal includes the re-modelling and landscaping of the front garden. The existing parking area would be replaced with a pathway and steps leading to the front door, whilst a ramp would provide access to the garage.
 5. The proposal would increase the width and length of the garage. The resultant garage would be about 6 metres in width and would extend across about two thirds of the front elevation. It would be cuboid in form. Due to its width and bulk it would dominate the appearance of the dwelling contrary to the guidance within *Supplementary Planning Document 12 (Design Guide For Extensions and Alterations)* which states that extensions to detached properties should normally be subservient in scale and not dominate the existing building.
 6. Views of the garage from the north would be screened to some extent by the boundary hedge to no 58. However, in views from the south the full extent of the proposed garage would be apparent. In these views the proposed garage would be an incongruous and prominent feature within the street scene and
-

would fail to comply with the guidance within the SPD which advises that extensions to the front of a property should not detract from the character of the property or the general street character.

7. I accept that there is some variation in the building line within the part of Wanderdown Road where the appeal property is located, and that garages projecting forward of the dwellings are a common design feature. Moreover, the proposed extension would not extend forward of the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, due to its form and width, the proposed extension would be an obtrusive feature and would dominate the appearance of the dwelling contrary to Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan (adopted 2005) which requires extensions to be well designed and sited in relation to the existing property.
8. I acknowledge that there are other garages within Wanderdown Road similar in width to that proposed. The garages at 48 and 50 Wanderdown Road, comprise two single, but adjoining garages. Although taken together they are similar in size to the appeal proposal, both are subservient to the appearance of the associated dwellings. The double garage at 54 Wanderdown Road is similar in width to that proposed, however, one of the garages extends to the side of the property and the proportions of the original front elevation remain unchanged. Therefore, notwithstanding their visual dominance, these other garages are subservient and proportionate in scale to the front elevation of the properties concerned.
9. I have also taken account of the other garages in Wanderdown Road referred to by the appellant, but unlike the appeal proposal, they do not dominate the appearance of the dwellings they serve. Therefore I do not consider that these other garages justify the harm arising from the appeal proposal.
10. I am aware that the appeal proposal seeks to address the Council's reasons for refusal in respect of a previous scheme and I appreciate that the existing garage may be inadequate to accommodate many modern family cars due to its width. However, the proposal would more than double the width of the garage, and for the reasons given above, would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of Wanderdown Road.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Lesley Coffey

INSPECTOR