

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2016

by AJ Steen BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/16/3156277
60 Wanderdown Road, Brighton 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 BH2016/01215, dated 8 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing garage and new landscaping to front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to existing garage and new landscaping to front garden at 60 Wanderdown Road, Brighton BN2 7BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BH2016/01215, dated 8 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3535.EX.01, 3535.EX.02 and 3535.PL.30.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed garage extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Wanderdown Avenue is a residential street comprising predominantly detached houses, bungalows and chalet bungalows of consistent character, although a variety of designs. No. 60 is a two storey detached house with single storey projection to the front with flat roof that originally formed the garage and entrance porch, although the rear part of the garage has been converted into a utility room. The ground floor of the house and garage is below the level of the road, with a ramp down to provide access. The main roof is of asymmetrical design, such that each roof slope is of different angles with the gable end to
-

the front. There are a number of other houses originally of the same design in the road, although some have been altered over time, including wider garages to the front.

4. The proposal would increase the width and depth of the front projection with a larger garage incorporating the utility area within it and a ramp down to access the garage. It is proposed to replace the existing flat roof with a pitched roof that reflects the asymmetrical design of the main roof to the property. The roof shape would provide visual interest to the proposed extension and reflect the appearance of the existing roof of the two storey element of the house.
5. Given the projection of the proposed garage to the front, it would be visible from the street, particularly in approaches from the south. However, being located lower than the road would reduce its prominence within the street scene and would be viewed with the neighbouring dwelling, including projecting garage with large pitched roof, in the background.
6. I understand that a previous proposal for an extension to increase the width of the garage with a flat roof was dismissed on appeal. However, it appears that the width of the garage now proposed has been reduced, albeit the open porch would remain the same width as that previously proposed. I understand that the previous proposal had a flat roof and was in front of a considerable part of the two storey house, whereas the current proposal has a pitched roof and is in front of a smaller proportion of the house.
7. The proposed roof would add bulk to the proposed extension, but results in a more attractive appearance to the front elevation. I note that the ridge would be above the first floor window cill, but is offset to the side of the window. The total width of the garage is more than half the width of the existing dwelling, but is offset to the side such that it is not across more than half of the existing dwelling.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed garage extension would reflect the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. As such, it would comply with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan that seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to dwellings are well designed, taking account of the space around buildings and character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

9. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty and a condition is necessary for materials to match those used on the existing house to maintain the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. On the basis of the above considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR