



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/23/3321297

9 Greenleas, Hove, BN3 8AD

- 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 Steve Chessell against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref: BH2022/02792 dated 2 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is free standing single garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The plans were amended at the application stage to bring the garage closer to the house and therefore further away from the frontage of the site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow sited at the cul de sac end of Greenleas in a predominantly residential area. The bungalows in this part of Greenleas are generally set back from the frontage with generous and largely open front gardens with low boundary treatments, all contributing to a character and appearance of low density housing in verdant and spacious surroundings. A number of the properties have garages set to the rear of the properties.
5. The proposal would introduce a single garage to the front of the property which would be sited alongside the eastern boundary. It would be sited noticeably forward of the property and in part alongside the garage at the adjoining property, at No 7.
6. Although it would be a single garage its siting forward of the residential dwelling would mean that it would be seen as a very prominent structure, and physically unrelated to the dwelling in street scene views. The adjoining dwelling at No 7 also has a garage which sits partly forward of the property, but it is physically more closely sited to the property. Although the garage at

No 7 appears as an anomaly in the street scene, its siting, with part behind the side wall of the dwelling helps to integrate it more closely with the dwelling it serves and into street scene views.

7. The proposal before me, given its proposed siting forward of the property would appear distinctly separate from the dwelling it would serve and a visually intrusive feature which would detract from the more open plan form of the surrounding front gardens. It would also be larger than the garage at No 7 both in terms of its length and width with a pitched roof, which would add to its undue prominence, although I acknowledge that this partly reflects the dimensions required for modern vehicles.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the local area. This would conflict with Policies DM18 and DM21 of the Brighton and Hove City Plan Part 2, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. I have taken into account the shape of the plot which narrows away from the frontage, limiting the opportunities to site a garage further to the rear. However, this constraint does not override the harm I have concluded. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other garages in the local area which sit forward of the properties but none of these compare directly in terms of siting and prominence with the proposal before me and do not therefore persuade me to a different view.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR