



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2024

**by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14 May 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H0724/D/24/3340386**  
**77 Wharton Terrace, Hartlepool TS24 8PB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by David Bromley against the decision of Hartlepool Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is H/2023/0393.
  - The development proposed is described as: 'proposed garage extension to the side of existing dwelling'.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terraced dwelling located within a terrace of four properties located adjacent to the entrance to Brecongill Close, a suburban cul-de-sac. Brecongill Close comprises of predominantly terraced and semi-detached dwellings located on modest sized plots with open front gardens. Dwellings here are typically a mix of brick and render with pitched, tiled roofs. Where present, outbuildings are small scale. Both attached and detached garages are present but these are typically modest in scale and subservient in width and height to the host dwelling.
4. Whilst fronting Wharton Terrace, the design, scale, form and materials of the dwellings comprising the appeal property and its terraced neighbours are consistent with those along Brecongill Close. In that regard, the garage at the opposing end of the terrace to the appeal site, attached to 83 Wharton Terrace, is modest in scale and subservient in width to its attached dwelling. Its roof is pitched, albeit with a hip, and tiled.
5. It is proposed to construct a new double garage that would adjoin the gable end of the appeal property. The garage would have significant width, exceeding the width of the host dwelling, in conflict with the prevailing character of modest sized garages and outbuildings. The flat roof would also fail to reflect the local character and, alongside the wide roller shutter door would give the building a somewhat industrial character that would appear out of place in a residential area such as this. The provision of such a wide flat roofed structure in a prominent position at the end of the terrace would also have the effect of

unbalancing the appearance of the terrace as a whole. Overall, the proposed garage would represent an incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area.

6. In that regard, I am mindful of the emphasis on good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as a key aspect of sustainable development. It sets out that new development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and sympathetic to local character. For the above reasons, the proposal would not constitute good design.
7. I acknowledge that a garage of the width proposed would ensure the appellant can store his vehicles, however this is a personal benefit as opposed to the public harm to the character and appearance of the area that would ensue from the proposed development. Whilst I note the appellant's willingness to 'compromise' on the size, and to provide a 'more conventional roof', I am required to make a decision on the scheme before me having regard to the proposed plans.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies HSG11 and QP4 of the Hartlepool Local Plan (2023) which together seek to ensure new domestic extensions are of a size, design and use materials that are sympathetic to the host dwelling and reflective of the character of the area. The proposal would also fail to accord with the provisions of the Framework, which sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused.

### **Conclusion**

9. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Paul Martinson*

INSPECTOR