
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by S M Holden BSc(Hons) MSc CEng MICE CTPP FCIHT MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/20/3255495

56a The Ridgway, Brighton BN2 6PD

- 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 and Mrs Hodgins against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
 - The application Ref BH2020/00942, dated 25 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is remodelling of existing bungalow to form two-storey dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for remodelling of existing bungalow to form two-storey dwellinghouse at 56a The Ridgway, Brighton BN3 6PD in accordance with the application Ref: BH2020/00942, dated 25 March 2020, 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: Location Plan, TRT 104, TRT 105, TRT 106, all dated 30 March 2020 and TR 108, dated 6 May 2020.
 - 3) The materials to be used in 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 proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The Ridgway is a straight residential street with dwellings that exhibit considerable variety of style, design, height, width, bulk and use of materials. There are detached bungalows of differing shapes and sizes, some of which have been extended. There are chalet bungalows and detached, semi-detached and terraced two-storey dwellings. There is therefore little rhythm or uniformity to the street scene. One of the few common features is that most of the properties are set back behind modest front gardens, but the depth of these gardens varies and there is no consistent building line along the street.
4. There are bungalows to one side of No 56a. Nos 58 and 60 differ from one another but have hipped roofs and small front projections. On the other side is No 56, a chalet bungalow with pitched roof at right angles to the street and a

series of 3 small dormer windows looking towards No 56a. Both the immediately adjacent properties are rendered whereas the appeal property is a small, brick-built bungalow with a large, steeply pitched roof facing the street. It therefore has little in common with its immediate neighbours and does not read as part of a group. No 56a does not include features that are regularly repeated in other properties in The Ridgway, nor does it have any distinguishing characteristics which are especially worthy of retention.

5. The proposal would add a storey to the dwelling and replace the pitched roof with a hipped one. It would increase the overall height of the dwelling by 1.45m, although the hipped roof would limit its overall bulk. The peak of the new roof would approximately align with that of the ridge height of No 56. However, as there is a significant gap between the two properties, this would not appear awkward or harmful to the street scene. No 56a is close to No 58 and is a little taller. The proposal would increase the difference between them. However, the resultant difference in the height of the buildings would not be dissimilar to others elsewhere on this side of the street. The proposal would therefore reflect the variety of height and shape of other roofs. It would not result in the enlarged dwelling appearing unduly prominent in the street scene.
6. The proposal would increase the bulk of the building at first floor level. It would project beyond the existing roofslope and a little further beyond the front of No 58, which is set further back on its plot. However, No 56a and the surrounding properties are set back from the street frontage and most have gardens with vegetation which reduces the dominance of the built form. Consequently, the additional bulk would not make the enlarged building appear excessively prominent, particularly given the variety of forms that already exists along this side of the road. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal could be accommodated between its neighbours and within the street scene without being unacceptably obtrusive.
7. The two-storey dwellings on the opposite side of the street are purpose-built pairs of semis and a terrace. They are therefore not directly comparable with the appeal scheme. However, that is not a reason for rejecting a proposal for adding a storey to No 56, provided it can be satisfactorily integrated into its surroundings and where there is already a variety of two-storey dwellings.
8. Taking all the above into account, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and saved Policy QD14 of the Brighton and Hove Local Plan. These policies require extensions to relate well to the adjoining properties and the surrounding area and seek to promote design that respects the diverse character of the city's neighbourhoods.
9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition specifying the plans in the interests of certainty. A materials condition is required to ensure the appearance of the scheme is acceptable.
10. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR