



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2019

by A Thompson BSc BTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/19/3219980

18 Chelsea Road, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO5 1NJ

- 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 Ms Ann Jenkins against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01347/HOU, dated 24 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor extension, conservatory, ground floor WC, re-cladding rear elevation and new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear/side lower ground extension and first floor rear extension to include installation of cladding and windows to rear elevation at 18 Chelsea Road, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO5 1NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/01347/HOU, dated 24 July 2018, 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: Drawing TC01 (Existing floor plans); Drawing TC01 (Proposed conservatory, first floor shower room extension, additional WC to ground floor and new windows to rear elevation); Site Plan and roof plan – proposed rear extensions and alterations, subject to the restriction set out in Condition 3.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the details of materials set out in the approved drawings, no development shall commence until details of the design, colour and finish of all external materials have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's description of development set out in their decision notice adds further detail to the description of the development that is proposed in the application and I have amended the description of development, provided by the applicant, to include this additional information, in my formal decision.

Main Issues

3. There are two main issues. The effect of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of 18 Chelsea Road (the host property) and the surrounding area, including the 'Campbell Road' Conservation Area (CRCA) and (b) the living conditions of the occupants of 20 Chelsea Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The defining characteristics of the CRCA are set out in the Guidelines for Conservation¹ (the Guidelines). These are described principally in terms of the visual character of the properties in the CRCA, when viewed from the public realm, and its predominantly residential land use.
5. The Guidelines make reference to important features and buildings on each road and how they contribute to the wider conservation area. In relation to the appeal property, the Guidelines note that *Nos 4-28 [Chelsea Road] were originally red brick although all but three have been painted. They are three storeys, with the lowest storey below street level and stairs up to the arched front doors.*
6. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
7. The proposed development would be confined entirely to the rear elevation of the appeal building and would not be visible from any publicly accessible point in the CRCA. Chelsea Road is on the edge of the CRCA and the properties at the rear of the appeal building (which front Goodwood Road) are not within the conservation area.
8. The existing three storey flat roof extension represents an unsympathetic and bulky feature to the rear of the property. It does not contribute to the significance of the CRCA, indeed to the limited extent it has any impact on the character and appearance of the CRCA, it is harmful.
9. The proposed first floor extension would add to the bulk of the building at first floor level, but the scale of the extension would be modest and not exceed the depth of the existing extension. A number of the nearby properties have rear extensions that are two or more stories in height and of similar depth. The proposed extension would be similar in height and design to a recently approved extension at No.12 Chelsea Road and would not overpower the host building. The extension would therefore be of an appropriate scale, density and layout in relation to the surrounding buildings in the terrace.
10. The overall impact of the first floor extension would be positive in design terms. Not only would the introduction of a sloping roof at first/second floor level add a visual break in the rear elevation which would reduce the visual impact of the existing rear extension, it would also replace a flat roof with pitched roof, which would be more in keeping with the design of the original building.

¹ Conservation Area No.15 Campbell Road, Southsea – Guidelines for Conservation (2010)

11. The existing rear extension of the building (in common with many other buildings in the terrace) contains a mixture of windows of different sizes, materials and positions. The proposed pattern of fenestration would deliver a marked visual improvement, through the introduction of windows in the extension of similar width, more regular alignment (vertical and horizontal) and improved style, with the use of vertical sliding sash designs on two floors that better reflect the fenestration of the original building.
12. Furthermore, I consider that the use of a single consistent high quality cladding on the rear elevation, which would cover the very poor quality bricks and replace the cement fibre tiles currently in place, would offer further visual improvement to both the building and wider area.
13. While I note the evidence that a modern form of cladding has been used on a nearby extension, there is insufficient detail about the proposed "Cedral Boarding" to be clear about its visual impact on the building and surrounding area. I therefore have imposed a pre-commencement planning condition, adopting the wording proposed by the appellant², which requires her to agree with the Council the details of all external facing materials to be used before development commences. The appellant has confirmed that she would agree to the imposition of such a pre-commencement condition.
14. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the first floor extension and the associated changes would improve the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Furthermore to the limited extent the proposed development would have any impact, it would enhance, the character and appearance of the CRCA.
15. In terms of the impact of the lower ground extension on the rear elevation of the property, I would concur with the view of the Council that the single storey rear/side extension would be acceptable in design terms and would preserve the character and appearance of the CRCA.
16. Accordingly the development accords with those elements of Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan (Portsmouth's Core Strategy)(2012) that seek to encourage good quality design and conserve and enhance the city's conservation areas. The development also accords with the policies for conserving and enhancing the historic environment in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living Conditions

17. The proposed additional room at the first floor would not project beyond the existing extension below and the provision of a pitched roof significantly reduces its height and bulk. Any direct impact on daylight and sunlight in No.20 would be limited to short periods of the day and the upper ground floor room in No.20 is an open plan lounge, so benefits from light and outlook from both the front and rear of the property.
18. In terms of outlook and enclosure, the new extension would only be visible in oblique views and the proposed new cladding would improve the visual impact of the existing side elevation of rear extension compared to the unsightly mix of poor quality materials on the existing building. Given these factors and the small scale of the extension, I do not consider that the proposed extension

² Appeal Statement on behalf of Ms Ann Jenkins Pages 8/9

would materially harm either the outlook or sense of enclosure from either the upper ground floor or first floor rooms in No.18, closest to No.20.

19. In short, I consider there would be some limited impact on the living conditions for the occupiers of No.20, as a result of the first floor extension, and thus the scheme does not fully accord with the element of Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan, which seeks to protect the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, I do not consider the level of harm and the conflict with Policy PCS23 to be sufficient to justify refusal of the scheme on this ground alone. Nor do I consider that the impact of the scheme would be sufficient to create substantive conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
20. I concur with the Council, that the proposed lower ground single storey side/rear extension would not have any significant impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No.20 in terms of outlook, light, or sense of enclosure and therefore accords with both Policy PCS23 and the Framework.

Other Matters

21. The proposal would improve the living conditions for the occupiers of No 18, including through the provision of a bathroom on the same level as the main bedroom floor. This factor adds some weight in favour of allowing the development.

Conclusions

22. The proposed first floor rear extension with associated changes to cladding and fenestration would improve the character and appearance of the rear elevation of No.18 and the surrounding area. Furthermore, to the limited extent it would have any impact, it would enhance, the character and appearance of the CRCA. Although there would be some limited impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property at No.20, this would not be sufficient to justify refusal of the scheme or outweigh the benefits I have identified.
23. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have commented on the need for a third condition earlier in this decision.

Anthony Thompson

INSPECTOR