



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

by S Hanson BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/19/3229419

31 Hatfield Road, Southsea, Portsmouth PO4 9DJ

- 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 & Mrs Fabik against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00074/HOU, dated 17 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the loft space to include hip to gable conversion with gable wall and rear dormer. Partial conversion of existing garage to living room and raise existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the hip to gable roof extension and the addition of the box dormer on the rear roof slope of the property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace two-storey house with a hipped roof. It is located on a corner position on a street of similar original style terraced properties within a high-density residential area. The immediate area has a planned and cohesive character, notwithstanding the fact that some properties have had alterations and extensions to their roofs. The symmetry and rhythm of the houses within the surrounding roads create a uniformity which contributes significantly to the character and appearance of the street scene in this location.
4. The proposal would result in a number of alterations to the property with the hip to gable extension changing the roof form. The existing hipped roof of 31 Hatfield Road (No 31) is mirrored at the other end of the terrace and on the properties, which share their boundaries with the road junction. Although, gable ends are not a particularly common feature of the street scene, there are a few examples within the surrounding area, the closest being displayed on the school building opposite the appeal site. However, this building is of a different architectural style to the surrounding residential properties and is purposefully dissimilar. Although there are also instances where hip to gable conversions have been implemented and where roofs have been extended, in the main, the roof lines of the surrounding properties remain unaltered.

5. In addition to the hip to gable alteration, a large flat-roof box dormer is proposed. The dormer would extend almost the full width and height of the rear facing roof slope giving the appearance of a full third floor to the original property. Whilst there are some houses in the vicinity which display dormers these are mainly of a scale and design that are visually appropriate in their setting. The examples of box dormers that I have been referred to demonstrate the intrusive and overbearing appearance of large dormers in this location and they serve to illustrate very clearly why further similar developments would be unwelcome.
6. The proposed dormer and hip to gable extension, because of the bulk and visual prominence of these alterations, would not be sympathetic or subordinate to the roofscape of the terrace. The extensions to the roof would be highly visible from the public realm with extensive views along neighbouring roads. The discordant features would depart from the uniformity and pleasingly repetitive pattern of the residential properties within the vicinity to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
7. Additionally, while historic applications may previously have been considered acceptable, they would have also pre-dated current guidance contained within The Portsmouth Plan (Portsmouth's Core Strategy) (2012) (CS) and the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which places great emphasis on high quality design, and these cannot be seen as setting any sort of precedent.
8. Overall, the proposed hip to gable roof extension and rear box dormer would not achieve the quality of design or respect for the surroundings and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with Policy PCS23 of CS, which among other things, seeks to ensure that new development is appropriate in scale and appearance in relation to the particular context.

Other Matters

9. Whilst reference is made to permitted development limits and to what could be implemented without the need for planning permission, I am dealing with the proposal before me, which I have considered in the context of the relevant development plan policies.
10. The benefit of additional living accommodation with a bedroom in the roof space is appreciated, along with the proposed materials and the nautical themed portholes. However, these considerations would not outweigh the alterations to the roof as proposed and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into consideration all matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hanson

INSPECTOR