
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Martin Small, BA (Hons), BPI, DipCM, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/19/3233756

82 Kirby Road, Portsmouth, PO2 0PE

- 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 Stephen Duffin against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/00571/HOU dated 4 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as side extension, roof conversion and changes to external fenestration materials as shown on planning drawings PO1 and PO2.
-

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. Kirby Road is a mature residential area with a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings to either side set back with hard standings and gardens to the frontages. The dwellings are predominantly 2-storey although some have additional accommodation in the roof space with pitched or flat-roofed dormers and / or roof lights. The gaps between the dwellings contribute to the street scene as they provide separation between the various forms of dwellings allowing each form to be appreciated in its own right.
4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, the pair being at one end of four pairs of semi-detached dwellings of similar design and appearance along this part of Kirby Road. The pairs have distinctive hipped roofs which contribute significantly to their character and appearance.
5. Although the proposed side extension would be slightly lower than the existing ridgeline of the host property and slightly set back from the front elevation, it would almost completely fill the gap between the host property and the neighbouring terraced property at both first-floor level and roof level. As a result, it would significantly diminish the appearance and appreciation of the existing hipped roof of this pair of semi-detached dwellings and unbalance their form.

6. Furthermore, the proposed first floor window in the front elevation of the extension would relate awkwardly to the corresponding window in the adjacent end of terrace property in form and height above ground level. Accordingly, the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the terrace. For these reasons the proposed side extension would be detrimental to the street scene.
7. The proposed rear flat-roofed dormer would be only slightly lower than the ridgeline of the dwelling and would be in line with the rear elevation. It would dominate the rear roof slope and its flat roofed form and bulk would jar with the roofscape of the appeal property and thus harm the character and appearance of the property and area.
8. The appellant refers to existing extensions to Nos. 15 and 100 Kirby Road. I do not have the full details of these extensions, but I viewed them during my site visit. I note that the side extension to No. 15 is set back significantly from the front elevation of the property allowing the original hipped roof form to be seen and appreciated. It is also set back significantly from the front elevation of the neighbouring property and is not attached to it. The extended side elevation to No. 100 is adjacent to a road which provides a gap to the property on the other side of this road. Furthermore, the extension to this property retains a hipped roof. Therefore, neither of these existing extensions set a precedent for the proposed development before me and, in any event, it is an established planning principle that each application should be considered on its own merits.
9. As a consequence of the harm to the street scene and character of the area that the proposed development would cause, I conclude that it would be contrary to Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan 2012 which requires, in summary, all new development to be well designed, including being of an appropriate scale and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR