



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/19/3230797

14 Florence Road, Southsea PO5 2NE

- 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 Mr and Mrs Nick and Lorna Glover against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00437/HOU, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear side infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for rear side infill extension at 14 Florence Road, Southsea PO5 2NE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00437/HOU, dated 13 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 395.P100_A, 395.P101_A, 395.P102_A.
 - 3) The bricks to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 16 Florence Road, having particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwelling located within a tightly-knit urban area, where residential properties sit close to each other. The proposed extension would be built along the boundary shared with no 16 Florence Road, which is marked by a wall varying in height on the side of the appeal site, and an approximately 1.8 metre-high timber fence with a trellis along the top section on the side of this neighbouring property. There is a door on the rear elevation to no 16 and a single storey extension, which includes a side window facing onto the appeal site, and is set approximately 2.5 metres away from the shared boundary.
4. The shallow and glazed mono-pitched roof of the extension would be sloping away from the boundary shared with no 16, and the eaves height of the

proposed addition would not exceed the overall height of the trellis element. As a result, the effect of the proposal on light levels within no 16 would be minimal, when compared with the existing situation. Additionally, the relatively modest height along the boundary and the sloping roof design would ensure that it does not appear as an overbearing structure or create a harmful sense of enclosure, when viewed from this neighbouring property.

5. My attention has been drawn to a recently dismissed appeal¹ relating to the erection of a conservatory within the area administered by the Council. Although limited information has been submitted in respect of this particular scheme, it is clear that the circumstances differed from the proposal before me which, in any event, I am required to assess on its individual merits.
6. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 16 with regards to outlook and light. The proposal would not, therefore, be contrary to Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan which, amongst other things, requires development proposals to protect amenity and provide a good standard of living environment for neighbouring and local occupiers as well as future residents and users of the development.

Other Matters

7. Located within the East Southsea Conservation Area, the appeal property is regarded by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset. No concerns have been raised by the Council in respect of the effect of the proposal on the building itself or the character or appearance of the East Southsea Conservation Area, and there are no reasons for me to disagree with this approach.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings, as this provides certainty. The requirement to use bricks matching the existing property is considered necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Z1775/D/18/3211571.