
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2020

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/20/3251983
76 Grant Road, Portsmouth PO6 1DX

- 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 Clayton Frost against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01315/HOU, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2020.
 - The development is the construction of a dormer to rear roofslope and a hip to gable extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a dormer to rear roofslope and a hip to gable extension at 76 Grant Road, Portsmouth PO6 1DX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01315/HOU, dated 27 August 2019, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 03 C1; 04 C2 and 06 C3;

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal scheme includes a roof extension in the form of a dormer which has been erected within an enlarged roofslope to the rear of the appeal property. The hip to gable roof extension which has occurred is not the subject of a specific objection from the Council.
4. A Lawful Development Certificate (LDC – Ref 18/00572/CPL) for alterations to the property's roof, including the erection of a dormer of a similar size, has been issued by the Council. Alterations to the roof have occurred but what exists falls outside the scope of permitted development because the external materials for the dormer's cheeks and main elevation are clad with grey fibre cement weatherboarding rather than tiles matching the original roof. As part of the existing alterations, it appears that the roof has been retiled with some variations in the colour of the tiles. The existence of the LDC is given significant weight in the determination of this appeal because this represents a realistic fallback position, including because of what has already been erected.
5. The dormer as erected is proportionate in size to the enlarged roofslope and is set in from the eaves and sides of the roof. The dormer is sited well below the

ridge of the roof. Accordingly, because of its siting, scale and bulk the dormer is appropriate and proportionate to the size of the roof and does not visually dominate the roofslope.

6. The window design is of concern to the Council. Although not echoing the first floor fenestration, the linear design of the dormer window does reference the extent and form of the large area of glazing within the property's ground floor rear extension.
7. From what was observed, the majority of other dormers in the surrounding area have predominantly been erected with tiled external cheeks and elevations. However, the cladding at the property is of a dark colour and is viewed against the context of the extensive roof slope with varying tile colours. The dormer is visually assimilated into the background of the roofslope. For these reasons, the choice of external material and its colour are not incongruous and they do not make the dormer a visually more prominent or bulky addition to the roofslope, including compared to what could be erected pursuant to the LDC. Altering the dormer's external cladding to hanging tiles would not result in a material visual difference.
8. Reference has been made by the Council to a dismissed appeal scheme for a dormer with cladding but the detailed planning circumstance of this proposal, including its context, have not been provided. However, it is noted that the cladding was cedar rather than being similar to that used at the property. Similarly, the circumstances associated for the removal of weatherboarding from another dormer identified by the Council have not been provided. For these reasons, limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal which has been assessed on its own circumstances.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the dormer does not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it does not conflict with Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan. Amongst other matters, this policy requires high quality design which is appropriate in scale, appearance and materials.

Conditions

10. The only condition suggested by the Council is that matching materials should be used for the external surfaces of the dormer. However, because of the assessment made of the external materials as part of this appeal, this is an unnecessary condition. No other conditions have been suggested by the Council but it is considered necessary for reasons of certainty that the approved drawings are included in a specific condition.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR