



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020

by Martin Small BA(Hons) BPI DipCM MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/20/3251654

45 Lindley Avenue, Southsea, PO4 9NT

- 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 Stuart Maun against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01620/PLAREG, dated 25 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the addition of dormer in the roof space at the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The dormer has been constructed. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is one of a terrace of early 20th century properties with pitched roofs of plain brown or dark red tiles. Rear projections with double pitched roofs are a particular characteristic of the terrace. The roof of the rear projection of the host property has been replaced with a flat roof and a dormer constructed in the rear roof slope of the main dwelling.
5. The dormer is visible from Collins Road through the gap between 23 Chitty Road and 49 Collins Road. The top of the dormer is also visible from Owen Street over the rear gardens of properties on Lindley Avenue. In addition to these public views, the dormer is visible from the rear of properties on Collins Road and Chitty Road and from the private alleyway that runs between the rear gardens of properties on Collins Road and Lindley Avenue.
6. The dormer is set in from either side and is below the ridgeline of the roof of the host dwelling. It is therefore of an acceptable scale and mass. However, the external light grey cladding is at odds with the brown tiles of the roof of the host dwelling, resulting in an incongruous and discordant appearance which is detrimental to the character of the dwelling.

7. During my site visit I observed dormers on the rear roof slopes of several dwellings in the area. However, all of these were clad in tiles to match the tiles on the roof of their host dwellings. These other dormers emphasise the incongruity of the development before me.
8. I note that the occupiers of the neighbouring property do not object to / support the development and the appellant refers to a request from the occupiers of a nearby property for the existing cladding to remain. However, these representations do not alter my finding that the development is harmful.
9. The replacement of the pitched roof over the rear projection to the host dwelling has resulted in the loss of a characteristic feature and a 'boxy' appearance, at odds with the traditional pitched roofs of the projections to other properties in the terrace. This is also harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, although I accept that the demolition of the pitched roof falls outside the scope of Class B of Part 11 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
10. I therefore conclude that the external cladding of the dormer is unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Although the dwelling is not listed or within a conservation area, neither Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan Portsmouth's Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) nor the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) relating to design are restricted in their application solely to designated heritage assets.
11. Accordingly, in this respect, the development conflicts with Policy PCS23 of the Core Strategy, which requires all new development to be well-designed, including the use of appropriate materials. Policy PCS23 is consistent with the policies of the Framework relating to design, and the development conflicts with paragraph 127 c) of the Framework, which sets out that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. A rear dormer could potentially be constructed as permitted development if the conditions in paragraph B.2 of Class B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO are met. These include that the materials used in any exterior work must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse. Such a dormer would therefore be less harmful than, and so does not justify, the development before me.
13. The development has provided a larger house for the appellant's family. However, I see no reason why additional accommodation could not be provided in a dormer with external materials more sympathetic to the host dwelling.

Conclusion

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

Martin Small

INSPECTOR