



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021 by M Long

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/21/3272337

10 Barham Way, Portsmouth PO2 9NY

- 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 David Packham against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01361/HOU, dated 18 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to existing side first floor extension to provide additional bedroom, including raising roof height, removal of front dormer and installation of rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. There is a discrepancy in the name of the appellant included within the documents submitted during the appeal process. Following further clarification, it has been confirmed that Mr David Packham, the original applicant of the proposal, has made this appeal against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 36 and 38 Spinnaker Drive, with regard to whether there would be an overbearing impact and increased sense of enclosure.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is a two storey, detached dwelling with a side extension on its eastern side which was converted from a previous attached garage building. The appeal property is located in a prominent position along Barham Way and its orientation means that its eastern elevation is particularly visible when

viewed from the south-east. The surrounding residential estate is comprised of a mix of housing types which share a similar design style and have largely symmetrical roof slopes. Generally, garage buildings remain in their original form and there are very few two storey side extensions. There are, however, a limited number of exceptions including 19 Barham Way, located opposite the appeal site, which has a two storey side extension.

6. The proposed development would increase the size and scale of the existing extension through adding considerable bulk to the first floor level which would increase the ridge height and change the roof form. Whereas the roof slopes of the existing extension are largely symmetrical, the proposal would create an asymmetrical catslide roof with a short slope on the front elevation and a tall and long rear roof slope that would also incorporate a rear dormer window.
7. The asymmetrical roof slope design would appear out of keeping with the pattern of largely symmetrical roof slopes that characterise the surrounding residential estate. Although this asymmetrical design would not be noticeable when viewed from directly in front of the site, the appeal property's prominence in the streetscene means that the proposed extension would be clearly visible from the south-east to the detriment of the local character.
8. I have had regard to the extension at No 19, however, the appeal site's prominence means that, despite its comparatively smaller size, the proposed extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. While the extension at No 19 is visible from the front of the site, its side elevation is largely obscured by its neighbour which limits its impact on the streetscene.
9. Given the above, the proposed extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would be contrary to Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan (Portsmouth's Core Strategy), adopted January 2012, which seeks to ensure new development is well-designed and has an appropriate scale and appearance in relation to its particular context.

Living Conditions

10. The eastern boundary of the appeal site is shared with the rear gardens at 36 and 38 Spinnaker Drive. No 38 occupies a corner plot and has a relatively wide garden in comparison to the modestly sized garden at No 36. The existing side extension at the appeal property forms the entire rear boundary at No 36 and covers a short distance of the rear boundary at No 38. The dwellings in this area are located within close proximity to each other resulting in a tight form of development. There are also a number of conservatory extensions and garage buildings in the vicinity which contribute to a sense of enclosure, particularly in the rear garden at No 36.
11. The proposed extension would add considerable bulk and height at the first floor level alongside the shared boundary with No 36. The close proximity of the proposed development to the neighbouring property would result in an overbearing impact that would harm the occupier's living conditions. Moreover, the proposed rear dormer would add further bulk to the roof and would contribute to an increased sense of enclosure at No 36.
12. Due to its corner plot position and comparatively larger garden, the proposal would not result in an undue sense of enclosure at No 38. The proposed

extension would only cover a short distance of the shared boundary with No 38 and so the additional bulk would not result in an overbearing impact. Although the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to its effect on the living conditions at No 38, this would not outweigh the harm identified against the occupier at No 36.

13. Overall, the proposed development would not result in undue harm to the living conditions of the occupiers at 38 Spinnaker Drive, however, it would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupier at 36 Spinnaker Drive with regard to an overbearing impact and increased sense of enclosure. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy PC23 of The Portsmouth Plan (Portsmouth's Core Strategy) which seeks to ensure new development provides a good standard of living environment for neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

14. Site visit notes from an earlier application at the appeal site in 2004 have been submitted which suggest that the planning officer reached an initial view that a similar proposal would not have a significant impact on the streetscene and would be acceptable in terms of light. However, the context of these notes is not clear. This could relate to a previous withdrawn application at the site, and it does not appear to relate to a formal decision by the Council, as such this matter carries limited weight.
15. Reference has been made to plans submitted for a development at 2 Barham Way with similarities to the appeal scheme. However, these plans have not been provided and it is therefore unclear as to what the outcome of any such scheme would be. In any case, each appeal must be determined on its own individual planning merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan, when considered as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR