

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/21/3278173

3 Maidford Grove, Portsmouth PO3 5TJ

- 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 Colin Mountifield against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01453/HOU, dated 3 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension, side two storey extension, loft conversion and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, side two storey extension, loft conversion and single storey side extension at 3 Maidford Grove, Portsmouth PO3 5TJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 20/01453/HOU, dated 3 December 2020 subject to the conditions set out below:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-01, PL-02, PL-03, PL-04 and PL-05.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against Council and which is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey house with an attached double garage located within a residential cul-de-sac consisting of a variety of house

types and including a three storey terrace (nos 5, 6 and 7) at its end which is very imposing in its appearance.

5. The proposed two storey side extension would be quite substantial, but the current flank elevation is set well back behind the front elevation of 2 Maidford Grove and such a notional building line would only be breached marginally on construction. I note that the single storey side extension would touch the boundary with its 'cranked' elevation; however this part of the appeal site is already enclosed by a high close-boarded fence. Whilst the extension would be clearly higher than it, nonetheless by virtue of its hipped roof and the fact that there is no uniformity in the placing of, or spacing between, dwellings in the immediate locality would not render it as unduly prominent or incongruous in the street scene.
6. I note the Council's concerns with regard to views of the extension from the east, however whilst the full extent of the side elevation would be visible, I consider that this would not be harmful to the visual amenities of the area, especially with nos 5, 6 and 7 viewed in the background.
7. I accept that the two storey/first floor extension would not be set back from the northern elevation, nor would its ridgeline be set down from that of the main dwelling, nonetheless I have not been made aware of a policy requirement of this. Taking into account the overall scale and massing of the nos 5, 6 and 7, the appeal dwelling as extended would still remain a subservient presence within the street scene notwithstanding its overall increase in scale. Consequently, I fail to understand how the proposal would contribute further to the enclosure of the cul-de-sac or why this would be an issue in any case. I do however accept that the example of the single storey extension provided by the appellant, pursuant to planning reference 20/00261/HOU at 8 Brampton Lane, is not wholly relevant to the proposal before me, but in any event each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. I therefore find that the proposed side extensions by reason of their overall mass and siting would not result in an excessive or intrusive form of development within the street scene. Whilst sizable, I consider that the proposal would relate appropriately to the host building and would not conflict with Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan (2012) which requires all new development to be well designed and, in particular, respect the character of the City whilst, amongst other things, ensuring appropriate scale, layout and appearance in relation to its context.

Conclusion and Conditions

1. Therefore for the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
2. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council recommends that conditions are imposed that require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the materials employed match the existing building. I consider that in the interests of the character and appearance of the area these conditions are necessary.

C J Tivey INSPECTOR