

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

**by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> January 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/21/3281668**  
**27 Lakeside Avenue, Portsmouth PO3 6EZ**

- 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 & Mrs Howe against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00154/HOU, dated 2 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is for a front dormer.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the eastern side of Lakeside Avenue which comprises 3no blocks of terraced houses. A number of houses have undergone loft conversions by virtue of the installation of rooflights to their front roof slopes, however none have had dormer windows constructed on their principal elevations. Consequently the front roof planes along this side of the road are largely unbroken.
4. Whilst I acknowledge that extensions and alterations to dwellinghouses are considered acceptable in principle, I respectfully consider that this is a case of form following function. Whilst I note that the width of the proposed front dormer would align with the bay feature on the ground and first floor front elevation below, by virtue of its overall scale and design, it would appear as an incongruous feature, not only on the host dwelling, but within the wider street scene.
5. I have been given no reason to doubt that the proposal would become a family home for the long-term as opposed to being a speculative form of development; and I note the examples of other dormer windows that have been constructed within the wider locality; however whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these or otherwise, ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.

6. Therefore, whilst I accept that the proposal would protect the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties, the National Planning Policy Framework is quite clear in stating within its paragraph 126 that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. I consider the proposal by reason of its scale and position within the front roof slope would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan (2012) which, amongst other things, requires new development to be well designed, requiring development to be of an appropriate scale, appearance and materials in relation to the particular context, whilst seeking excellent architectural quality in new buildings and changes to existing ones.

### **Conclusion**

7. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, including the responses to the appellants' neighbour questionnaires, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

*C J Tivey*

INSPECTOR