
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2021

by S Edwards BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/W/21/3276954

Flat 1, Red Lodge, 61 Clarence Parade, Southsea, Hampshire PO5 2HP

- 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 Mrs Kim Martin against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00086/FUL, dated 16 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Replacement French doors – West elevation (work completed); Replacement windows – North and West elevations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) published on 20 July 2021 sets out the Government's planning policies for England. Policies within the Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account for the purposes of decision-making from the date of its publication. References to the Framework in this decision relate to the latest version published in 2021.
3. Some of the windows have already been replaced, and I shall therefore proceed on the basis that the appeal development is part retrospective.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Seafront Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises an attractive red brick villa, which has been converted into flats. Despite some unfortunate alterations, Red Lodge retains many of its original features, including a two-storey canted bay window complemented with a parapet, decorative brackets, red brick chimney stacks and string coursing, etc. Although some of the original openings appear to have been replaced, the windows to the front elevation in particular add to the overall character of the property.
6. The appeal building lies within the Seafront Conservation Area, which owes much of its special interest to its rich collection of historic buildings overlooking the sea and the open and spacious aspect of the seafront. By virtue of its

strong historic character and prominence within the street scene, the appeal building makes an important contribution to the Seafront Conservation Area.

7. The Seafront, Southsea Conservation Area No 10 – Guidelines for Conservation seeks to ensure that alterations and extensions to existing buildings are carried out in a sympathetic manner. It requires replacement windows to match the appearance of the existing original windows including the pattern of glazing bars and the method of opening.
8. The existing timber sash openings to the western (front) elevation are proposed to be replaced with UPVC windows. However, despite the woodgrain effect, the material, size of the glazing bars and method of opening would clearly identify the new windows as modern manufactured replacements, which would fail to replicate and harmfully contrast with the elegant joinery prevailing to the front elevation of the property. Within the slender openings designed to accommodate sash windows, the top hung replacements would appear overly bulky and represent discordant features, which would erode the quality of the host building and incrementally undermine the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to numerous examples of similar openings within proximity to the appeal site. However, I have been presented with no substantive evidence to demonstrate that these windows benefit from planning permission. Furthermore, there are significant numbers of properties which retain traditional openings within the Conservation Area, and this forms an important defining element of this designated heritage asset. Subsequently, the presence of insensitive alterations does not provide justification for what would constitute a further erosion of the traditional character and appearance of the Seafront Conservation Area.
10. The magnitude of the harm which the development would cause to the significance of the Seafront Conservation Area would be less than substantial. In accordance with the requirements of paragraph 202 of the Framework, the harm should therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, I have been presented with no public benefits which would outweigh the identified harm.
11. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the windows and French doors which have already been replaced to the northern and western elevations respectively, and there are no reasons for me to reach a different view. However, the appeal development as a whole would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host building and the Seafront Conservation Area. It would therefore conflict with the design aims of Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan – Portsmouth’s Core Strategy¹, which emphasises the need to respect the character of the city. The development would also be contrary to the Seafront, Southsea Conservation Area No 10 – Guidelines for Conservation, as well as Section 16 of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. There are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. For the

¹ Adopted 24 January 2012.

reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR