

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/21/3285332

79 Lawrence Road, Southsea, Portsmouth PO5 1NX

- 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 Josh Stewart of Channel View Estates Limited against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00197/PLAREG, dated 11 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the proposed dormer was substantially complete, and had been broadly built in accordance with the submitted plans. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part; and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Campbell Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the eastern edge of the Conservation Area which itself is centred along Campbell Road and comprises well conserved town houses. The terrace of which the appeal site forms part is more modest in its architecture, nonetheless it provides a reasonable contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area notwithstanding that a number of dwellings have been altered and extended over time.
5. I note the example of the tile-clad, flat roof box dormer to the rear of 77 Lawrence Road next door, and whilst it is not normally for me to comment on the appropriateness of this or otherwise, in this case I consider that "two wrongs don't make a right". Whilst I acknowledge that the proposed dormer extension has been clad in slate to match the re-clad front roof slope, nonetheless it protrudes quite significantly above the ridgeline of the two-

storey rear outrigger shared with 81 Lawrence Road; and which appears as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, also partially visible from the north-east on Lawrence Road.

6. The Council's Campbell Road Conservation Area Guidelines (CAG) stipulate that dormer windows will generally be discouraged on front, side or other elevations which currently do not have them, where these are visible from the public highway. Whilst I accept that the majority of the views of the proposed development are from the rear, nonetheless I cannot agree that the proposal complies with the spirit of the CAG, particularly bearing in mind it is advised that roof extensions often lead to the loss of existing historic fabric such as pitched roofs. This view supports guideline (1) (d) (vi) of the CAG which stipulates that roof extensions will be discouraged where they would have an adverse visual effect on the existing building or townscape or where they would lead to the loss of original historic roofs or their features. Furthermore it goes on to state that where roof extensions are permitted, they should match existing properties in respect of design, materials, bulk or size.
7. Therefore notwithstanding the presence of the roof extension next door, by granting planning permission for the appeal proposal it would give rise to further incremental erosion of the terrace and overall I consider that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. Consequently I consider that the proposal would give rise to less than substantial harm to a Designated Heritage Asset and notwithstanding the recent improvements to the dwelling in terms of the re-slatted front roof slope and re-pointed brickwork, I consider that the public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm.
9. In conclusion, I consider that the proposal represents an incongruous and unduly top-heavy feature that has an overbearing impact on the existing roof, fails to relate sympathetically to the existing dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part and harms the Conservation Area. In addition to the conflict with the CAG I also find the proposal conflicts with Policy PSC23 of the Portsmouth Plan (2012) which requires all new development to be well designed and respect the character of the City through, amongst other things, excellent architectural quality to existing buildings whilst ensuring that development relates well to the history of Portsmouth, particularly the City's Conservation Areas, through the protection and enhancement of the City's historic townscape.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR