



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/22/3291103
64 Lealand Road, Portsmouth, PO6 1LZ

- 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 Brad Cosh against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01579/HOU, dated 25 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of dormer to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have adopted the description of the proposed development on the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposal.
3. The submitted plans show a new dormer on the rear roof slope to the host property annotated to confirm that this was under construction and did not form part of the submitted application. The Council's Delegated Report (CDR) confirms that they determined the application on that basis. In view of the above, I have also determined the appeal on the basis that it only seeks planning permission to construct a dormer on the front roof slope.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac and comprises a two storey semi-detached property. Similar semi-detached properties are to be found throughout Lealand Road, which has a formal, but pleasant layout, with several semi mature street trees adding to the overall character of the road.
6. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a dormer that would occupy a large part of the main (front) roof slope to the host property. The proposed dormer would sit above the existing eaves and below the existing ridge, as well as being set in from the sides. It would include a flat roof and a large central window, which would not align with the existing windows below.
7. There are numerous examples of dormers within the road, including that at 79 Lealand Road (No.79). The latter comprises a large flat roofed dormer, similar

to that proposed, which again does not align with the windows below. Other examples of dormers are to be found at 27, 65, 69 and 71 Lealand Road, most of which appear to have been granted planning permission by the Council. All of these examples are much smaller in scale to that proposed, occupy a small part of the front roof slope, are aligned with the windows below and incorporate a pitched roof. Consequently, these dormers sit comfortably within their respective roof slopes and are proportional and subordinate to their host. I also note from the CDR that a smaller pitch roofed dormer to 54 Lealand Road was granted planning permission by the Council in 2018.

8. Within that context, the size, scale and siting of the proposed dormer would be excessive. It would occupy a large part of the front roof slope to the host property and would not align with the existing windows below. Combined with its flat roofed design, the proposal would represent an incongruous addition that would disrupt the rhythm of the existing roofscape. It would not be subordinate and neither would it be proportionate to either the host property or to its immediate context. Also, as the appeal site fronts onto a large oval turning area, the front roofscape to the host is highly visible and the proposal would, therefore, visually dominate its immediate surroundings.
9. The Appellant contends that the proposal is no different to the existing dormer at No.79. However, the Council state that this is the only example of a flat roofed dormer in this part of the road and that there is no record of the development being granted planning permission. The Council also contend that its design is not a good example to follow, which, based on my observations on site and the examples of the smaller dormers referred to above, is a finding that I fully concur with.
10. The Appellant also contends that the new build development at 46A Lealand Road provides a further precedent. However, that development is set well back from the road, is well screened and is essentially a backland development that is quite different to the proposal before me. Even so, I have not been provided with any planning background to this development and have, as is required, determined the appeal proposal on its individual merits.
11. Accordingly, I find that the combined height, width, depth, siting and flat roofed design of the proposed dormer on the front slope would be inappropriate and would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. The appeal proposal would, therefore, be contrary to policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan (2012) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021). Both seek, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development is well designed, is appropriate in terms of its appearance and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR