
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2023

by D M Young JP BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI MIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/W/22/3292145

Campbell Mansions, Campbell Road, Southsea PO5 1RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Delph Property Group against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00157/FUL, dated 18 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the formation of new roof extension to comprise 2 No. 2 bed residential dwellings along with extended external walkway & roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of new roof extension to comprise 2 No. 2 bed residential dwellings along with extended external walkway & roof terrace at Campbell Mansions, Campbell Road, Southsea PO5 1RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00157/FUL, dated 18 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 19.3141.101 P1; 19.3141.102 P1; 19.3141.103 P1; 19.3141.105 P1 and 19.3141.104 P1.
 - 3) Details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, including windows, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained.
 - 4) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until written documentary evidence has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority, demonstrating that the development has achieved: - a maximum water use of 110 litres per person per day as defined in paragraph 36(2)(b) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended). Such evidence shall be in the form of a postconstruction stage water efficiency calculator.
 - 5) Prior to first occupation of the two flats, secure and weatherproof bicycle storage facilities for 4 bicycles shall be provided at the site and shall thereafter be permanently retained for the parking of bicycles at all times.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the Campbell Road Conservation Area (CRCA).

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. As the proposal is in the CRCA, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in the exercise of planning powers in conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
4. The appeal building is a 1930s, three-storey, flat-roofed apartment block occupying a corner plot at the junction of Campbell and Lorne Roads within the built-up area of Southsea. The building is set-back behind a line of mature trees which provides some screening in views along Campbell Road. The surrounding area contains a mix of building styles dating from the mid to late 19th Century to the end of the 20th Century.
5. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a mansard roof extension containing two, 2-bedroom flats. The addition would extend across most of the front elevation but would be set-back slightly from the front edge of the building behind a low parapet wall. The extension would also be inset from the eastern and western sides of the building increasing its height from 8.3m to 11.0m. The mansard roof would have a flat top and be clad in traditional slate. The fenestration pattern would largely respect that on the floors below.
6. As I saw on my site inspection, the surrounding roofscape lacks uniformity in terms of materials, form and height. While many of the Victorian properties possess front gables, hipped and more traditional pitched roofs are not uncommon. In that regard, the appeal building is already something of an anomaly. The height of the appeal building currently sits below the 3-4 storey dwellings to the east and west.
7. Against that background and given its modest proportions and traditional appearance I am satisfied that the extension would not dominate the roofscape in the immediate area nor overpower the host building. I have noted the previous Inspector's concerns regarding the impact upon No 39. However, the Lorne Road junction provides a good degree of physical and visual separation between the buildings. Moreover, the extension in the current scheme would not be built up to the eastern edge of the building nor extend rearwards into Lorne Road. As a result, I am satisfied there would be no harm caused to No 39.
8. Unlike the previous appeal scheme¹ I am not persuaded that the overall visual impact of the extension would be significant. As I have already set out, the proportions of the extension would be relatively modest. Additionally, the Campbell Road frontage is already well screened by established trees. Existing landscaping along Lorne Road would also limit longer distance views from the north. While the extension would be seen from the southern end of Lorne Road, its set back would ensure it remained relatively inconspicuous in public views.

¹ PINS Ref: APP/Z1775/A/05/1176827

9. In any event, I consider the design of the mansard would complement the design of the appeal building and therefore it would not be inappropriate in its context. Consequently, the fact that it might be visible in some public views is not a matter that weighs against the scheme.
10. I have found that the design of the mansard roof extension would be appropriate to the host building and its surroundings. Accordingly, there would be no harm to the CRCA's Victorian character or appearance or conflict with Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan or the principles of good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The former seeks proposals that are respectful to the host building and are appropriate to their surrounding context.

Other Matters

11. An agreement under section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 has been submitted. Both parties agree that this would secure adequate mitigation for the SPAs. Consequently, the Council's second reason for refusal falls away.
12. I have noted concerns regarding overlooking, overshadowing, car parking, drainage, fire safety and waste storage. However, these matters were previously considered by the Council, and I have seen no persuasive evidence that would lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

13. I have imposed conditions relating to time limits and the approved plans to provide certainty. A materials condition is necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. I have amended the condition to include a reference to windows. Conditions covering water efficiency and cycle parking are necessary to comply with relevant development plan policies in these areas.
14. For the reasons given above and taking into account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D. M. Young

Inspector