



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/23/3331322

62 Locksway Road, Southsea, Portsmouth PO4 8JP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Beard against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00862/HOU.
 - The development proposed is construction of dormer to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of dormer to front roof slope at 62 Locksway Road, Southsea, Portsmouth PO4 8JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00862/HOU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan; Block Plan Proposed A; 6143.22.1 Existing Floor Plans and Elevations; 6143.22.2 Rev C Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormer hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the original application form, but for clarity I have removed words not describing acts of development.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2023, during the course of this appeal. However, insofar as the contents are relevant to this appeal, the Framework has not changed. Therefore, I am satisfied no party would be disadvantaged by not having the opportunity to comment on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The host dwelling is a modest terraced house with a ground floor bay window. There is a double window on the first floor, centred above the bay below. Other

houses in Locksway Road and surrounding streets are generally of a similar scale and design, although not all include a bay window. A few properties have a front dormer, including Nos 58 and 69 Locksway Road.

6. The position of the proposed dormer would be aligned with the ground and first floor windows of the host dwelling. The dormer's width would be narrower than the ground floor bay and little greater than the first-floor double window. The top of the dormer would be positioned below the ridge of the existing roof and its depth would be clearly subservient within the roof slope. The design of the proposed fenestration would complement that of the existing windows in the front elevation of the house and matching materials could be secured by condition.
7. Overall, I find the scale and appearance of the dormer would be in proportion with the host dwelling. Given there are existing front dormers nearby, the proposal would not look out of place in the street scene, notwithstanding that some other dormers have a somewhat different design or were granted permission before the current development plan.
8. The Council states the differences in design between the appeal proposal and the previous refused application for the appeal site (Ref 22/01622/HOU) would be relatively modest and unlikely to be readily visible. From the information before me about the previous refused dormer design, I find the reduced depth and height of the appeal scheme would be materially and visibly smaller in scale. The revised window design would also be more in keeping with the appearance of the other windows in the building.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy PCS23 of The Portsmouth Plan 2012, which requires development to be well designed with scale, appearance and materials appropriate to its context. I also find no conflict with the Framework, which seeks good design and development that is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition on materials is necessary to integrate the appearance of the dormer with that of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons the proposal accords with the development plan, read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR