



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2025

by **D Cramond BSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/25/3368222

12 Wilberforce Road, Southsea, PO5 3DR

- 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 Minoo Sefidan against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Reference is 25/00248/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a 3 storey front extension; addition of a second floor including the remodelling of the rear elevation (with Juliet balconies at first and second floor); new natural slate roof incorporating photovoltaic 'slates', a raised ridge and a rear dormer with Juliet balcony (with solar panels on top); single storey rear extension; and air source heat pump in rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Whilst the above description of development is a complex one there are previous consents (primarily ref 23/00335/HOU) which deal with the bulk of this. The issue between the Council and the Appellant relates solely to the planned change at the appeal property's upper-level northern-side from a hip to a gable end. My focus is, therefore, on the proposed roof form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling undergoing considerable refurbishment and extension work at the time of my visit. It is of a more modern idiom than the established surrounds. The site is located within the Castle Road Conservation Area. Proximity to the neighbouring property to the north is immediate. It is an upper side window, and the amenity it provides, in this building which the Council felt should be protected from a proposed alteration from a hip facing it to a gable-end being alongside.
 5. The Appellant argues amenity would be retained and draws upon a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (Syntegra: corrected RevA 24.6.25) (DSA). With regard to the window and room which is the subject of debate the DSA concludes that:
-

- Daylight (VSC & NSL): The second floor south facing window (W2) at No. 14 Wilberforce Road would experience a major adverse impact in terms of VSC and APSH, this would be mitigated by continued daylight distribution compliance (NSL) within the room it serves. The room would retain additional daylight through compliant rooflights, and overall lighting levels remain within an acceptable range for habitable use.
 - Sunlight: W2 at No. 14, registered a major adverse reduction; however, its functional impact would be moderated by the multi-aspect lighting conditions of the room, including east and west-facing roof lights.
 - In overall summary the DSA confirms that the pertinent window at No. 14 would fall outside BRE numerical targets, however it concludes that the room continues to receive adequate daylight.
6. I observed that the neighbouring space in question is a one room flatlet accommodating sleeping, lounge, dining and kitchen facilities. The occupant(s) share bathroom facilities with other residents of No 14 and the building appeared to have no other internal communal facilities. The (two) rooflights referred to above are only of modest size and inconveniently set at a level above average eyeline. The principal window (W2) is of reasonable proportions and set low on the long (side) wall. Notwithstanding formulaic calculations my subjective but experienced judgement was that an ability to have continued outlook from the principal window is absolutely critical for this composite and compact living accommodation to have what may be termed a good standard of environment.
7. I say this because the important aspect of *Outlook* would effectively be removed completely. Blocked outlook to me is key. However, I would also consider that, whatever mitigation might technically or practically be offered by the two rooflights, in terms of the acknowledged major adverse reductions on Daylight and Sunlight they would simply not offer enough to allow a person or persons to live suitably comfortably in this small home. The application of low standards in this particular situation is simply not good enough.
8. The Portsmouth Plan's Policy PCS23 is relevant. Amongst other matters it seeks to protect residential amenity and ensure a good standard of environment for neighbouring occupiers. I conclude that this proposal would conflict with this policy.

Other matters

9. I understand the wish to enlarge this family dwelling and appreciate that the scheme would bring benefits to would-be occupiers. I can see that the scheme would increase the scope for generation of power by solar means. I also appreciate that a symmetrical dual gable ended property could be seen as more the norm for this street. However, the asymmetrical appearance of one gable and one hip would not be jarring on the eye or stand out as alien within the limited vistas of this street. I am satisfied that the effects of both the appeal scheme and the asymmetry as described would be neutral in Conservation Area terms. It follows that by rejecting amendment and adhering to the approved scheme there would not be conflict with the duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

10. Having carefully considered all points raised by the Appellant I conclude that the matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR