



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8th July 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1775/D/25/3367186

35 Brecon Avenue, Drayton, Portsmouth, Hampshire PO6 2AN

- 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 Uddin against the decision of Portsmouth City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00106/HOU.
 - The development proposed is room in roof with rear elevation pitched roof dormer. Side elevation extension above garage with hip roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a proposal for a first-floor side extension and rear dormer at No. 35 Brecon Avenue, a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located on the west side of Brecon Avenue. The property forms part of a pair of houses with distinctive architectural features, including a short ridge roof, a catslide roof over the side garage, and a full-height front bay window.
4. The adjoining property, No. 37 Brecon Avenue, has been extended over the garage at first floor level in a manner that respects the original design, incorporating a hipped roof that mirrors the short ridge and catslide form. This has preserved the architectural coherence of the pair.
5. While several properties further along Brecon Avenue, such as Nos. 22, 25, and 29, have undergone more substantial alterations, these are located in part of the street where the architectural character is more varied. In contrast, No. 35 is situated within a group of houses that have largely retained their original form and detailing.
6. Although there are examples of first-floor side extensions and dormers in the vicinity, the majority have maintained the original roof proportions by being set back and remaining subordinate to the main ridge, thereby preserving the rhythm and character of the street scene. In contrast, the proposed first-floor extension is not set back and as a result loses the catslide roof. The rear dormer, although not visible from the street, appears visually fussy due to its double-pitched design,

which, based on the submitted drawings, would disrupt the coherence of the overall roofscape.

7. Properties such as Nos. 31 and 33 feature barn hip roofs and appear to be of a different original design, with simpler front elevations and bay windows only at ground floor level. Houses on the opposite side of the street also differ in scale and proportion, often with longer main roof ridges that more readily accommodate extensions without disrupting the overall character.
8. Nos. 49 and 57 have flat-roofed extensions that have detracted from the character of their respective properties. However, these are located in a part of Brecon Avenue where cumulative changes have resulted in a more mixed and less coherent architectural character. This is not the case for No. 35, which remains part of a visually consistent and architecturally distinctive row.
9. The proposed extension to No. 35 would significantly increase the length of the main roof ridge and alter its form in a way that would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling. The resulting bulk and scale would disrupt the balanced appearance of the semi-detached pair and diminish the architectural integrity of this relatively unaltered group of properties.
10. The first-floor side extension would appear incongruous within its immediate context, failing to respect the established character of the immediate street. While the rear dormer is not visible from the public realm, its design assessed from the plans, would impact the architectural integrity of the dwelling and the visual balance of the semi-detached pair. Overall, the proposed development would unbalance the symmetry of the pair of properties and introduce a built form that is visually disproportionate to the existing dwelling, thereby causing significant harm to the character and appearance of both the property and the immediate street scene.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal; would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy PCS23 of the Portsmouth Plan (Core Strategy, 2012), which seeks to ensure high-quality design that respects the character and appearance of the local area. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes development that is sympathetic to local character and history.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR