



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

**by John Felgate BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities**

**Decision date: 15th July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/22/3298198**

**55 Manor Farm Road, Southampton SO18 1NR**

- 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 and Mrs Lawrie and Joanna Hodgson against the decision of Southampton City Council.
  - The application Ref 21/01898/FUL, dated 21 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2022.
  - The development proposed is "single storey rear extension replacing existing extension, hip to gable roof conversion, and minor exterior alterations to windows".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension replacing the existing extension, a hip to gable roof conversion, and alterations to the windows, at 55 Manor Farm Road, Southampton SO18 1NR, in accordance with the application, Ref 21/01898/FUL, dated 21 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 176/101, 176/102 and 176/103.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used on the existing building.

### Reasons

2. Manor Farm Road is a mainly residential street, which also contains a mixture of other uses including retail, commercial and community uses. Architecturally, the existing buildings vary widely in age and style. No single building type predominates. The area as a whole is densely developed.
3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house with four reception rooms and three bedrooms. The development now proposed would add an extended kitchen/dining/family room to the rear, replacing an existing smaller outbuilding. It would also extend the existing main roof, from a hipped design to one with two gable ends, plus a rear box-dormer, to accommodate an additional bedroom and bathroom at second floor level. There would also be some minor alterations to existing windows. The Council raises no objection to the rear extension, the dormer, or the window alterations, and I agree that these are uncontroversial. The matters in dispute are therefore limited to the hip-to-gable element of the proposed roof enlargement.

4. The Council argues that the gabled roof form would be out of keeping with the area. On my visit however, I saw several other examples of gabled roofs, of varying types and styles. These include Nos 53 and 55A, which directly adjoin the appeal property on either side, and Nos 52 and 56, which are both within a few metres of the appeal site. A short distance to the south there is also another prominent gabled roof at No 31A, which is particularly visible due to its elevated corner position. None of these other examples appears to me to be noticeably at odds with the surroundings, and indeed it seems to me that the variety of roof forms on display is an established part of the area's mixed architectural character.
5. I agree that the appeal property is quite prominent, due to its size and position, and the roof enlargement now proposed would increase that prominence to some degree. But nevertheless, the pitch of the front and rear roof slopes, and the main ridge height, would all be unchanged. So too would the overall width and depth. Consequently, whilst there would be some additional mass and volume, the size of the roof would remain proportionate to the building as a whole. Overall, it seems to me that the proposed design would be well-balanced and well-composed. In these circumstances, I see no reason why the proposed enlargement should be considered detrimental to the character or appearance of the building or its surroundings.
6. I note the Council's reference to the Residential Design Guide, dated 2006, which advises against the reconfiguring of roofs where this would adversely impact on the character of the area. However, for the reasons that I have identified, I do not consider that the present appeal proposal would have such an effect. Similarly, I have had full regard for Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy<sup>1</sup> and Policies SP1, SP7 and SP9 of the Local Plan<sup>2</sup>, which all seek to encourage good design and respect for local context. For the same reasons, I find no conflict with the aims of these policies.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would cause no material harm to the character or appearance of the area, or to the local street scene. The appeal is therefore allowed.
8. In granting planning permission, I have imposed conditions controlling the choice of materials, and requiring adherence to the approved plans. These are necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance, and to provide certainty as to the nature of the development permitted.

*J Felgate*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Southampton Core Strategy Development Plan Document, adopted January 2010

<sup>2</sup> City of Southampton Local Plan Review, adopted March 2006