



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/D/24/3350028

2 Stanley Road, Southampton, SO17 2LW

- 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 and A Mrs Lawton against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00549/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of a part two storey part first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey part first floor side and rear extension at 2 Stanley Road, Southampton, SO17 2LW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00549/FUL, 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:
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.
 - 4) No ground disturbance shall take place within the site until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority.
 - 5) The developer will secure the completion of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority.

Preliminary matter

2. Since the appeal application was refused the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 has been replaced. Within the current National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (the Framework), paragraphs 131 and 135 remain unchanged and whilst paragraph 208 is now numbered 215, its content has not changed. Accordingly, the introduction of the 2024 Framework has not affected the consideration of this appeal. I confirm that in this decision I refer to the 2024 Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. Stanley Road is primarily characterised by modest sized two storey semi-detached and terraced Victorian houses that are set back from the street behind shallow front gardens. The appeal property comprises one of two detached Victorian dwellings located at either end of the rows of dwellings on both sides of the road, the other dwelling being 25 Stanley Road (No.25). The front parts of these dwellings appear particularly narrow alongside the pairs of semi-detached dwellings. To the north of the appeal site is a modern church centre that is attached to St Denys Church, which is Grade II Listed. Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework state that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
5. The appeal dwelling has a part single/part two storey narrow rear projection, which does not project beyond the side wall of the host dwelling. Conversely there are two storey side and rear extensions at No.25. They wrap around the rear and a significant proportion of the side elevation of the original dwelling and have a part flat and part crown roof. Its crown roof is not readily apparent from the street scene and it largely screens the flat roof behind it. From Stanley Road this extension appears subservient to and other than the glimpses of the flat roof it respects the scale, character and appearance of the original dwelling. It also reflects the split rear building line of the dwelling at 27 North Road, whose side and rear elevations are prominent within the street scene at the southern end of Stanley Road.
6. Amongst other things policies SDP1 (i), SDP7(iv) & SDP9(i) of the Southampton Local Plan Review Document 2015 (LP) and policy CS13 of the adopted Southampton Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010) (DPD), seek to ensure that new development adds to the quality of the area. Proposals should respond positively and integrate with their surroundings, character and vernacular and contribute positively to local distinctiveness. They should respect the scale, density and proportions of the existing building. Paragraphs 131 & 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework), have similar objectives.
7. Sections 2.3.1 and 2.5.2 of the Southampton City Council Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance 2006 (SPG) similarly advises that extensions should be smaller than the main part of the dwelling. They should appear subordinate and should not dominate the appearance of the host dwelling. Their roof form and pitch must relate to the original design of the building and its roof. This usually means a pitched roof set lower than the existing main ridge height.
8. The proposed extension would be largely contained to the rear of the main part at the dwelling. It would be in line with the southern wall of the existing rear projections and set in from the adjoining dwelling at 4 Stanley Road. To the north the proposed extension would be located close to and in line with the deep side elevation of the modern church centre.
9. The eaves line, roof pitch, front facing window and external materials of the proposed dwelling would match those of the host dwelling. Its roof would be lower than that of the main house and its crown top is discretely designed and would not be noticeable from the street screen. When viewed from the front of the appeal site the proposed extension would

- appear discrete and subordinate to the host dwelling. This is due to its siting, lower roof height and the modest width of the side element of the proposed extension.
10. To the rear the proposed extension would appear prominent due to its width, although it would appear less cluttered than the existing single and two storey rear projections. It would also be consistent with the width of the linked projections to the rear of Nos.4, 6, 7 & 8 Stanley Road. The proportions and design of the fenestration on the rear elevation would not reflect that of the host dwelling. However, it would be in proportion with the width of the proposed rear elevation and would not be out of keeping with the diverse range of extensions and associated fenestration within the rear garden environment.
 11. The proposed rear extension would be screened from St Deny's Church and St Denys Road by the modern church centre. As such it would not have an adverse impact on the setting of the listed church and would not result in any harm to its significance. As stated by the council's conservation officer the proposal would not diminish the appreciation of the church or its setting.
 12. From St Deny's Road the proposed extension would be largely screened by the existing terrace, the modern church centre and trees. There would be glimpses of the proposed extension from Stanley Road immediately to the front and for a short distance to the north of the appeal site, particularly during the winter months when the trees are not in leaf. In such views the extension would appear subordinate and would respect the character, appearance, materials and detailing of the host dwelling.
 13. For these reasons, although the proposed extension would not be smaller than the main part of the host dwelling if the original rear projection is excluded, it would appear modest and subordinate from the street scene and would be readily assimilated into the rear garden environment.
 14. As stated in paragraphs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 of the SPD, the purpose of the SPD is to provide advice and that the principles set out in it are the starting point for designs. In achieving the key objectives of the SPD, some of the principles within it may need to be compromised. In this instance, not only would the proposal blend in satisfactorily with the host dwelling, it would respect the street scene and the rear garden environment. It would also materially enhance the living conditions of the appellant and their family, without causing material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings.
 15. Finally, I note that the appeal site is located within an area of Archaeological potential. The council has suggested the imposition of conditions to address this, which I agree are necessary to ensure that any archaeological deposits are recorded and appropriately protected. The council has also suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions are necessary to ensure the development respects the host dwelling and the street scene and in the interests of certainty.
 16. I conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and so would comply with DPD Policy CS13, LP Policies SDP7(iv) & SDP9(i), the key objectives of the SPD of paragraphs 131 & 135.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR