

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2025/0061
Valid 28/03/2025

7 SIDNEY DRIVE
KINGSLEY HOLT

2 STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT
OF THE HOUSE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design and visual impact
- Neighbour amenity
- Highways
- Coal (low-risk area)

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is number 7 Sidney Drive, Kingsley Holt, a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling sited within a well-established residential area to the north of Kingsley Holt. The property occupies a visually prominent roadside location and benefits from off-road parking/turning space at the front of the house, as well as external amenity space at the rear.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration, the application site is located outside of any settlement boundary and therefore within the open countryside. The application site does not lie within the Green Belt but it is located within a low-risk, coal development area. Number 7 Sidney Drive does not form part of any Conservation Area, the dwelling is not listed, and there are no nearby listed buildings/structures or protected trees which need to be considered.

PROPOSAL

Consent is sought for the erection of a two-storey front extension. The addition would provide a store room, entrance hall, WC, utility and drying room on the ground floor with a bedroom at first floor level. The plans also show internal works to merge two of the first floor bedrooms as well as form a corridor to lead to the new bedroom. There are no materials details on the elevation drawings. The application form states bricks as being both existing and proposed materials.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS9 Smaller Villages Area Strategy
- SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
- H1 New Housing Development
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance

1. Space About Dwellings
2. Design Principles for Development in the Staffordshire Moorlands

Supplementary Planning Document

1. Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

National Planning Policy Framework

Including sections;

- 2 Achieving sustainable development
- 6 Building a strong, competitive economy
- 9 Promoting sustainable transport
- 12 Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice. Expired.

Neighbour consultation period. Expired.

Public Comments

One representation received objecting to the application. The objection relates to blocking of a view and blocking light entering a living room and upstairs bedroom.

Kingsley Parish Council

Kingsley Parish Council concluded that the proposed development constitutes overdevelopment of the plot and is not in keeping with the street's vernacular. (*Unanimous*).

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Recommendation Summary: Acceptance

Site Visit Conducted on: 18-Apr-2025

Personal Injury Collisions

Current records show that there were not any Personal Injury Collisions on Sidney Drive 43 metres either side of the property accesses for the previous three years.

Background

Sidney Drive is an unclassified road (Road No. D1165) with a speed limit of 30 mph. Sidney Drive has footways on either side of the carriageway. The road is lit.

Description of Proposal

2 storey extension to front of the house.

Comment on Information submitted

There is no proposal for any additional bedrooms therefore no further impact on the local highway network. There will still be ample parking spaces.

Recommendations

I have no objection (on Highway grounds) to the proposed development.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is within Kingsley Holt. Kingsley Holt is identified as a 'Smaller Village' within the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan. Policy SS9 relates to the Smaller Villages, outlining the types of development which may be acceptable within those areas, this includes residential development. There are no objections in principle to a domestic extension at the application property.

Design and visual impact

Adopted design policies seek to avoid extensions at the front of properties, instead seeking well-designed additions which would remain subordinate in size to the host dwelling and not result in the character/appearance of the original building being lost. The two-storey front extension cannot be described as subordinate, the bulk of the extension would completely overwhelm the principal elevation to the extent of the original property character being lost. The proposed elevations plans do not give details of proposed building materials. However the application form states existing and proposed materials are brick. The side wall of the application property appears to be painted brickwork but the front of the house appears to be finished in a render/cement render. There are no details of the type of brick proposed. However there is concern that a large brick structure at the front of the house could appear out of keeping. The addition would span the majority of the frontage, mask the principal forwards facing gable whilst wrapping around and connecting with the side 'wing' of the house, including removing sight of original window and door openings. The existing roof consists of a dominant gable arrangement at the front and a more secondary hipped roof style to the right hand side. The splayed footprint and complicated roof style do not enhance the appearance of, or sit comfortably against, the existing dwelling, rather proposing elements which are not currently seen at the front of the house. The overall appearance is of a disjointed and discordant addition. An extension of the size, design and location of that currently proposed would adversely impact upon the overall design and character of the pair of semi's. Whilst the attached dwelling (number 5) has a different material (render?) colour, its form/appearance/overall character is the same as that of number 7 (application property). The proposal would significantly unbalance the simplistic character and harmony of the properties.

The extension would have further harm in terms of visual impact upon the streetscene. The surrounding properties do vary in their styles but at this end of Sidney Drive the character is very much that of strong gables, including side gables, forwards projecting gables and gable porches. The proposal would be harmful to the character of the street by introducing a poorly designed addition on a principal elevation which was very much forward of the building line, interrupting the character, including openness of the street at this point.

In its current form, the proposed front extension cannot be supported by reasons of design and streetscene / visual impact harm.

It is noted that the 'Proposed Left Side Elevation' appears to have been drawn incorrectly, it appears to be showing a single-storey extension rather than a two-storey addition.

Neighbour amenity

The proposal would not appear to have any adverse amenity impact upon the occupants of the dwelling to the east (number 9 Sidney Drive) in terms of being overbearing upon principal windows. Number 9 is positioned at an angle, facing away and slightly further forwards from the application dwelling. There are no windows within the side elevation of number 9, the closest windows on the principal elevation are directed away from the application site.

The attached dwelling, number 5 Sidney Drive, appears to be a 'handed' version of the application property and there are principal windows within the roadside/front elevation.

Although the extension has a partially splayed wall, its overall size, including projection distance from the front wall, footprint area and height, means that the addition will have an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the amenity of the adjoining dwelling, not only in terms of impact upon windows but also the front garden. An extension of the size proposed, close to the boundary would be overbearing and unacceptably intrusive. The orientation of the dwellings (extension to the east of the attached dwelling) also means that there will be a degree of overshadowing. It is noted that the occupant of 5 Sidney Drive has objected to the proposal, citing reasons of blocking of views and light entering bedroom and living room.

There are no amenity impact objections relating to dwellings on the opposite side of the road, or to the rear of the site.

Highways

Construction of the extension would remove some of the space available for parking but parking would still be at the front of the house. The County Highways officer raises no objections to the application.

Coal (low-risk area)

The application site is within a low-risk coal development area. Latest advice contained on the Gov.uk website is that 'If you are submitting a planning application in a Development Low Risk Area then there is no statutory requirement to submit a CMRA to the LPA' however 'the proposed development still lies within a coal mining area and could contain unrecorded hazards.' The advice is that if any coal mining feature is encountered it must be immediately reported to the Coal Authority.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The application is recommended for refusal based on adverse neighbour amenity impact upon the occupant(s) of number 5 Sidney Drive as well as poor design including adverse street scene impact.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse.

Case Officer: Lisa Jackson

Recommendation Date: 22.05.2025.

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council