

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2025/0244
Valid 20/05/2025

10 SPINNEY CLOSE
ENDON

PROPOSED TWO STOREY
EXTENSION TO FRONT AND SIDE
ELEVATIONS AND SINGLE STOREY
EXTENSION TO REAR

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Design and visual impact
- Neighbour amenity
- Highways
- Trees

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is 10 Spinney Close Endon, a detached, two-storey dwelling occupying a cul-de-sac location. The property currently benefits from off-road parking at the front of the house, an attached garage has recently been demolished and some building works have commenced on site. The property benefits from front and rear gardens. There is a protected Oak tree near to the rear boundary and a mature Birch at the front of the house. A Public Right of Way (Endon with Stanley 29) runs to the rear of the site.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration, the application site is located within the Endon Development Boundary. The site is not within any Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings/structures which need to be considered. Council records show Tree Preservation Orders to the front and rear of the property.

PROPOSAL

The application is for the erection of a two-storey front, two-storey side and single storey rear extension. The plans state that new roof tiles and new brickwork will match those of the existing house. Windows and doors would be anthracite grey colour upvc. The plans do not make any reference to the type/colour of render. The proposed extensions would provide the occupants with a large hallway, WC, study, utility, lounge and open-plan kitchen/living/dining area. At first floor level there would be five bedrooms (master with ensuite), and a separate bathroom.

The application form (Section 5) states pre-application advice has been sought. Details given are:-

'Previous application SMD/2025/0116 refused. New submission addresses concerns raised. Reduced front extension in width and depth. Removal of roof terrace.'

To clarify, the named Planning officer has not given pre-application advice.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan

SS1 Development Principles
SS8 Larger Villages Areas Strategy

DC1 Design Considerations
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
Appendix 2 Parking Guidance

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

SMD/2025/0116 Two-storey extension to front and side elevations and single-storey extension to the rear. Refused.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice. Expired.
Neighbour consultation period. Expired.

Public Comments

Two representations received both objecting to the application. Comments can be summarised as follows;

- Glass and steel balustrade have been removed from the rear extension but a Juliette type of balcony seems to be proposed which could allow future access to the roof.
- Amenity/overlooking impact upon neighbours to each side of the application property.
- The front of number 8 has been altered but the alterations at the front did not encroach beyond the original footprint
- Overdevelopment of the plot
- Significant extent of masonry and render
- Oversized footprint and mass
- Loss of character of original house
- Article 8 of The Human Rights Act 'Right to Privacy',
- This application is only a minor amendment to the previously refused scheme
- Loss of view from east facing lounge window
- Breach of the 25 and 45 degree rules.

Endon with Stanley Parish Council

This revised submission provides some visual relief compared to the previous proposals with the reduced central gable and the second gable to the former garage and the existing walls to receive a render coat finish.

Concerns still exist on the accessibility to the flat roof with the Juliet balcony effectively allowing future access should a planning consent be approved. This potential for future access with minimal works to provide it while unlawful, concern is how this would be enforced as the impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties would be impacted on. The replacement of the Juliet Balcony with a window arrangement will remove this potential risk.

The loss of the garage, which has already been demolished in advance of these proposals, and the creation of two further bedrooms severely impacts on the parking provisions for the dwelling noting the tree protection.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Recommendation Summary: Conditional

Site Visit Conducted on: 08-Apr-2025

Personal Injury Collisions

Current records show that there were no Personal Injury Collisions on Spinney Close within 43m of the property from 30/12/2019 and 29/12/2022.

Background

The property is located on Spinney Close (Road No. D1229), a cul-de-sac serving residential properties, it is subject to a speed limit of 30 mph and has streetlights and footways.

The 3-bedroom property currently benefits from off highway parking (driveway) the garage at 2.5m x 4.6m does not meet with the Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards which state the minimum internal dimensions for a single garage are 3m wide x 6m long.

Previous Applications

SMD/2025/0116 - Proposed Two Storey Extension to Front & Side Elevations and Single Storey Extension to Rear – Conditioned by the Highway Authority – Refused by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.

Description of Proposal

Proposed two storey extension to front and side elevations and single storey extension to rear.

Comment

The proposal is to construct a 2-storey extension to the front and side elevations of the property to provide a hallway, WC, utility and study and bedrooms 4 and 5 above. A single extension to the rear will create a dining and living area. The footprint of the property will increase from 3 to 5 bedrooms. The submitted Drawing Number 0110-02 Revision ii shows parking for 3 vehicles and is in accordance with Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards which state a detached /semi-detached property of 4 or more bedrooms requires 3 spaces (2.4 x 4.8m) for residents and visitors within the curtilage of the dwelling. It is considered the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the highway. I therefore have no objection to the proposal (application number SMD/2025/0244) subject to the following condition:

The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the parking area has been provided in accordance with the approved drawing number 0110-02 Revision ii. The parking and turning area shall thereafter be retained unobstructed as parking and turning for the life of the development.

Reasons

To comply with NPPF; to comply with SMDC Local Plan policy DC1; in the interests of highway safety.

Trees (SMDC)

No comments received relating to this specific application reference number. However comments were received in relation to the previous submission (SMD/2025/0116), confirming no objections. The comments are as follows;

Application proposes two-storey front and side extensions, and single-storey rear extension, with site containing a mature Oak tree at the rear boundary protected as T2 under TPO No. SM.302 (denoted "T1" on the application plans) and a mature Birch at the front highway boundary protected as T4 under TPO SM.302 (denoted "T2" on the application plans).

Although the trees, their nominal Root Protection Areas (RPAs) and temporary tree protection barriers are indicated on the revised "Proposed Plans and Elevations" plan (Drg. No. 0110-02 Rev i.), there is no tree report and the RPAs are not demonstrably derived in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012. "T1" at the rear boundary, in particular, appears to have a substantially under-represented RPA.

If following BS 5837 correctly, the RPA radius of 5.3m for "T1" stated on the plan would derive from a single-stemmed tree of stem diameter of only 44cm, but the Oak clearly has a stem diameter substantially in excess of this. I would estimate (from application site photos only) that this tree has a stem diameter in the region of c.75 - 80cm, resulting in an RPA radius of c.9.0 – 9.6m. That said, the proposed rear extension footprint, together with indicated drain runs, would still be located outside the more realistic/correct RPA radius of around 9.6m or so for the Oak, and therefore should not lead to any significant damaging impact on this tree. However, to ensure this, the fenced construction exclusion zone to respect the correct RPA (eg to avoid vehicle access, excavations, materials storage during development etc) would need to be notably larger than currently shown. Given surrounding shrubs and dense Ivy cover, it is not possible to reliably estimate the stem diameter of the Birch "T2" from file photos, although from memory from when the TPO was made (in 2017) the stem is perhaps of the order of 50cm diameter leading to an RPA radius of c.6m – this is likely to be a bit larger than indicated on the application plans, but clearly the proposed front extension would still be comfortably outside such as RPA and there is also some leeway/expansion room between the indicated RPA and the edge of the proposed altered drive/vehicle standing on the site frontage. Therefore I consider that the proposed development would also be unlikely to have significant detrimental impact on the Birch – again subject to appropriate temporary tree protection measures during construction. However, the RPA barrier for the Birch "T2" also needs to return along the front boundary to full enclose a construction exclusion zone – otherwise it will be too tempting and convenient for building contractors to use this area for informal parking and/or materials storage during construction.

In conclusion, I have no objection to this application on grounds of impact on trees.

Officer comment

The above Arboricultural comments are still considered valid. The current submission proposes a smaller front extension, whilst the rear extension remains the same, therefore no greater impact upon protected trees.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the village of Endon. Endon is identified within the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan as a larger village. Within the larger villages, a range of developments can be supported (subject to all material planning matters being satisfied). In this instance there are no 'in principle' objections to a domestic development.

Design and visual impact

In principle, the use of matching brickwork and tiles is acceptable. The scheme also shows the proposed use of render. There are no details as to the type/finish/colour of the render but if its use was found to be acceptable then these details could be dealt with by way of an appropriately worded condition.

There are no concerns regarding the design of the rear extension. Whilst the rear addition would have a mainly flat roof, it would have features such as stone coping around three edges of the roof and two glazed roof lanterns to give a more modern appearance. Matching, facing brickwork is proposed and this is welcomed.

Whilst there were no objections to the previous scheme in terms of the side extension, this does not remain the case now. Previously the side extension had a subordinate relationship with the dwelling due to the fact it would have been set well back from the principal elevation. It is a difficult scenario because the previously proposed two-storey gable (although not acceptable in terms of design and visual impact), allowed for the side extension to have a subordinate relationship with the dwelling. The narrowing of the proposed front gable has now resulted in a visually more exposed side extension, which does not have a subordinate relationship, its front wall and front roof slope, both project beyond the original principal elevation (no set back), it does not have a lower ridgeline, and there is no set back/break in the proposed roof slope. These are features which are sought for side extensions when not set back behind any projecting gable.

There remain concerns about the proposed two-storey, front gable. Whilst it is acknowledged that the gable has been narrowed, it still has a very odd relationship with the original dwelling. The gable is placed right in the middle of the principal elevation, and together with the side extension, they become the principal and dominant features, not sitting comfortably and removing all character of the original dwelling. Design Guidance seeks to avoid extensions at the front of properties, instead seeking additions which would remain subordinate in size to the host dwelling, and not result in the character/appearance of the original building being lost. It has previously been acknowledged that a precedent has been set by a neighbouring property for principal elevation extensions, this might be acceptable at the application property, but it depends on design. The plan shows brickwork around one of the upper floor windows which looks odd, it is assumed that it is due to the narrowing of the window opening but has the appearance of patchwork which is not acceptable.

Although reduced in width, the scheme the subject of this application still shows a very flat elevation, again in part due to the extent of brickwork.

Neighbour amenity

Letters of representation have again been received from members of the public. The dwelling to the west, 12 Spinney Close, is a detached bungalow. The occupants of number 12 have stated that the proposed side extension would breach the 45 and 25 degree angle rules, when measured from the lounge window within the side wall of their dwelling. These objections were received in relation to the previous refusal as well as the current submission. Photographs have been provided. It is noted that the Space About Dwellings standards do refer to both the 45 and 25 degree angles, which are used when considering the appropriateness of adjacent/nearby development. The use of the angles is a good indication of whether a development is likely to be acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity impact. However, the Space About Dwellings standards refer to principal windows being the 'main window' within living rooms, dining rooms, kitchens, and first and second bedrooms. The side facing lounge window of number 12, is not the main window to the room, the main lounge window is at the front of the house, and therefore the angle standards cannot be considered. Whilst there are design objections to the side extension, there is no objection to it in terms of neighbour amenity impact.

The proposed front extension would not raise any adverse neighbour amenity impact in terms of being overbearing upon dwellings.

The flat roof, ground floor, rear extension would have no neighbour amenity impact in terms of any overbearing relationship. The previous scheme incorporated a balcony with access off the upper floor rooms. The balcony has been removed; roof lights are to be inserted and there is a Juliette balcony serving the master bedroom. Neighbour representations have raised concerns over the possible use of the roof as a balcony, with access from the Juliette balcony opening. However, permitted development rights exist for flat roof rear extensions and Juliette balcony features, so whilst the neighbour comments are noted, it is not a reason to refuse this part of the scheme.

Highways

The scheme proposes five bedrooms which requires the provision of three off-road parking spaces. The application shows provision for three spaces. The Highways officer comments can be read within the

'Consultations' section of this report. There are no highways objections, just a recommended condition to ensure the parking area is provided prior to first use of the development.

Trees

There is a mature Oak tree at the rear boundary protected as T2 under TPO No. SM.302, and a mature Birch at the front highway boundary protected as T4 under TPO SM.302. The Arboricultural officer raised no objections to the previous application but recommended a condition to secure root protection zones/tree barriers and notices. The current scheme would have no greater impact upon trees than the previous scheme, therefore no objections and the same condition is recommended in the event of the application being approved.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is noted that the objections relating to overlooking have been removed due to the omission of the previously proposed balcony above the rear extension. There are objections to the design and visual impact of the proposed front and side extensions.

It is noted that notwithstanding the details contained within the application form, no pre-application advice has been sought from the named officer.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse.

Case Officer: Lisa Jackson

Recommendation Date: 15.07.2025

X



Signed by: Jane Curley

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council