

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2025/0280
Valid 10/06/2025

15 OVERLAND DRIVE
BROWN EDGE

PROPOSED REAR/SIDE
SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION
AND ROOF CONVERSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a detached brick and tile bungalow and its associated curtilage, situated in the Brown Edge and Endon Ward. The site is also within the Brown Edge development boundary, where positive development is encouraged to be concentrated. The proposed site is surrounded by neighbouring dwellings on Overland Drive. No. 17 Overland Drive is situated to the North of the site and No. 13 Overland Drive is located to the South. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins an area of open Green Belt land to the West. The Overland Drive highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the North-West.

It is noted that a number of properties within the street have been extended, however, the established character of the street has been retained.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises a proposed single storey flat roof rear / side extension and a roof conversion. The single storey extension would allow for a hallway, a larger kitchen / dining / sitting area, a utility room and an office on the ground floor. The roof conversion would accommodate one additional bedroom for the dwelling, with an ensuite and a store. Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would include facing brick, concrete interlocking tiles and grey fibreglass.

I note that initially, the proposed roof conversion included two flat roof dormer extensions, one on either side of the roof. This was removed from the proposed scheme.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (Adopted 2020)

SS1 Development Principles

1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

SS2 Settlement Hierarchy

SS8 Larger Villages Areas Strategy

DC1 Design Considerations

T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14

Section(s) 4 – Decision making, 12 – Achieving well designed places

Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD

Part 5 – Alterations, Extensions and Conversions

Staffordshire Moorlands Space About Dwellings SPD

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 27/09/2025

Neighbour consultation period ends: 26/09/2025

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One comment of support has been received, as follows:

“We wish to support this application. The property has been in a state of disrepair and has devalued the properties in Overland Drive. The street scene has many dormers and side extensions. This in our opinion will increase the value of our property and improve the overall skyline.”

Three comments of objection have been received, raising the following concerns:

- *I object to the removal of the garage from the property as for the last 31 years the garage has provided privacy onto my property. As the current boundary fence is only 3ft tall, removing the garage would give the owners of no 15 direct access into not only my garden but also full view into my conservatory and also my lounge. If alternative boundary fencing could be erected to provide this privacy, this could be*

considered however to install this would mean the current concrete fencing posts would need to be removed and new ones installed. this would mean damaging the paving on my side of the fencing which I am not prepared to have the expense of completing this work.

- The installation of dormer windows in the roof space would again reduce the privacy I currently have in my garden with no retrospective works planned to protect that privacy within the planning application.*
- The scheme introduces a dormer with a balcony facing directly towards our rear garden and habitable rooms. Its elevated position would allow clear, uninterrupted views into private amenity space that is currently not overlooked, contrary to the amenity safeguards in Local Plan Policy DC1.*
- The inclusion of a door giving access to the flat roof strongly suggests future use as an outdoor amenity area. Such use would intensify overlooking, noise and general disturbance for neighbouring occupiers, including our tenants. No assessment of this impact accompanies the application.*
- No other properties on Overland Drive feature roof-level balconies. Approving this element would create an unwelcome precedent, out of keeping with the established character of the street scene.*

Town / Parish Comments

No comments have been received from Brown Edge Parish Council.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

The proposal is for the construction of a single storey extension on the side and rear elevation of the property to create a kitchen, sitting, dining area, cloak room and an office. Internal modifications will convert the bedroom into a utility room, the lounge into a ground floor bedroom, and the kitchen will become a hall. Additionally, the installation of dormer windows to the roof will create a bedroom with wardrobes and ensuite. The existing porch is to be replaced with a new porch as shown on the Proposed Ground Floor plan.

The property footprint will increase from 1 to 2 bedrooms.

Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards state: Detached/Semi-detached property of up to 3 bedrooms will require 2 spaces (2.4 x 4.8m each space) for residents and visitors.

Parking for 2 vehicles is shown on the submitted Drawing No. Planning 5 and demonstrates there is sufficient parking to compensate for the loss of the garage and meets with the Parking Standards.

It was noted at the site visit that a section of the proposed parking area is currently grass and the submitted plan does not specify the type of material for the hardstanding.

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/2025/0280) subject to the following condition...

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. For decision takers this means (c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or (d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are more important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless: i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or ii) Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development as being economic, social and environmental.

In accordance with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan the Council expects all new development to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect and where possible enhance the environment. A concentrated focus on future growth is to be directed to larger settlements, including Brown Edge. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In compliance with Policy SS8, new development should be directed to the most sustainable locations. The site lies within the village of Brown Edge, which constitutes a larger village within the Staffordshire Moorlands. The Larger Villages Areas Strategy is based around areas where a focus of new development will be directed, with the aim of ensuring that all development enhances the character and appearance of the settlement.

The proposed site is within the Development Boundary, thus the proposed works are acceptable in principle, subject to conformity with other relevant national and local planning policies. The main issues which need to be considered as part of the assessment of the proposed works include design, neighbour amenity and highway safety.

Design

Policy DC1 seeks to ensure that all development is well designed and of a high quality, contributing to local distinctiveness and harmonising with sense of place. The Council's Design SPD outlines the Council's expectations in respect of design and states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building. An extension

should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing.

Notably, the context of the street scene in which the site sits comprises a row of bungalows with a unified pattern and design, which the Council will seek to protect. A couple of the bungalows along the row (No. 11 and No. 19 Overland Drive) have increased their roof pitches, in order to accommodate loft conversions. Front facing windows have been added into the pitch of the roof.

Initially, part of the proposed development comprised a significant increase in the roof pitch, to accommodate two flat roof dormer extensions as part of the roof conversion. One dormer extension was proposed to be on each side facing roof plane of the original dwelling. An increase in the roof pitch, two large dormer extensions and the proposed side / rear extension combined would have led to the side and rear elevations of the original dwelling being completely lost. Thus, the proposed extensions combined would strongly detract from the character of the rear and side of the original dwelling.

The pitch of the roof was considered overly steep, making the dwelling appear as a complete anomaly amongst the very unified row of bungalows. Whilst it is recognised that others have increased roof heights and pitches of surrounding dwellings, none of them are to the extent of the application initially presented to the Council. The roof pitch increases at No. 11 and No. 19 Overland Drive have only been increased to the extent of being able to accommodate front facing first storey windows.

Furthermore, the initially proposed dormers were not considered appropriate in this location. There are no other examples of dormers within the immediate context of the site / on the same style of dwelling. Therefore, the proposed dormers would appear incongruous and have an adverse impact on the surrounding street scene context. Whilst officers appreciate that other dwellings on the same street / in the nearby area have dormer extensions, these other dwellings are of different designs to the site and its immediate surrounding context.

Since these issues were raised, a revised scheme was submitted to the Council, removing the two dormer extensions and decreasing the pitch of the roof. A front facing window would be incorporated into the roof pitch, keeping a similar appearance to the front facing windows on the other two dwellings which have increased their roof pitches. Additionally, a pair of glazed doors with a fixed glass balustrade would be added into the rear roof pitch of the dwelling at first storey level. As the increased roof pitch and associated fenestration visible to the wider public domain would now be of an extremely similar appearance to the other dwellings with similar roof pitch increases, the proposed development would be considered acceptable in terms of its design.

A neighbour has commented on the proposed Juliet balcony, stating that no other properties on Overland Drive feature roof-level balconies. They believe that approving this element would create an unwelcome precedent, being out of keeping with the established character of the street scene. Notably, the proposed Juliet balcony would be positioned on the rear elevation of the dwelling, out of view from the wider public domain. Therefore, the proposed rear Juliet balcony is not

considered to have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding street scene.

The total extended area would wrap around the side and rear elevations of the host dwelling, having a 'L' shape. Initially, the proposed extension was only slightly stepped back from the principal elevation of the dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extension had a flat roof. Flat roof extensions are generally discouraged in the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD, especially in visible locations. Whilst it is recognised that other dwellings amongst the streetscape have wrap around single storey side and rear extensions with flat roofs (No. 13 and No. 17 Overland Drive), these extensions have a considerably less prominent impact on the street scene due to being substantially set back from the principal elevations of these dwellings. The proposed side / rear extension would only be slightly set back from the principal elevation of the dwelling, therefore the flat roof would be considerably more prominent amongst the street scene.

Since these issues were raised with the applicants, a revised scheme was submitted, setting the proposed extension further back from the principal elevation of the dwelling and adding a dummy pitch roof to the front section of the proposed extension. Whilst the side extension would not be set back as far as the extensions at the neighbouring dwellings, it would be more reflective of the neighbouring dwellings. Although the majority of the proposed extension would continue to have a flat roof, it is considered that the extension would no longer form a prominent addition in the area and when viewed from the street scene. It would barely be visible from the public domain due to it being located behind the dummy pitched roof to the front of the extension. On balance, although the proposed extension would conflict with the Design Guide SPD in terms of its flat roof element, its minimal visibility from the wider public domain would not result in a visually harmful addition to the dwelling. It is therefore considered acceptable in this case.

A proposed porch would be added to the principal elevation of the dwelling. Notably, No. 21 Overland Drive has a porch of an extremely similar design, thus the proposed porch would not have a completely incongruous appearance amongst the row of bungalows in the immediate context of the site. The proposed porch would have a simple gable style roof to compliment the character of the host dwelling. The porch would not be a dominant addition amongst the street scene. Initially, the proposed porch incorporated an apex window amongst the front roof pitch. There are no apex windows in visible locations on dwellings amongst the street scene, therefore it would be completely uncharacteristic of the street scene. A revised plan was submitted to the Council following the issue being raised with the applicants, removing the apex window from the proposed porch. Thus, it is now considered that the proposed porch is acceptable in terms of its design.

Initially, the materials used in the construction of the proposed extension did not match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. Although the surrounding street scene is comprised of a varied selection of house types, the dominant material used in the construction of the external walls of the row of dwellings in the immediate context of the site is brick. The applicants initially proposed to fully render the existing dwelling. Render, concrete interlocking tiles and grey fibreglass were proposed to be used in the construction of the proposed extension. Render would not match the brick and

hung tiles used in the construction of the host dwelling. Whilst it is recognised that render is present within the immediate context of the site, brick remains the dominant material on the row of bungalows. Therefore a fully rendered dwelling would not be considered acceptable.

A revised plan has been submitted to the Council, detailing that the existing dwelling would remain as brick and hung tiles and that the proposed extension would be constructed from brick and tiles. Therefore, the proposed materials would match the existing materials used in the construction of the host dwelling and harmonise with the surrounding street scene, not detracting from the character of the original street.

The proposal, by virtue of its size, scale and siting maintains the character of the existing dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore accord with the provisions of local plan policy DC1 and section 12 of the NPPF in this regard.

Amenity

Paragraph 135 f) of the NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. Local Plan Policy DC1 requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and to not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The application site is bound by No. 17 Overland Drive to the North and No. 13 Overland Drive is located to the South. Assessment of amenity impact will therefore be required on the direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the site.

The raising of the pitch of the roof would run parallel with the side elevations of the neighbours at No. 17 and No. 13 Overland Drive. Resultingly, no shadowing would occur over any front or rear windows of the neighbouring dwellings. Based on planning history of No. 13 (specifically SMD/2023/0522), it has been established that the two windows on the side elevation parallel to the application site serve a second bedroom and the bathroom. A second bedroom or bathroom are not considered to be primary, habitable rooms which the Council would seek to protect the light amenity of. Also no 13 is to the south of the development and therefore, no loss of direct sunlight would occur. As a result the impact of the raised roof height / pitch would not be considered detrimental enough on No. 13 to warrant refusal of the application. One side window at No. 17 would be impacted by the proposed raising of the ridge height of the dwelling. However, this window is obscure glazed. Rooms with obscure glazed windows are not considered primary, habitable rooms which the Council would seek to protect the light amenity of.

The neighbours have expressed concern regarding the installation of dormer windows in the roof space, which they believe would reduce the privacy they currently have in their garden. Furthermore, they worried that the scheme introduces a dormer with a balcony facing directly towards their rear garden and habitable rooms. Its elevated position would allow clear, uninterrupted views into their private amenity space that is currently not overlooked. Notably, the dormer extensions have been removed from the proposed development, and therefore this would no longer

be an issue. Whilst the initial proposed plans indicated that the roof space of the proposed extension could potentially be used as a balcony, the revised plans submitted show doors contained by a Juliet balcony which would prevent access to the roof space. Thus, the Council are not approving a full balcony in this case. I note that a Juliet balcony can be implemented without the requirement of planning permission. In order to solidify that the applicants shall not use the roof space of the proposed extension as a balcony, a condition shall be implemented to prohibit balcony use of this space.

Some neighbours have raised concern relating to the Juliet balcony with the fixed glass balustrade. They worry that the inclusion of a door giving access to the flat roof strongly suggests future use as an outdoor amenity area. Such use would intensify overlooking, noise and general disturbance for neighbouring occupiers. Notably, the plans indicate that there would be a fixed glass balustrade in front of the doors, meaning that it would be used as a Juliet balcony. The Council can only make judgement on the planning application as per the details submitted but as noted above a condition can be imposed to prevent future use as a balcony.

Whilst the floor to ceiling first storey doors contained by the Juliet balcony would create an element of additional overlooking, this is typical in the suburban type of environment which the site sits amongst. Notably, there are other dwellings amongst the street scene which have raised their rooflines to accommodate loft conversions, incorporating first storey rear fenestration. For example, a first storey rear window has been incorporated into the loft conversion at No. 11 Overland Drive approved by the Council under SMD/2015/0705. The addition of the first storey window in the instance of No. 11 would not have a different impact to the addition of the fenestration at the site.

The proposed single storey side part of the extension would be located on the Northern side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 13 Overland Drive is positioned to the South of the site, the single storey extension on the Northern side elevation will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour. Whilst the single storey rear part of the extension would be within closer proximity to the neighbours at No. 13, it is clear that minimal resulting light amenity impact would occur, as there would be no breach of the 45 degree rule to the closest rear windows. Furthermore, as noted above no.13 is to the south.

The proposed single storey side / rear extension would be within close proximity to the neighbours at No. 17 Overland Drive. The single storey extension would align parallel with and protrude beyond an existing conservatory extension at No. 17. Due to the East to West sunlight trajectory, the proposed extension would cast some shadowing over the closest side elevation the conservatory during the afternoon / evening hours. Regardless of this, the extensive amount of glazing on the opposite side elevation, the rear elevation and the roof of the neighbours' conservatory would all continue to gain plenty of natural sunlight entry. Therefore, it is not considered that the shadowing impact from the single storey side / rear extension which would occur on the neighbours at No. 17 is detrimental enough to warrant refusal of the application.

There would be one new door on the side elevation of the original dwelling which would face towards the neighbours at No. 13, incorporating a small glazed panel.

This door would serve a utility room, which is not considered to be a primary, habitable room of a dwelling. Regardless, a condition shall be implemented on the decision notice to state that the glazed area in the door shall be obscure glazed, in order to prevent overlooking and protect the privacy amenity of No. 13.

Two new roof lights would be located on the side roof plane facing towards No. 17; serving what looks to be the new master bedroom, which is considered to be a primary, habitable room. However, due to the angle of the roof slope, overlooking would be minimal and would be over the roof of the neighbour. A small toilet window is also shown on this side which could be fitted with obscured glazing. Thus, detrimental privacy amenity impact would not occur for these neighbours as a result of the addition of the proposed development.

The neighbours at No. 17 have raised concern regarding the removal of the garage from the property, as for the last 31 years the garage has provided privacy onto their property. As the current boundary fence is only 3ft tall, removing the garage would give the owners of No. 15 direct access into not only their garden but also full view into their conservatory and lounge. They have also expressed concern regarding the idea of alternative boundary fencing being installed, meaning that the current concrete fencing posts would need to be removed and new ones installed. This would mean damaging the paving on their side of the fencing.

Notably, the existing garage can be demolished without the requirement of planning permission, and therefore the Council do not have control to stop the applicants from doing this. Additionally, it is within the gift of either party to erect a boundary fence of up to 2 metres in height on the common boundary without the requirement of planning permission. Any dispute regarding boundary / party walls is a civil matter which would need to be dealt with under The Party Walls Act 1996. Thus, it is not a material planning consideration which would be considered in the planning decision making process.

Furthermore, the proposed extension would not cause any overlooking regardless of the loss of the existing garage. Only one new window and two roof lights would be added to the side elevation / roof plane of the dwelling which would face towards the neighbours at No. 17. The window would serve a cloak room / W/C, which is not considered to be a habitable, primary room of a dwelling. In order to further protect the amenity of the neighbours at No. 17, it shall be conditioned that this window is obscure glazed. As previously stated, the proposed roof lights would be above natural eye level, therefore they would not create any detrimental overlooking issues over No. 17.

Highway Safety

Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places. Policy T1 seeks to provide safe and sustainable access and ensure that development does not lead to an increase in on street parking.

The proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling

from one to two. Despite the increase in the number of bedrooms, the Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards state that for any dwelling with up to three bedrooms, 2 parking spaces are required. Therefore, no additional off-highway parking space would be required for the number of people inhabiting the dwellinghouse. The development proposals therefore comply with Policy T1.

Staffordshire County Council Highways department have stated that whilst parking for two vehicles has been shown on the submitted plans to demonstrate that there is sufficient parking to compensate for the loss of the garage, the parking spaces detailed are not currently in situ. Upon completion of a site visit, it was established that a section of the proposed parking is currently grass and the submitted plan does not specify the type of material used for the proposed hardstanding. Thus, Highways have stated that they have no objections to the proposed development, provided that the development is not brought into use until the parking area has been provided in accordance with the plans submitted and surfaced in tarmac or other sustainably drained material.

Thus, the proposed extension would have no impact on highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In consideration of all of the above, the application is recommended for approval. Due to the application having no adverse effect upon neighbour or street scene amenity and no overall impact on the highway, it is deemed acceptable under planning policy. Whilst the flat roof element of the proposed extension would contradict the adopted Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD, the dummy pitch roof at the front of the extension will reduce the visibility of the flat roof. Thus, on balance, the flat roof element of the extension is considered acceptable in this instance. Therefore, the proposed development is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Varley

Recommendation Date: 29/09/2025

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council