

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HNT/2025/0015
Valid 16/09/2025

96 UTTOXETER ROAD
DRAYCOTT IN THE MOORS

APPLICATION TO DETERMINE
IF PRIOR APPROVAL IS
REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED
REAR SINGLE-STOREY
EXTENSION EXTENDING AN
EXISTING EXTENSION TO THE
SIDE - TO EXTEND BEYOND
THE REAR WALL 5.36M, HAVE
A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 2.70M
AND HEIGHT AT THE EAVES
OF EXTENSION OF 2.70M

(HOUSEHOLDER
NOTIFICATION APPLICATION)

MAIN ISSUES

- Compliance with HNT under GPDO(2015) Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A
- Whether there is an objection from any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The property is a semi-detached bungalow on the south side of Uttoxeter Road, Blythe Bridge. The original bungalow was present by the time of the 1937 – 1939 OS map. It has at some point subsequently been extended to the rear. Photographs supplied by the applicant show that the extended rear elevations have been coated in a white pebble dash render. Information supplied also shows that land to the rear of the bungalow drops to an appreciably lower garden level. There are French doors in the current extension opening on to a verandah. A detached single garage against the west neighbour boundary, and positioned rear of the dwelling, aligns with a drive way running alongside the dwelling from Uttoxeter Road.

By reference to the Council's historical map records the dwelling remained in its original form at least up until 1966-67. The only planning history record is from 1972 under planning reference 9107. It appears that this relates to the existing rear extension as it is seen at the present day. It is apparent to the LPA that the earlier extension was not present up until 1966. This previous extension is represented on the submitted existing layout plan as a 'lounge'.

The original bungalow would have been 7.2m x 6.2m (c.45m²). The post 1966 lounge extension projects 5.3m and extends across the original rear elevation c.4.7metres

leaving a side gap to the attached neighbour of c.1.4metres. Its ridge height scales from the drawings as c.4.2 to 4.4m.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to create a single open-plan combined lounge and kitchen across, in effect, the whole of the rear of the property (though not quite meeting up with the attached neighbour boundary line). It would not extend any further out to the rear than the existing extension.

It appears the roof profile of the existing extension would not be altered. The new infill extension would have a flat roof.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024)

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;

Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes; 6 – Building a strong and competitive economy; 7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres; 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities; 9 – Promoting sustainable transport; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places; 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land; 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

Local Plan Supporting Evidence Documents:

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

9107 granted 5th April 1972 was for:

‘Alterations to form bathroom with WC, kitchen, hall and lounge extension to form bedroom and garage at 96 Uttoxeter Road, Draycott, Stoke-on-Trent’.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: N/A

Neighbour consultation period ended: 9th October 2025

Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

None received

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

A larger home extension of up to 6m projection off an original rear elevation of a semi-detached dwelling is permissible as PD subject to this prior notice procedure and its relevant associated criteria being followed.

Under the relevant PD provisions as set out in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO(2015), Condition A.4(2) (b) requires the applicant to submit

(b) a plan indicating the site and showing the proposed development and any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which the enlarged part will be joined.

The application refers in the description to “extending an existing extension” though this is not identified explicitly on the submitted drawing.

Original building is defined by reference to the glossary in the NPPF as:

A building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.

Examination of the mapping history shows that the extension to the original dwelling comprises the room identified as ‘lounge’ in the applicant’s as-existing drawing.

Paragraph A.1 (ja) defines development not permitted as including:

(ja) any total enlargement (being the enlarged part together with any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which it will be joined) exceeds or would exceed the limits set out in sub-paragraphs (e) to (j);

This means taking into account the existing rear extension to which the proposal would be attached. Paragraph A.1 (f) (ii) requires the proposal not to exceed 4 metres in height. Given that the ridge height of the existing extension to which the proposal would be attached exceeds this height limit the proposal cannot succeed as Permitted Development.

Paragraph A.4 (3) provides as follows:

(3) The local planning authority may refuse an application where, in the opinion of the authority—

(a) the proposed development does not comply with, or
(b) the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with, the conditions, limitations or restrictions applicable to development permitted by Class A which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g).

Based on A.1 (f) (ii) and by reference to A.4 (3) (a) the proposed development does not comply with the requirement to not exceed the 4.0m maximum permitted height.

Also not permitted, as stipulated by paragraph A.1 (k), is development that would consist of or include the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform. An area described on the submitted drawing reference 1671/A2/01 revision A as a patio is shown in the side and rear elevations as being a raised platform of at least c.0.6m in height. A raised platform is defined in the technical guidance as any platform with a height greater than 300mm.

Other matters

All adjoining land / property owners have been notified by the LPA in accordance with Condition A.4(5). There have been no representations received within the prescribed minimum time ending in this case 9th October 2025.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The development does not comply with the permitted development rights in that it exceeds the 4.0m maximum height and is shown in the submitted drawings as including the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank

Recommendation Date: 28.10.2025

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council