

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2025/0400
Valid 02/09/2025

82 PORTLAND DRIVE
FORSBROOK

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY
SIDE & REAR EXTENSION

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a semi-detached brick, hung tile and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Forsbrook ward. Additionally, the site is within the Blythe Bridge Development Boundary, where positive development is encouraged to be concentrated. The site is enclosed by neighbouring dwellinghouses on the North, East and West. No. 80 Portland Drive is situated to the East of the site and No. 84 Portland Drive (the adjoining neighbour) is located to the West. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the rear curtilage of No. 8 Meadow Close to the North. The Portland Drive highway runs adjacent to the site on the South.

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

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises of the demolition of an existing single storey conservatory to the rear of the property and the erection of a new single storey extension with a hipped roof, wrapping around the principal, side and rear elevations of the property. The proposed extension would allow for a larger kitchen / diner / family room, a utility room and a bedroom with an ensuite bathroom on the ground floor of the dwelling. It would be constructed from materials which would harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse, including red/brown facing brick, blue/grey roofing tiles and UPVC.

Notably, the application is a resubmission of SMD/2025/0138, which was refused.

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
Appendix 2 - Parking Guidance

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

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

SMD/2025/0138 – Single storey side and rear extension. Refused.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 09/10/2025
Neighbour consultation period ends: 08/10/2025
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One public comment has been received by the Council, as follows:

“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application. I'm writing on behalf of my mother (Mrs Beryl Christine Lunt), who lives in the neighbouring property No. 80, Portland Dive, Forsbrook, S-o-T. ST11 9AU. The issues we wish to highlight relate to the side extension which has no gap or maintenance strip to the existing boundary wall. This is the retaining wall to my mum's drive and thus gives rise to the following queries:

- 1. Do the works have Building Regulation approval including approved structural calculations (Part A) and Fire transference (Part B)?*
- 2. The external face of the new extension wall appears to abut the boundary retaining wall, however, there are no structural details to show an approved foundation design. The new foundation needs to account for the foundation of the existing retaining wall and must not detrimentally affect or undermine this wall.*

3. *The existing boundary retaining wall has low level drainpipes / weep holes to discharge ground water at regular intervals. The proposed side extension will block several of these drain positions as the new wall appears to tightly abut the face of the retaining wall. Is there a detail to show how this drainage will be maintained?*

4. *The application drawing appears to indicate the eaves gutter of the new side extension overhangs the boundary fence. There is no agreement for encroachment, hence there needs to be a detail to show the gutter will not encroach over the boundary line between the two properties.*

5. *There is no agreement to use my mum's property for maintenance access eg: gutter cleaning. No agreement was sought prior to submission, and this would not be agreeable in any case.*

6. *As maintenance can't be provided from my mum's neighbouring property, the shallow pitch roof tiles of the new extension will need to be of a type that can be walked on for maintenance purposes.*

7. *The construction of the extension should in no way rely on the use of my mum's property for building access or have scaffolding encroachment. Again, no discussion was had or agreement sought prior to submission."*

Town / Parish Comments

No comments have been received from Forsbrook Parish Council.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

"The proposal is to construct a single storey extension to the rear and side elevations of the property to provide a family room to the rear and a utility, shower room and bedroom to the side.

The footprint of the property will increase from 3 to 4 bedrooms. The extension will sever access to the garage causing the loss of the garage parking provision.

Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards state for 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.

The submitted plans show parking for 2 vehicles this does not meet with the Parking Standards, and therefore a plan detailing sufficient parking for 3 vehicles is required.

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/2025/0400) 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 Forsbrook. 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 Forsbrook, 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.

The maximum height of the proposed single storey extension would be set down from the maximum and eaves heights of the parent building, as well as follow the course of the original dwellinghouse. Thus it would be considered appropriate

development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD, due to its subordinate relationship with the parent dwelling.

The proposed single storey extension would have a hipped roof. The introduction of a hipped roof to the dwelling would be somewhat incongruous with the surrounding streetscape, which is strongly characterised by pitched rooves / gables. This being said, a gable style of extension with the forward projection would result in a bulkier roof form and overly dominant addition to the dwelling which is not in keeping with the street scene (as identified under SMD/2025/0138). It is also noted that there are examples elsewhere in the street scene which comprise side extension with a hipped roof form. The proposed front extension would not be a dominant addition amongst the street scene and is characterful of the row of dwellings in its context, some of which have similar small single storey projections forward of the principal elevation.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension would match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. A prominent feature of the street scene is the brick used in the construction of the dwellinghouses. Red/brown facing brick, blue/grey roofing tiles and UPVC would be used in the construction of the proposed extension. It is noted that the previous application proposed render which was considered to be unacceptable. Thus, the proposed materials would match the existing materials 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. 80 Portland Drive to the East and No. 84 Portland Drive (the adjoining neighbour) is located to the West. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the rear curtilage of No. 8 Meadow Close to the North. Assessment of amenity impact will therefore be required on the direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the sides and rear of the site.

The proposed extension would be within closer proximity of the neighbouring dwelling at No. 80 Portland Drive. Notably, the natural slope of the public highway means that No. 80 is sited on a higher ground level than the site. As the proposed extension is at single storey level and the site is on a lower ground level to No. 80, it is clear that no detrimental shadowing would occur as a result of the extension. The proposed side extension would predominantly align with the side wall of No. 80,

which is blank at ground floor level. Therefore, there would be no risk of loss of light into any habitable side windows. Following the completion of a site visit and assessment of the plans submitted, it has been established that there would not be a breach of the 45 degree rule to the closest front or rear fenestration at No. 80.

Whilst there would be no new windows on the side elevations of the proposed extension which would face towards No. 80, there would be one new roof light. As roof lights are installed above natural eye level, they do not create any detrimental overlooking issues. Therefore, the proposed roof light would not impact the privacy amenity of No. 80.

Part of the proposed single storey extension would be located on the Eastern side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 84 Portland Drive is positioned to the West of the site, the single storey side extension will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour. Furthermore the distance between the proposed single storey side extension and the neighbouring dwelling would eradicate any chance of overshadowing. Although the proposed extension would extend beyond the principal and rear elevations of the dwelling, there would be no breach of the 45 degree rule to the closest front and rear windows of No. 84. The proposed rear extension would in fact have a lesser depth than single storey rear extension at No. 84.

There would be no windows on the side elevations of the proposed extension which would face towards the neighbours at No. 84, therefore their privacy amenity would not be adversely impacted.

Due to the approximately 18.9 metre distance between the proposed single storey extension and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 8 Meadow Close, it is clear that no shadowing would occur resulting from the extension. There would be a set of bifold doors (four panes wide), a single glazed door, a window and three roof lights on the rear elevation of the proposed extension which would face towards the rear curtilage of No. 8. This being said, the approximately 2 metre high common boundary fencing between the site and No. 8 would prevent overlooking from occurring as a consequence of the new glazed areas, considering they would be at ground floor level. Despite the addition of the three new roof lights, the privacy amenity of No. 8 would not be impacted, as roof lights are positioned above natural eye level. Thus, it is not considered that the addition of these roof lights would create any detrimental overlooking issues.

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 of the adopted Local Plan 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 three to four. For a dwelling with four plus bedrooms, three parking spaces are

required in accordance with the Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Guidelines. Staffordshire County Council Highways have commented on the application to make this point, stating that the submitted plans only show parking for two vehicles, which does not meet with the Parking Standards. Therefore, Highways have requested that a plan which details sufficient parking for three vehicles is secured by virtue of condition.

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

Other Issues

One public comment has been received by the Council in relation to the application, raising concern about the proposed development. The concern raised largely relates to the side extension having no gap or maintenance strip to the existing boundary wall, comprising the retaining wall to the drive of No. 80 Portland Drive.

Notably, points 1, 2 and 3 raised by the neighbour will be dealt with under statutory building regulations and are therefore not material planning considerations in the decision making process.

In terms of point 4, the applicants are entitled to build up to their property boundary subject to being granted relevant planning permissions. From the plans it appears that the guttering would fall onto the common boundary line, rather than over it.

Points 5, 6 and 7 relating to property maintenance and building access / scaffolding encroachment again are civil matters and a matter for both parties to agree upon (or not). Refusal of planning permission cannot be warranted based on these reasons.

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. Therefore, the proposed development is recommended for approval, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Varley
Recommendation Date: 27/10/2025

X *J. Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council