

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026

by **C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: 6001280

#### 71 Armshead Road, Werrington ST9 0DG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Wayne Greensmith against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
  - The application Ref is SMD/2025/0275.
  - The development proposed is 'Single Storey Rear & Two Storey Side Extension'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The conclusion in the Council's delegated decision report references harm to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. However, this is not given as a reason for refusal in the decision notice nor is it assessed as being a concern in the body of the report itself. I have instead focussed on the reason given in the decision notice.

### Main Issue

3. Based on the above, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a detached bungalow with a dormer window to the front roof pitch. The dwelling forms one of five largely identical properties fronting Armshead Road, while to the east and west of the five dwellings, housing becomes more varied in its style, scale and general design. The proposal includes single storey rear and two storey side extensions as well as two dormers to the front roof slope.
5. My attention is drawn to the Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted February 2018) which advises that an extension should respect the dominance of the original building and be subordinate to it in terms of its size and massing. Setting back the new section from the building line and keeping the eaves and ridge lower than the parent building will help.
6. The host property along with the other four dwellings of this design contribute positively to the local area through their simple form, matching proportions and regular spacing. The two storey side extension would erode much of the space between the host property and No.73, with only a small gap remaining to the

adjacent dwelling. This would create a terracing effect when viewed from Armshead Road which would harmfully interrupt the pleasant rhythm caused by regular gaps between properties. Moreover, the set down from the host ridge and set back from the front elevation would be minimal. The rear extension would cover the whole width of the original dwelling and the proposed side extension while also including two pitched roof gable projections. This would overwhelm the rear elevation of the host building, with the extensions overall adding considerable mass and bulk relative to the original size of the dwelling.

7. Furthermore, the front roof slope currently includes a small flat roof dormer window to the left hand side. This is repeated on other dwellings in this cluster of dormer bungalows, and although it is on the right hand side of the front slope of No. 75, the proportions and prevalence of a single dormer is repeated. The addition of two larger, pitched roof dormers to the host building would dominate the roof while eroding the symmetry between this and neighbouring dwellings. This would not be lessened by vegetation and would be clearly visible and prominent in the local area. There are also dormers on the dwellings to the rear of the appeal site, which are observed through the gaps between the properties along Armshead Road. I don't disagree that dormers are prevalent in the area. However, as I have already concluded, the gap between No's.71 and 73 would be largely eroded in any event.
8. I am informed that a rear extension could be carried out using permitted development rights as a fallback position. Be that as it may, the relevant part of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO) would have its own limitations, particularly with respect to height and the joining of rear and side extensions. Given the limitations, I am not convinced this would be as desirable as the proposal before me and as such I give this little weight as a fallback consideration.
9. Despite the variety of designs of other dwellings on the same road, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and local area. This would conflict with policies SS8 and DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020). These seek to ensure development proposals are designed to respect the site and its surroundings and promote a positive sense of place through scale, height, character and appearance, among other things. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance in the SPD and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which advises that development proposals should be sympathetic to local character.

## **Conclusion**

10. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it and as such, the appeal is dismissed.

*C McDonagh*

INSPECTOR