

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

**SMD/2026/0123**  
**Valid 16/03/2026**

**CROSSMOOR BANKS LANE**  
**KINGSLEY**

**SINGLE STOREY GARAGE  
EXTENSION, REMOVAL OF  
FRONT PORCH AND NEW BI-  
FOLD DOORS TO REAR  
ELEVATION**

**(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

---

### MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Churnet Ward. Additionally, the proposed site is on Green Belt land, where development is more restricted. Ivy Cottage, Banks Lane is situated to the North of the site. Curtilage space belonging to No. 1 The Cottages, No. 2 The Cottages and No. 3 The Cottages, Hazles Cross Road adjoin the North-Western curtilage of the site. Notably, the site is visible from the Kingsley 7 Public Right of Way, which runs adjacent to the Eastern curtilage of the site. The site is served by an access off Banks Lane to 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 of a single storey garage extension, the removal of an existing front porch and the installation of new bi-fold doors on the rear elevation of the dwelling. Notably, the proposed garage extension would not be large enough to park a car inside of. Materials used in the construction of the proposed development would match those used in the construction of the host dwelling, including brickwork, concrete tiles and white UPVC.

### 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  
SS10 Other Rural 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, 13 –  
Protecting Greenbelt Land

### **Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD**

Part 5 – Alterations, Extensions and Conversions

### **Staffordshire Moorlands Space About Dwellings SPD**

## **SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS**

SMD/1978/0613 – Building of a dwelling house. Approved.  
SMD/1980/0609 – Details of detached dwelling. Approved.  
SMD/2002/1241 – Two storey side extension. Withdrawn.  
SMD/2003/0625 – Two storey side and single storey side / front / rear extensions.  
Approved.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### **Publicity**

Site Notice expiry date: 22/04/2026  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 21/04/2026  
Press Advert: N/A

### **Public Comments**

No public comments have been received.

### **Town / Parish Comments**

Kingsley Parish Council have made the following comment:

*“There was some concern about the proposed extension to the garage, specifically its height and proximity to the nearby Ivy Cottage.”*

### **Staffordshire County Council Highways**

*The proposal seeks to remove the front porch and to add a single storey extension to the garage. The garage will measure 5.5m wide by 5m long (minimum internal dimensions). Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards state the minimum internal dimension for a single garage should be 3m wide by 6m long or for a double garage 6m wide by 6m long. The proposed garage at only 5m long does not meet the Parking Standards.*

*The submitted plan titled Proposed Block Plan shows parking for 2 vehicles however the parking/hardstanding area is capable of accommodating 3 vehicles and is considered sufficient for a 4 bedroom property.*

*The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the adopted highway. I have no objection (application number SMD/2026/0123).*

## **OFFICER COMMENTS**

### **Principle of Development / Green Belt**

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. For decision makers 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 more limited focus on future growth is to be directed to rural areas, including the outskirts of Kingsley. 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).

The application site is located in the Open Countryside and Green Belt whereby Policy SS10 of the Local Plan (2020) is applicable. Policy SS10 states that these rural areas will provide only for development that has an essential need to be located in the countryside, supports the rural diversification and sustainability of the rural areas, promotes sustainable tourism or enhances the countryside.

Part (3) of policy SS10 seeks to protect the quality and character of the area and

requires all development proposals to respect and respond sensitively to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape.

The site is located within the Green Belt. Part (6) of Policy SS10 states that the Council will “maintain the Green Belt within Staffordshire Moorlands. Strict control will continue to be exercised over inappropriate development within the Green Belt allowing only for exceptions as defined by Government policy.”

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF (2024) states that ‘inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances’. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2024) outlines that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it meets an exception. One such exception is (c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

Neither the Local Plan nor the NPPF (2024) provide a definition of what is regarded as being ‘disproportionate’ for the purposes of Green Belt policy. However, previous policy guidance considered a development resulting in a 30% increase in the size of the original building as being acceptable. Whilst it is acknowledged that 30% increase is not planning policy, it does represent a useful “rule of thumb”.

Notably, the existing dwelling has been extended by virtue of a two storey side extension and a single storey front / side / rear extension. The existing extensions to the dwelling combined with the proposed extension would equate to an increase in the volume of the original dwelling by approximately 78%. This would amount to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling and therefore, it is considered that the development would amount to inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

At present, there is a substantial gap between the existing garage at the site and the closest elevation of the neighbouring dwelling at Ivy Cottage. The gap between the existing development can be viewed from the Kingsley 7 Public Right of Way (PROW), as can be seen in the photograph below:



Figure 1: View of the site from the Kingsley 7 PROW

The proposed garage extension would enclose this gap, reducing the openness of the land by compacting the development within the cluster, in addition to the purely volumetric assessment above.

This will result in harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and harm to openness and should not be allowed unless there are very special circumstances to outweigh that harm. No such circumstances have been put forward or identified.

It is now necessary to identify whether there is any other harm arising from the proposed development.

## **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 proposed garage extension would be single storey, therefore the eaves and maximum heights of this extension would be set down from the parent building. Thus, it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD, due to its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling. It would create a continuation of the pitched roof course of the existing garage, which would be in keeping with the roof course of the host dwelling.

The proposed removal of the existing single storey porch on the principal elevation of the dwelling would not be considered to detrimentally impact the character or appearance of the dwelling.

Notably, the addition of the proposed bi-fold doors could be made utilising permitted development rights under Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Therefore, this work could be completed without the requirement of planning permission.

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension and alterations would match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling, as well as from surrounding dwellings in the area. Brick, concrete tiles and white UPVC would be used in the construction of the proposed development. 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 Ivy Cottage, Banks Lane to the North. Curtilage space belonging to No. 1 The Cottages, No. 2 The Cottages and No. 3 The Cottages, Hazles Cross Road adjoin the North-Western curtilage of the site. Assessment of amenity impact will therefore be required on the direct neighbouring dwellinghouses to the site.

The proposed garage extension would bring the garage at the site closer towards a single storey rear outrigger at Ivy Cottage, Banks Lane. As there are no windows on the rear elevation of the rear outrigger at Ivy Cottage which the proposed extension would run parallel with, no overshadowing would occur. Therefore, their light amenity would not be impacted by the proposed extension.

There would be no windows on the elevation of the proposed garage extension which would face towards the neighbours at Ivy Cottage. Therefore, the privacy amenity of these neighbours would not be impacted, as no overlooking opportunity would be created.

The proposed garage extension would run parallel with the side elevation of No. 3 The Cottages, Hazles Cross Road. It would not protrude beyond the principal elevations of No. 3, No. 2 or No. 1 The Cottages, therefore there would be no breach of the 45 degree rule to the closest windows on these neighbouring dwellings. Based on this, the light amenity of these neighbours would not be impacted.

There would be no glazed fenestration on the side elevation of the proposed garage extension which would face towards the neighbours at No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 The Cottages. Whilst a new garage door would be located on this elevation, its solid exterior would not lead to any detrimental overlooking on these neighbours. Therefore, their privacy amenity would not be adversely impacted.

The removal of the existing single storey porch on the principal elevation of the dwelling would not have any amenity impact on any surrounding neighbours.

The proposed bifold doors on the rear elevation of the dwelling would face towards open, Green Belt, countryside land. Therefore, their addition would not result in any privacy amenity impact for any neighbours by virtue of overlooking.

## **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 development would not increase the number of bedrooms of the dwelling. Therefore, it is clear that no additional parking spaces will be required for the number of people inhabiting the dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the available off-highway parking on the driveway would not be compromised.

Staffordshire County Council Highways department have commented on the application, stating that they have no objection to the proposed development. The submitted plan titled 'Proposed Block Plan' shows parking for 2 vehicles however the parking/hardstanding area is capable of accommodating 3 vehicles and is considered sufficient for a 4 bedroom property.

Thus, the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy T1 in this regard.

## **CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE**

In consideration of all of the above, the application is recommended for refusal. Although the application would have no adverse effect upon neighbour amenity and would be acceptable in terms of its design, the proposal would not comply with Green Belt policy. Before this application had been submitted, other extensions had already been added to the building comprising disproportionate additions. Therefore, the proposed extension would exacerbate this position and would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. As such it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been put forward to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Therefore, the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

**Case Officer: Hannah Varley**

**Recommendation Date: 11/05/2026**

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

**On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council**