

## DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

---

**SMD/2026/0210**  
**Valid 05/05/2026**

**6 KENT DRIVE**  
**ENDON**

**SINGLE STOREY REAR**  
**EXTENSION AND FIRST**  
**FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION**

**(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)**

---

### MAIN ISSUES

- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety

### DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site comprises a semi-detached brick and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Brown Edge and Endon Ward. The site is also within the Endon development boundary, where positive development is encouraged to be concentrated. The site is bound by neighbouring dwellings to the North, South and East. Tree Tops, No. 8 Kent Drive is situated to the North of the site and No. 4 Kent Drive is located to the South. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the curtilage of No. 2 Kent Drive to the South-East and the curtilage of Kerrilyn, Platts Avenue to the East. The Kent Drive highway runs adjacent to the Western boundary of the site.

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 the erection of a first storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. As part of the proposed development, a small area of raised decking would adjoin the proposed rear extension. The proposed extensions would allow for a larger kitchen / diner / family room on the ground floor and an additional bedroom and extension to the existing bathroom on the first storey. The proposed first storey side extension would have a hipped roof to complement the hipped roof of the host dwelling and the proposed single storey rear extension would have a lean to roof. Materials used in the construction of the proposed extensions would match those used in the construction of the host dwelling, including brick, tiles and white UPVC.

Notably, the proposed scheme is a revised version of the initially proposed scheme. Revised plans were submitted as the Council expressed concern regarding the proposed use of render and the size of the initially proposed area of raised decking.

## **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: 23/06/2026  
Neighbour consultation period ends: 22/06/2026  
Press Advert: N/A

### **Public Comments**

One public comment has been received, as follows:

*We, the owners of the properties directly opposite No 6 Kent Drive, while not wishing formally to object to this application, feel that if, by some means the roof line of the proposed extension could be lowered by say, half a metre, this would lessen the impact on surrounding properties, reduce our loss of light and improve the aesthetic appearance of the development.*

## **Town / Parish Comments**

*At a meeting of Endon with Stanley Parish Council on 9th June, the application was noted to include alterations and extensions resulting in a four-bedroom dwelling, including the removal of the existing garage. Concerns were raised regarding reduced on-site parking provision, which may increase pressure for on-street parking given the narrow nature of the road. Objection raised, with councillors expressing concerns regarding parking provision.*

## **Staffordshire County Council Highways**

*The proposal involves the construction of a single-storey rear extension together with a first-floor extension. The ground floor will accommodate a new open-plan family and kitchen area, and the garage will be converted into a storage room, utility, and WC. At first-floor level, a bathroom and 4th bedroom will be created above the proposed storage room, utility, and WC.*

*Although the proposal results in the loss of the garage, the garage does not meet the minimum internal dimensions required to accommodate a modern vehicle and therefore does not function as an effective parking space.*

*The number of bedrooms will increase from 3 to 4.*

*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 plan 3167 - PL04 Rev B shows parking for 3 vehicles and meets with the Parking Standards.*

*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/2026/0210) 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 Endon. 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 will be directed to the most sustainable locations. The site lies within Endon, 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.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that *“Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary documents, such as design guides and codes.”*

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. Paragraph 5.2 of the Council's Design Guide SPD states that *“alterations need to be undertaken with care. Insensitive changes can easily spoil a building. The key to a sensitive approach is to take note of what is there already before preparing the design and to work with and not against the building's character... The aim should be to revitalise the building without altering its fundamental character.”*

Although the proposed side extension would add a first storey element to the Southern side elevation of the dwelling, the proposed extension would reflect

the style of the existing building in terms of the hipped roof to compliment the hipped roof of the host dwellinghouse. Although the comments of the neighbours are noted, the maximum height of the proposed side extension would be set down from the parent building, thus it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD, as it would be subordinate to the parent dwelling. Furthermore, the first storey side extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, again reiterating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling.

The proposed rear extension would be single storey, therefore the maximum height of the extension would be set down from the parent building. Thus, it would be considered appropriate development in accordance with the Council's Design SPD. I note that the rear extension would clearly be set back from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, again reiterating its subordinate nature to the parent dwelling. The rear extension would have a simple lean to roof, which would complement the roof of the host dwelling.

Paragraph 7.14 of the Council's Design Guide SPD states that *"new buildings should ideally be constructed from the same palette of materials used traditionally in the area. This means for the most part natural stone or brick for walling and Staffordshire blue clay tiles or slate for roofs."*

Notably, the street scene comprises of predominantly brick constructed dwellings, thus there is an established character. Throughout the application process, the applicants submitted plans which showed the proposed extensions to have external elevations constructed from render. They made the point that there are other examples of rendered properties within the wider area, including Hazelwood Road, St Georges Avenue, and further along Kent Drive.

Each planning application is considered on its own merit, depending on the context of the host dwelling and surrounding streetscape. Examples of rendered dwellings on Hazelwood Road and St Georges Avenue sit within different streets in different contexts and are therefore not relevant in the case of the application in front of the Council. Brick is the predominant material used in the construction of the dwellings amongst the Kent Drive street scene. Only one other dwelling is present on Kent Drive which incorporates render. This is just a feature vertical strip of render on part of the principal elevation as opposed to a totally rendered dwelling or extension.

The proposed extensions, in particular the first storey side extension would be very visible amongst the wider public domain, thus it is important that they are designed to be sensitive to the surrounding street scene. Therefore, the Council consider that a proposed rendered extension would have a harmful impact on the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

Upon this concern being raised with the applicant, revised plans have been submitted to the Council. The proposed extensions would now be constructed from brick, tiles and white UPVC, to be of a similar appearance to the materials used in the construction of the host dwelling. 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.

A proposed area of raised decking would adjoin the single storey rear extension as part of the proposed development. Due to its location to the rear of the dwelling, it would be completely tucked away and out of view from the wider public domain. Therefore, it is considered acceptable as it would not cause any harm to the street scene.

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 Tree Tops, No. 8 Kent Drive to the North and No. 4 Kent Drive is located to the South. The rear curtilage of the site adjoins the curtilage of No. 2 Kent Drive to the South-East and the curtilage of Kerrilyn, Platts Avenue to the East. Therefore, it becomes important to assess whether the amenity of these neighbours would be compromised.

The proposed first storey side extension would be located on the Southern side elevation. As the neighbouring dwellinghouse at Tree Tops, No. 8 Kent Drive is positioned to the North of the site, the first storey extension on the Southern side elevation will be tucked behind the host dwelling on the opposite side to the neighbour. Thus, there would be no adverse impact on the light or privacy amenity of the adjoining neighbour as the extension would not be visible to them.

The single storey rear extension would be within close proximity to the neighbouring dwelling at Tree Tops, therefore the 45 degree rule has been assessed between the corner of the proposed extension and their closest rear window. Upon assessment, it has been established that there would be a marginal breach of the 45 degree line, meaning that the light amenity of the neighbours at Tree Tops would be impacted. This being said, the breach of the 45 degree rule is only very marginal, meaning that it would not have a significant and detrimental shadowing impact on the closest rear window at Tree Tops. Therefore, the proposed extension is considered acceptable in this instance, despite its breach of the 45 degree rule. There would be no windows on the side elevation of the rear extension which would face towards the neighbours at Tree Tops, therefore no overlooking would occur and their privacy amenity would not be impacted. Notably, no objections have been received from the neighbours at Tree Tops in relation to the proposed extensions.

A new area of raised decking would adjoin the proposed single storey rear extension. Initially, the proposed area of raised decking was a large enough area to

potentially be used as a balcony. The boundary treatment between the site and the neighbours at Tree Tops comprises low level fencing (lower in height than the window sills on the host dwelling and Tree Tops), thus meaning that there is no barrier to protect the privacy amenity of these neighbours. Therefore, the initially proposed area of raised decking would lead to direct overlooking into the closest rear window at Tree Tops, as well as their private amenity space.

Upon this concern being raised with the applicants, revised plans were submitted to the Council, reducing the size of the raised patio area so that it could not be used as a balcony. It would now only protrude slightly beyond the depth of the bifold doors when opened. Therefore, the area of raised decking would no longer detrimentally impact the privacy amenity of the neighbours at Tree Tops, or any of the other direct neighbours.

Notably, the site sits on a higher ground level than the neighbouring dwelling at No. 4 Kent Drive. Despite the change in levels, the proposed extensions would be offset from the rear wall of No. 4. Due to the northerly location of the proposed extensions to No. 4, no overshadowing would occur over the rear windows or garden of this neighbour resulting from the East to West sunlight trajectory. Therefore, it is evident that there would be no impact on the light amenity of No. 4. Furthermore, the proposed first storey side extension would sit at an oblique angle to the rear elevation of No. 4. Resultingly, the rear windows of No. 4 would not be directly looking at a first storey extension and the extension would not be considered to have an overbearing impact. A small ground floor window would be positioned on the side elevation to replace two larger windows and a glazed door. This reduction in glazing would be a betterment for the privacy amenity of the neighbours at 4 Kent Drive. Moreover, this window would serve a utility room, which is not considered a primary, habitable room of a dwelling.

Whilst the rear curtilage of the site adjoins the rear curtilages of No. 2 Kent Drive and Kerrilyn, Platts Avenue, these neighbours are located a substantial enough distance from the proposed extensions to mitigate any overbearing or overshadowing impact which could have otherwise occurred as a result of the proposed extensions. The proposed extensions would be located over 13 metres away from No. 2 and Kerrilyn and with no direct visibility between windows.

There would be a new set of bi-fold doors, window, three roof lights and first storey window on the rear elevation of the proposed extensions which would face towards the rear curtilages of the neighbours at No. 2 and Kerrilyn. Whilst these windows would be located approximately 12 metres from the closest elevations of these neighbours, these neighbours sit at oblique angles from the site, meaning that there would be no direct overlooking into their rear windows. Whilst the new first storey rear window could lead to a degree of overlooking into the rear garden of No. 2 and Kerrilyn, this is typical in the suburban type of environment which the site sits amongst. Furthermore, this window would serve a bathroom, which is not considered to be a primary, habitable room of a dwelling. In order to ensure that the privacy amenity of the neighbours at No. 2 and Kerrilyn would be protected, it shall be conditioned that this first storey window shall be obscure glazed. Therefore, the privacy amenity of No. 2 and Kerrilyn would not be detrimentally impacted by the new fenestration.

Whilst No. 6 St Georges Avenue does not immediately adjoin the site, the Council have considered amenity implications on this nearby neighbouring dwelling as a result of the erection of the proposed extensions. The distance between the proposed extensions and the closest elevation of No. 6 St Georges Avenue would be approximately 22 metres, which is substantial enough to comply with the spatial standards set out in the Space About Dwellings SPD, regardless of the addition of the first storey rear window. Thus, the light and privacy amenity impact of No. 6 St Georges Avenue would not be adversely impacted.

One public comment has been received from the neighbours across the road from the site. This neighbour has made the point that if, by some means the roof line of the proposed extension could be lowered by approximately half a metre, this would lessen the impact on surrounding properties, reduce their loss of light and improve the aesthetic appearance of the development. Notably, the dwellings across the road from the site sit on a higher ground level than the site. The proposed first storey side extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling, being set down from the height and back from the principal elevation. For these reasons combined, the proposed extension would not impact the light amenity of the neighbours across the road any more than the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extension is considered to be well designed, in accordance with the Council's Design Guide SPD.

### **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 should 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.

Staffordshire County Council Highways have commented to say that they have no objections to the proposed extension. The proposed development would result in the addition of a fourth bedroom to the dwelling. Therefore, three off-highway parking spaces would be required to meet the Parking Standards set out within the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan.

Based on the proposed plans submitted, the Highway Authority are satisfied that the driveway to the front of the dwelling is capable of accommodating three vehicles. The Highway Authority have requested that a condition be added to the decision notice to stipulate that the development shall not be brought into use until the parking area has been provided in accordance with the approved plan and surfaced in tarmac or another sustainably drained material. The parking arrangement shall thereafter be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

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

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION:      APPROVE**

**Case Officer: Hannah Varley**

**Recommendation Date: 25/06/2026**

X 

---

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

**On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council**