

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2026/0178
Valid 16/04/2026

75 RUDYARD ROAD
BIDDULPH MOOR

**PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR
EXTENSION TO BEDROOM
WITH ALTERATIONS TO
EXISTING ROOF, PROPOSED
BALCONY AND ALTERATIONS
TO EXTERNAL WALL
FINISHES**

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on Green Belt
- Impact on Character and Appearance
- Impact on Amenity of neighbours

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

Semi-detached stone rural cottage dating from the late 19th century. The dwelling is on a broadly L shaped footprint with a gabled two storey outrigger at the rear which is shared with the adjoining property.

The dwelling has already been extended with a two-storey side extension, granted planning permission in 2007, that extends from the side gable of the original dwelling with a slimmer gable addition that sits subordinately against the broader size and form of the original dwelling. At ground floor, the extensions footprint is broader where it extends to the rear with a single storey flat roof section that also provides a roof terrace in the corner alcove recess against the side of the original dwelling.

Since 2007 the dwelling's curtilage has been increased at the side and rear. Aerial photographs demonstrate that current curtilage arrangements have been in place for at least 10 years.

More recently, without planning permission, pebble render had been replaced on the extensions side and rear elevations with smooth white render sections and stone slate effect tile cladding.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the further enlargement of the original dwelling with the introduction of a first floor addition that would extend from the side wall of the original dwelling and be built over an existing flat roof section at the rear.

The applicant was not encouraged or invited to amend their proposal, however, a set of revised plans were submitted on the 29th June and it was confirmed that these should be the plans under consideration at the time of determination.

Rather than broadening the width of the existing first floor gable on the extended side elevation, the revised proposal is to retain the existing gable, as per existing approval, and instead twin gables would extend from the rear of the side extension out over the existing flat roof.

The side and rear of the extension would be smooth white render (the use of tile cladding at the rear has been omitted).

A cantilevered balcony would overhang and extend out from the rear elevation at first floor level. Revisions have reduced the depth to which it would project by 800mm to just 1000mm in total (to allow first floor French windows to open) and introduced an opaque screen panel 1800mm high to the flanking side of the balcony.

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

SMDC Design Guide 2018 SPD

Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan

DES1 Design considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

07/01309/FUL Demolition of garage and erection of two storey dwelling.

APPROVED.

SMD/2025/0495 COLP Proposed porch, garage and rear extension. Certificate Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 16th June 2026

Neighbour consultation period ends: 16th June 2026

Press Advert: N/A

Biddulph Town Council

No adverse comments subject to compliance with Green Belt regs and compliance with size requirements.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Acceptance. The proposal would not remove parking spaces or increase the required parking spaces. There would be no breach of the Council's parking standards.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact on Green Belt

The house is in the Green Belt where all development is inappropriate and, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt unless it is provided for by one of the exceptions that appear on the closed lists at Chapter 13 of the NPPF. Substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green and planning permission should not be granted unless there are other considerations, amounting to very special circumstances, that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harms that would result from the development.

One such exception provides for the extension or alteration of a building provided it does not result in a disproportionate size increase over and above that of the 'original' building.

For the purposes of the NPPF original building means a building as it existed in 1948 or if built after that date as it was originally built and intended.

In this case, the house and original building is a late 19th C semi-detached stone cottage that would have been built with an outhouse toilet. A simple two up/two down cottage built on a broad L shaped footprint of 38sqm, with a two-storey outrigger that formed half of a central rear projecting gable that is shared with the adjoining neighbour. The first-floor area mirrored and covered the ground floor area exactly.

The dwelling has already been extended with additions and alterations made after 1948. Initially, a flat roof garage was added to the slim area of curtilage to the side of the dwelling. Under a planning permission granted in 2007, the flat roof garage was replaced with a two-storey side extension that included an integral garage space at ground floor (later converted into living/dining space opened to the kitchen) and a second bedroom at first floor. The ground floor footprint was increased, with the two-storey side extension and the section of single storey flat roof at rear, by 28sqm to a total area of 66sqm (a near doubling effect with a percentage increase of some 74%). At first floor, the bedroom added some 20sqm to the first-floor area, a 53% increase to first floor area.

Additionally, with the extension of the dwelling's curtilage, without planning permission but apparently now lawful, pushing into the field at the side and rear, a row of large sheds has been erected to the side of the dwelling. The applicant has also indicated an intent, with the submission of an application for certificate of lawfulness for proposed development, to replace the sheds with a detached flat roof garage building and to add a single storey rear that would extend from the original rear wall of the existing gable outrigger.

Alterations and extensions that have already been carried out have already resulted in a disproportionate size increase over and above that of the size of the original building. Some concession and leniency might have been invoked because the original building was so small and, as a dwelling, limited in space and facilities. Available first floor bed space would have been curtailed with the introduction of an integral bathroom in the early 20th C.

With extension, the existing building is now an amply sized two-bedroom dwelling with kitchen, dining and lounge space on the ground floor and two small double bedrooms and a family bathroom at first floor.

The proposed addition would not increase the overall footprint of the building. However, at first floor it would add area and volume taking first floor area to 28sqm. The introduction of additional mass and volume would result in notable and apparent size increase from roadside vantage to the southwest and side of the house. Overall, the proposed development would result in, and compound, disproportionate size increase over and above that of the original dwelling. The size increase would be apparent both spatially and visually.

The proposed development would not be provided for by the exceptions at Chapter 13 of the NPPF. It would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt for the purposes of the NPPF.

The applicant was expecting the authority to consider the lawful development that they could carry out as permitted development (a small single storey rear extension and a detached garage) as a 'fall back' position that should tip the balance in favour of the application proposal. However, these developments would be at ground floor - concealed at the rear and a replacement for existing sheds on the site. In those regards the permitted development would, overall, have a much lesser impact than the addition of first floor mass and width on an exposed and prominent aspect of the building.

Moreover, the permitted development would not provide a relatable alternative to the application development; it is simply other development that the applicant could carry out regardless. The applicant's ability to carry out other forms of development, as permitted development, is not a consideration or circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and the other harms that would result from the development that are discussed below.

Design and Impact on Character and Appearance

Local Plan design policy DC1 requires that all development shall be well designed and reinforce local distinctiveness by positively contributing to and complementing the character of the area in line with the Council's Design Guide SPD. In particular, new development should be of a high quality and add value to the local area, incorporating creativity, detailing and materials appropriate to the character of the area. Policy DES1 of the Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan is reflective and supportive of those requirements.

The NPPF says that LPAs should ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme, for example, changes to materials (para 141).

From the side of the dwelling to the southwest, the first storey section of the existing extension's side gable, has slim narrow proportions against the wider/broader side gable of the original stone dwelling. It is stepped well back from the front of the original cottage and the staggered ridge lines give impression that the addition is of a

subordinate height. Overall, it is clear that the existing extension is a latter subordinate addition that respects the form and dominance of the original dwelling. The terms of the 2007 planning permission approved the use of a pebble render to the side elevation and that was applied successfully with the pebble mix picking up and reflecting the mix of pinks, browns, greys and sand, that are apparent in the gritstone of the original cottage.

More, recently without planning permission, the applicant has treated this exposed side elevation with a smooth off-white render at ground floor and a light grey slate/stone slip style tile cladding at first floor. This tile cladding does not compliment or relate well to the materials of the original dwelling, and it does not relate to any vernacular reference point in the locality. It is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is to use smooth white render to the side elevation at first floor and, now with the revision, remove the tile cladding at the rear and use smooth white render to the rear too. The smooth white render at such an expanse and extent on an exposed and prominent elevation, so that it would become a dominant and primary facing material to the side of the dwelling, would be at odds with the original stone facing material and the local vernacular. Variations such as render sections are limited to feature or accent elements.

The proposed first floor extension would be constructed above the flat roof section at the rear. The slim, subordinate, profile and width of the gable extension at the side of the original dwelling would be broadened and added to at first floor with the side flank wall of a rear projecting gable. From the side of the dwelling that greater mass and width profile at first floor would be exposed and prominent, against the original dwelling, total additions would become dominant and overbearing against the elevation of the original dwelling. The existing side extension would no longer retain a sense of subordination. This would relate poorly to the form and character of the host dwelling and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

At the rear, all of the original shape and arrangement of the original dwelling, set out with the L shape footprint, would be squared out with the infill of the first-floor recess. The rear elevation would become a very wide flat faced elevation presenting a discordant and incoherent arrangement of gable roof peaks of varied shapes and sizes.

Moreover, at the rear, the introduction of a cantilevered balcony with an 1800mm high opaque glass screen on its flanking side, would result in an odd form of development that would appear intrusive and relate poorly to the building form of the original dwelling.

In these regards there would be conflict with policy DC1 of the SMDC Local Plan, DES1 of the Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan, the SMDC Design Guide and the terms of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbour's Amenity

Local Plan Policy DC1 requires that development protects the amenity of the area, including creation of healthy active environments and residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, visual impact, sunlight, outlook, privacy, soft landscaping as well as noise, odour and light pollution.

The proposal includes the provision of an overhanging cantilevered balcony that would extend from and beyond the rear elevation. The cottage, however, is a small semi-detached cottage. The balcony would be close to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property, and it would provide an unacceptable height vantage from which the neighbour's garden could be overlooked at the expense of their privacy and enjoyment of their garden.

The revised plan has reduced the depth and projection of the proposed balcony by 800mm to be no more than 1000mm. It also proposes the introduction of an opaque glazing screen to a height of 1800mm on the flank side of the balcony.

The external balcony area would provide an overt height vantage over the garden at the adjacent property at 77 Rudyard Road that would project beyond the existing rear elevation. Despite the introduction of an opaque glass panel to the side of the balcony and the reduction its depth, residents stood on, or using, the external balcony would be suspended beyond the edge of the building and loom above an area of garden at the neighbour's property. The impact would, to the neighbour, feel and appear intrusive and result in a perception that they are overlooked from close quarters. The development, therefore, would, in these regards, have an unacceptable impact on the neighbour's amenity and their enjoyment of the outdoor space.

In these regards, the development would have an unacceptable impact on the neighbour's amenity and there would be significant conflict with policy DC1 of the SMDC Local Plan.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

An unacceptable form of householder development that would result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt, dominate and relate poorly to the form and character of the original dwelling, and adversely impact the amenity of the adjacent neighbour. There would be conflict with policies SS10 and DC1 of the SMDC Local Plan, DES1 of the Biddulph Neighbourhood Plan, the terms of the SMDC Design Guide, and the terms of the NPPF.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : REFUSE

Case Officer: Ben Hurst

Recommendation Date: 03/07/2026

X *J Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council