

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2026/0185
Valid 20/04/2026

1
BLUESTONE COTTAGE
HOUGH HILL
BROWN EDGE

PROPOSED PART
DEMOLITION, EXTENSION
AND ALTERATIONS TO
CONSTRUCT REPLACEMENT
TWO STOREY
KITCHEN/BEDROOM AND
DETACHED GARAGE

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Whether the proposal comprises an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- Design
- Amenity
- Highway Safety
- Public Rights of Way

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The proposed site comprises a semi-detached stone, render and tile dwellinghouse and its associated curtilage, situated in the Brown Edge and Endon ward. Additionally, the proposed site is on Green Belt land, where development is more restricted. No. 2 Bluestone Cottage, Hough Hill (the adjoining neighbour) and its associated curtilage is situated to the East and South of the site. The North-Eastern side curtilage of the site adjoins a plot of open, Green Belt land; the Brown Edge 70 Right of Way runs parallel to the Northern site curtilage through this land. The Hough Hill highway runs adjacent to the proposed site on the West.

PROPOSAL

The proposed development comprises of the part demolition, extension and alterations to construct a replacement two storey kitchen/ bedroom and detached garage. The proposed extension would accommodate a larger kitchen, porch / utility room and W/C on the ground floor and an additional bedroom on the first storey (whilst one room is labelled as a study, it could easily be changed to a bedroom). The proposed extension and replacement garage would be constructed from materials including red multi rustic facing brickwork, plain clay tiles, UPVC and anthracite composite.

Notably, the proposed scheme is an amended version of the initially proposed scheme. Amendments to the initially proposed scheme were requested due to concerns regarding the design of the proposed extension.

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
SS9 Smaller Villages Areas Strategy
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/2006/1033 – Implement store. Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 28/05/2026
Neighbour consultation period ends: 27/05/2026
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

One public comment of support has been received from the neighbours at No. 2 Bluestone Cottage, as follows:

We fully support the development. The house is in a bad state of repair. We feel this had a negative impact on our property. It will certainly make a difference.

Town / Parish Comments

No comments have been received from Brown Edge Parish Council.

Staffordshire County Council Highways

The proposal is to construct a replacement 2 storey extension. The ground floor will have a kitchen, porch/utility, and WC and on the 1st floor an ensuite to the main bedroom, a family bathroom and bedroom. The current bedroom 2 will be reconfigured to make way for a central stairway. A detached garage is also proposed.

Parking:

Staffordshire Moorlands Parking Standards state: detached/semi-detached property of up to 3 bedrooms requires 2 spaces (2.4m x 4.8m) each space. The Parking Standards state the minimum internal dimensions for a single garage should be 3m wide by 6m long.

The original bedroom, proposed as a study, can easily be converted back into a bedroom, increasing the number of bedrooms within the property from 2 to 3.

The property will have 3 bedrooms, a garage and sufficient space on the driveway for parking 1 vehicle. The single garage with internal measurements of 3m wide by 6.3m long exceeds the minimum internal dimensions stated in the Parking Standards. A total of 2 parking spaces including the garage are provided.

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/2026/0185) subject to the following conditions.

Staffordshire County Council Rights of Way

The Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way for Staffordshire shows a public right of way crossing the application site. From the submitted information, it appears it will be directly impacted by the proposed development although the right of way has not been acknowledged by the applicant.

Public right of way Footpath No. 70 Brown Edge runs across the application site close to the northern extent of the proposed alterations. The centre line of the footpath is estimated as being with 1.5m of the northern most wall of the existing garage.

NPPF 104. states that: Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

It would be preferable that this route is diverted in order to fulfil the aims of the application. Failure to do so will most probably lead to the obstructing of this public

right of way. The granting of planning permission does not constitute authority for any interference with the public right of way and associated items - or its obstruction (temporary or permanent) by buildings or scaffolding. The term obstruction, in this context, also applies to items such as gates or stiles which are regarded as licenced obstructions which must be sanctioned by the highways authority.

Users of the path must be able to always exercise their public rights safely and the path reinstated if any damage to the surface occurs as a result of the proposed development.

As the public right of way should be diverted as part of this proposal, the developer must apply to your council under section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to divert the public rights of way to allow the development to commence. For further information the applicant must read section 7 of DEFRA's Rights of Way Circular (1/09). It is also strongly suggested, in order to avoid unwanted complications, that guidance should be sought from Staffordshire County Council as Highways Authority, regarding the exact position of the Public Right of Way shown on the Definitive Map.

Should this planning application be approved and any right of way require a temporary diversion, please see the County Council website for guidance and an application form.

Staffordshire County Council has not received any application to add to or modify the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way in that vicinity. The possibility of the existence of a currently unrecognised public right of way, makes it advisable that the applicant pursue further enquiries and seek legal advice regarding any visible route affecting the land, or the apparent exercise of a right of way by members of the public.

Peak and Northern Footpaths Society

We note that the PROW Brown Edge 70 runs close to the site.

Use of the PROW, and the safety of users must not be affected by the development, nor during the work taking place.

This comment is made on behalf of Peak and Northern Footpaths Society, a registered charity which exists to protect and improve public rights of way for use by walkers.

Nothing in this response should be taken to imply the Society's support for the development.

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 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 more limited focus on future growth is to be directed to rural areas, including the outskirts of Brown Edge. 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”.

The proposed extensions combined would equate to an increase in volume of

approximately 32%. As the extensions to the property only just exceed the 30% guideline, the Council do not consider that this will result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.

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.

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.”*

Paragraph 5.5 of 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.”*

Notably, the proposed extension would be highly visible and prominent amongst the street scene due to the largely open boundary frontage. It would be located within close proximity to the curtilage boundary of the dwelling, hard up to the public highway. The existing single and two storey rear outrigger is considered to be proportionate to the dwelling; it is set inwards on both sides and set down from the height of the dwelling.

Initially, the proposed two extension did not have a subordinate relationship with the host dwelling. It was not set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling, had a deeper depth than the host dwelling and had a width which occupied over half of the rear elevation. Thus, the proposed extension would have appeared disproportionate to the parent dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extension appeared to have an asymmetrical gable – the eaves on one side dropped lower than eaves of the host dwelling and the other side of the extension. This design of gable end would have appeared visually awkward against the backdrop of the host dwelling.

Whilst the windows on the host dwelling and its adjoining neighbour are vertically emphasised, the initially proposed extension incorporated horizontal, squat windows. Moreover, whilst the windows on the existing dwelling have heads and cills, the windows on the initially proposed extension did not have them. Therefore, the initially proposed windows were considered uncharacteristic of the windows of the host dwelling.

For these reasons combined, the initially proposed extension was not considered to be appropriate in its design, completely conflicting with the Council's Design Guide SPD.

Since these issues were raised with the applicants, revised plans were submitted to the Council. Although part of the proposed extension would continue to be two storey, the proposed extension would reflect the style of the existing building in terms of the gable style roof to compliment the pitched roof of the host dwellinghouse. The gable end of the proposed two storey extension would no longer be asymmetrical, having a neater appearance against the backdrop of the host dwelling. The maximum height of the proposed extension would now 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, whilst the proposed two storey extension would be located on a prominent elevation, it would be reduced in its width so that it would be no wider than the existing two storey extension. It would be well designed, in that it would no longer occupy the majority of the rear elevation, appearing proportionate to the host dwelling.

Part of the proposed extension would be single storey, therefore its maximum height 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 have a subservient relationship with the parent dwelling. The single storey elements of the extension would have simple lean to rooves, which would complement the roof of the host dwelling.

Although the amended scheme represents a significant improvement to the initially proposed scheme, the depth of the proposed extension would still compete with the depth of the host dwelling. Whilst the depth of the proposed extension has been reduced, it remains comparable to that of the main dwelling; the main dwelling has depth of approximately 4.74 metres and the proposed extension would have a depth of approximately 4.38 metres. Notably, the site is relatively isolated in its location; it does not sit within a context of a surrounding street scene. Thus, there is no specific character in the area which the proposed extension should adhere to. Furthermore, the proposed replacement two storey element of the extension would sit over the same footprint as the existing outrigger, meaning that it would not have a larger depth than what is already there. In addition to these points, the adjoining neighbouring dwelling at No. 2 Bluestone Cottage, Hough Hill also has a two storey extension on the equivalent elevation, which has a depth over half the depth of the host dwelling. The neighbours' two storey extension has a depth of approximately 3.26 metres whilst the host dwelling has a depth of 4.74 metres. The proposed extension would be similar to the neighbours' extension, in that they both compete with the proportions of the host dwelling.

The revised plans show the windows on the proposed extension to have been altered so that they would be vertically emphasised. Furthermore, heads and cills have been added to the majority of the proposed windows to reflect the heads and cills on the windows of the host dwelling.

Paragraph 5.10 of the Council's Design Guide SPD states that garages need to be *"designed and built in sympathy with the properties they serve. Materials and roof pitch should generally match those of the parent building."*

The proposed replacement garage would be simple in its design, similarly to the existing garage outbuilding at the site. It would continue to be significantly set down from the height of the host dwelling, thus remaining subservient to the host dwelling. Moreover, it would have a simple pitched roof to reflect the character of the host dwelling and existing garage.

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."*

Paragraph 7.27 continues *"New materials need to respect the building and its setting. Occasionally, high quality modern materials may be used as substitutes or replacements for traditional materials in exceptional circumstances where appropriate to the design or setting, provided they harmonise well."*

Materials used in the construction of the proposed extension and replacement garage would not all match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is constructed from stone, render and plain tiles. Red multi rustic facing brickwork, plain clay tiles, UPVC and anthracite composite would be used in the construction of the proposed extension and replacement garage. Whilst there is no presence of brick on the host dwelling, the adjoining neighbouring dwelling has a two storey extension with brick elevations. Therefore, a brick constructed extension and detached garage would be considered acceptable in this instance, as they would pick up on the brick extension at the neighbouring dwelling. Furthermore, brick is a more traditional material used in the construction of buildings in the Staffordshire Moorlands, therefore a brick extension and garage would arguably lead to an improvement to the appearance of the host dwelling. Thus, the proposed materials would not be considered to detract from the character of the original dwelling.

The proposal would not strictly accord with the provisions of local plan policy DC1, the Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD and section 12 of the NPPF, in that its depth would compete with the depth of the host dwelling. Whilst this would lead to a visually harmful addition, there would not be enough harm to warrant a refusal of the application, as the revised scheme exhibits an extension which is acceptable in all other design considerations. Thus, whilst the proposed extension fails to wholly comply with the Council's Design Guide SPD, it is considered acceptable on balance in this instance for the reasons articulated above.

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. 2 Bluestone Cottage, Hough Hill (the adjoining neighbour) and its associated curtilage to the East and South. Assessment of amenity impact will therefore be required on the direct neighbouring dwellinghouse to the side of the site.

Due to the East to West sunlight trajectory, the proposed two storey extension could cause overshadowing on the neighbours at No. 2 Bluestone Cottage, Hough Hill during the afternoon hours of the day. Notably, the closest elevation of the neighbouring dwelling which would be impacted by the proposed extension and replacement garage is the rear elevation of a two storey extension which has been constructed. The rear elevation and side elevation (which faces towards the site) of the neighbours' extension are completely blank, there is no fenestration on either of these elevations. Thus, there are no windows which could be impacted by the proposed extension and replacement garage. Regardless, based on assessment of the site plans submitted, there would be no breach of the 45 degree rule if there were any windows on this rear elevation. Furthermore, the garage is located to the north of this property. Therefore, the proposed development would not impact the light amenity of the neighbours at No. 2 Bluestone Cottage, by virtue of overshadowing or overbearing impact.

There would be a door and a window on the ground floor of the proposed extension which would face towards No. 2 Bluestone Cottage. The door would serve a porch / utility room and the window would serve a W/C. Additionally, a door would be incorporated into the side elevation of the proposed replacement garage which would face towards the neighbours at No. 2 Bluestone Cottage. Notably, neither a porch, utility room, W/C or garage are classed as primary, habitable rooms, and therefore this fenestration would not be considered to lead to any detrimental overlooking on these neighbours. Regardless, the proposed new fenestration would only look towards the blank rear elevation of No. 2 Bluestone Cottage; no overlooking into any windows or private amenity space belonging to this neighbour would occur. The occupier of the property has written in support of the application. Moreover, ground floor fenestration can rely on a permitted development fallback position under Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

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.

Staffordshire County Council Highways have commented to say that they have no objections to the proposed extension. The original bedroom, proposed as a study, could easily be converted back into a bedroom, therefore it is considered that the

number of bedrooms in the property would increase from two to three. Regardless of the increase in bedrooms in the dwelling, two off-highway parking spaces would continue to 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 and garage outbuilding in the curtilage of the dwelling are capable of accommodating two vehicles. The Highway Authority have requested that a condition be added to the decision notice to stipulate that the parking area identified on the approved plan Drawing No. FAD-85-P-05 B shall be retained unobstructed as parking for the life of the development. Another condition shall be added to the decision notice to state that the garage indicated on the approved plan Drawing No. FAD-85-P-03A shall be retained for the parking of motor vehicles and cycles and shall at no time be converted to living accommodation without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

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

Public Rights of Way

The proposed development would impact a Public Right of Way, namely the Brown Edge 70 Right of Way. Therefore, Staffordshire County Council Rights of Way, the Peak and Northern Footpaths Society and the Ramblers Association have been consulted on the application.

Notably, the existing garage already encroaches onto the definitive line of the Right of Way. On completion of a site visit, it looks as though the footpath has been informally diverted around the garage to the North.

The Definitive Map & Spatial Information, Environment and Countryside Officer at Staffordshire County Council has advised that the proposed development is likely to further obstruct the public right of way. Therefore a permanent diversion will need to be applied for to ensure that this right of way will remain in place in the future. It has been identified from a site visit that there would be scope to take the footpath around the curtilage of the property, without moving it too far from its existing location. Therefore, it is not considered that impact on the public right of way would be a reason to warrant a refusal of the application.

The Peak and Northern Footpaths Society have commented that use of the Public Right of Way and the safety of users must not be affected by the development, nor during the work taking place. Submission of an application to divert the Public Right of Way will ensure that use of an appropriate diversion of the Right of Way and safety of users shall be sustained.

An informative shall be included on the decision notice to specify that the applicants need to apply for a footpath diversion order under The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In consideration of all of the above, the application is recommended for approval on balance. 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 on balance, subject to compliance with all conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Case Officer: Hannah Varley

Recommendation Date: 10/07/2026

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council