

[REDACTED]

From: Reuben Berriman
Sent: 28 August 2026 10:10
To: Planning (SMDC)
Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO REVISED PLANS Planning Application SMD/2026/0217

[REDACTED]

Hi,

Please can this objection be added to the file.

Many thanks,

Reuben Berriman Planning Officer

(He/Him)

Development Services

High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council

[REDACTED] Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#)

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)



From: Stacey Nelson
Sent: 27 August 2026 21:53
To: Reuben Berriman
Subject: OBJECTION TO REVISED PLANS Planning Application SMD/2026/0217

Hi Reuben,

Please can I ask you confirm receipt of the following objection.

Kind regards.

OBJECTION TO REVISED PLANS
Planning Application SMD/2026/0217
19 Brookfield Avenue, Endon, Staffordshire, ST9 9ED
From:
Occupier of 23 Brookfield Avenue
Endon
ST9 9ED

Dear Planning Officer,

I previously submitted an objection to planning application SMD/2026/0217 concerning the proposed two-storey rear extension at 19 Brookfield Avenue.

I have now reviewed the revised plans and wish to confirm that I continue to object to the application.

I acknowledge that the revised proposal has been reduced compared with the original submission, particularly in respect of the first-floor projection. However, having considered the revised drawings, I do not believe that the amendments adequately address the fundamental planning concerns raised in my original objection.

I would ask the Council to consider the following matters.

1. Cumulative development of the property

A particularly important consideration is the planning history of No. 19.

The property has already been extended under planning application SMD/2022/0048. The drawings from before that extension show the substantially smaller original dwelling.

The current application would therefore constitute a further significant enlargement of an already extended property.

I ask the Council to assess the current proposal in the context of the original dwelling, the development approved under SMD/2022/0048 and the further extension now proposed under SMD/2026/0217.

In my view, considering only the dimensions of the latest extension without considering the cumulative effect of successive extensions would fail to properly assess the overall scale and intensity of development on this plot.

The combined effect would be a substantially larger dwelling with significantly more built form than the original property, together with a corresponding reduction in the openness and garden space surrounding it.

This is an important consideration when determining whether the latest proposal represents an appropriate scale of development.

2. The revised proposal remains substantial

I recognise that the revised scheme is smaller than the original proposal.

However, it remains a two-storey rear extension with a substantial ground-floor projection and additional first-floor accommodation.

The reduction in size does not fundamentally alter the nature of the development.

The Council should therefore assess whether the revised extension itself, when added to the existing extended property, remains appropriate in terms of its scale, massing, footprint and relationship with the original dwelling.

I remain of the view that it does not.

3. Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide – subordinate extensions

The Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide SPD is particularly relevant.

The Council's guidance states that extensions should harmonise with the parent building and respect the dominance of the original building, being subordinate to it in terms of size and massing. It also recognises that a building can reach a point beyond which further extension would adversely affect its character.

This is especially relevant here because No. 19 has already been extended under SMD/2022/0048.

The latest proposal should therefore not be viewed as a standalone modest extension to the original house. It would be a further substantial addition to an already enlarged dwelling.

In my view, the cumulative development is beginning to move beyond what can reasonably be regarded as a subordinate extension to the original dwelling.

I therefore ask the Council to give particular consideration to the Design Guide's guidance on the size, massing and cumulative effect of extensions.

4. Overdevelopment of the plot

The proposed extension would occupy a significant additional area of the rear garden. When this is considered alongside the existing extension, the amount of built development on the plot would be substantially increased.

This would reduce the balance between the dwelling and its garden and would result in a more intensive form of development than is characteristic of the surrounding properties.

I remain concerned that the proposal therefore represents overdevelopment of the plot.

The issue is not simply whether some garden space remains, but whether the resulting relationship between the dwelling, built footprint and remaining garden is appropriate for this particular site.

5. Character and appearance of Brookfield Avenue

The existing character of Brookfield Avenue includes houses set within gardens which provide a degree of openness between properties.

The successive enlargement of No. 19 would materially alter that relationship.

The current proposal would add further substantial built form to the rear of a property which has already been enlarged.

I am concerned that permitting this further extension would contribute to the gradual erosion of the established spacious character of the avenue.

There is also a concern that approval could establish a precedent for similarly substantial extensions to other properties, resulting in a cumulative change to the character of the street.

6. Residential amenity

I remain concerned about the effect of the proposed development on residential amenity.

Policy DC1 – Design Considerations is directly relevant. The policy requires development to respect its surroundings and protect residential amenity, including matters such as daylight, sunlight, overbearing visual impact, outlook and privacy.

The revised proposal would still introduce a substantial amount of additional built mass at the rear of No. 19.

This has the potential to:

increase the sense of enclosure;

alter the existing outlook from neighbouring properties and gardens;

create a more substantial built presence within the rear garden;

affect the perception of openness; and

introduce additional opportunities for overlooking through first-floor accommodation and windows.

Although No. 23 is not immediately adjoining No. 19, it is within the same immediate residential environment. I therefore ask that the wider visual and cumulative effect of the development is properly considered.

7. Privacy and overlooking

The revised plans retain first-floor accommodation within the proposed rear extension.

I remain concerned about the potential for the resulting first-floor windows to create additional overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

The Council should assess the actual relationship between the proposed windows and surrounding properties and gardens, including any potential direct or oblique views.

If the Council considers that there would be no unacceptable effect on privacy, I would ask that this conclusion is clearly explained in the officer's assessment.

8. Design and national planning policy

The Council's current Design Guide is an adopted supplementary planning document and is used to assist in determining planning applications.

The current National Planning Policy Framework also places significant emphasis on good design, local character, appropriate development and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The national approach therefore reinforces the requirement to consider whether the proposal is appropriate for its context rather than simply whether the extension can physically fit on the plot. In my view, the cumulative enlargement of No. 19 needs to be considered carefully against these principles.

9. My original objections remain relevant

My original objection raised concerns regarding:

the scale and depth of the extension;

overbearing impact;

loss of outlook;

increased enclosure;

potential loss of daylight and sunlight;

potential overlooking and loss of privacy;

overdevelopment of the plot; and

harm to the established character of Brookfield Avenue.

Having considered the revised drawings, I believe these concerns remain relevant.

I acknowledge and recognise the reduction in the size of the revised scheme. However, the fundamental issue remains that No. 19 has already been substantially extended and the current proposal would add a further substantial two-storey extension.

The reduction therefore does not, in my view, resolve the cumulative planning concerns.

Conclusion

I respectfully ask Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to consider application SMD/2026/0217 in the context of the full planning history and existing built form of No. 19, including planning application SMD/2022/0048.

The original plans demonstrate the substantially smaller form of the dwelling before the earlier extension. The current proposal would represent a further significant enlargement.

While I acknowledge that the revised proposal has been reduced from the original application, I do not consider that the revised scheme goes far enough to overcome the concerns regarding:

cumulative development;

scale and massing;

overdevelopment of the plot;

the subordinate relationship to the original dwelling;

loss of openness;

impact on the character of Brookfield Avenue; and

residential amenity, including outlook, enclosure and privacy.

I therefore continue to object to planning application SMD/2026/0217 and respectfully request that planning permission is refused.

I also ask that my original objection is retained and considered alongside this objection to the revised plans.

Yours faithfully,
Miss Stacey Nelson
23 Brookfield Avenue
Endon
ST9 9ED

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
