



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/25/3369974

10 Spinney Close, Endon, Staffordshire ST9 9BP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ashley Mountford against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
 - The application Ref is SMD/2025/0244.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to front & side elevations and single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, located towards the end of a residential cul-de-sac within the village of Endon. The street scene is predominantly characterised by two storey detached houses, as well as detached bungalows. The houses are primarily set within spacious plots arranged along the road frontage, with bungalows located at the head of the cul-de-sac, adjacent to the appeal site.
4. Dwellings along the road largely retain their original appearance, which maintains uniformity within the street scene. However, there are a small number of properties that have had two-storey side extensions, with a forward projection. Including the neighbouring property, 8 Spinney Close (No 8).
5. The extension to No 8 is large but due to its position and acceptable form and appearance, it is a sympathetic addition to the property, adding visual interest to the front elevation. The position of No 8, set within a linear row of two storey detached dwellings, also ensures that the dwelling is not overly dominant or stark within the street scene.
6. In contrast, the proposed two-storey side extension would be built up close to the boundary with the neighbouring bungalow, reducing the gap between the two properties. With its forward projection and two storey height, the side extension would be a noticeable addition to the property. In combination with the two-storey front extension, the resultant dwelling would have a large, commanding appearance. Indeed, the size and position of the two projecting gable features

would be prominent, overwhelming the front elevation. Thus, the proposals would not be subordinate additions to the property. As a consequence, the side and central extension would detract from the character of the original dwelling and those within the immediate street scene.

7. The commanding appearance of the resultant dwelling would be exacerbated by its juxtaposition next to the modest bungalows at the head of the cul-de-sac, being significantly larger than those properties. As such, the proposed development would be stark and incongruous within this part of the street scene.
8. Facing materials would largely match the original dwelling and render could be introduced to add visual interest. Even so, the proposal does not represent a contemporary design and while there are other examples of two storey side extensions nearby, they are not comparable designs to the appeal scheme. Also, other than No 8, those other examples are a noticeable distance from the appeal property, set within a different site context and street scene.
9. The Council has not raised concerns with the single storey extension at the rear. Due to its size and appearance, as well as its location on the rear elevation, I am also satisfied that the design of that element of the scheme would not be harmful.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with the design aims of Policy DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan, which amongst other things, requires development to be of high-quality design which respects the site and surroundings, and adds value to the local area.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge the appellants frustrations with regard to the Council's handling of the planning application. Nevertheless, I have considered the proposed development on its planning merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR