DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2016/0637	**RED LION INN**	**PROPOSED EXTENSION TO**
Valid 24/10/2016	**BOUNDARY ROAD**	**EXISTING DINING ROOM.**
	BOUNDARY	
		(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Green Belt
- Design
- Amenity
- Highways

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The Red Lion at Boundary is a two storey detached building with its two storey front (westerly) elevation built directly on to the roadside edge. The two storey part of the building was present at least by the date of the 1887 OS map. There is a car park of more recent date to the north of the building bounded by a laurel hedge behind the highway verge. There is a Post Box in the verge against the hedge. There is a single storey building off the north elevation which appears originally to have been a separate building now to some extent connected.

Off the south gable of the building is a single storey extension approved under permission SMD/1999/0193 set back from the road and largely concealed behind the roadside embankment. This is the existing dining room of the current application. It is well recessed by 2.9m relative to the front elevation line of the original building.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is to extend the dining room forwards to the road front and flush with the front elevation line of the original building. The design would involve the introduction of a gable to face the road front with a door against the gable end of the original building and a row of three windows. A 0.9m 'patio' is proposed along the edge of the new westerly elevation and a bin store is proposed open to the roadside of the southern end. The proposal would involve the complete removal of the existing c.1.5m high grassy embankment to the roadside.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted 2014)

S01 Spatial Objectives
SS1 Development Principles
SS1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
SS6c Rural Areas Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting

R1 Rural Diversification
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraphs 1 to 17
Sections 7 – Design;
9 – Protecting Green Belt Land

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS
SMD/1985/0156 – extension to form first floor kitchen – approved
SMD/1999/0193 – extension to public house – approved

CONSULTATIONS
Publicity
Site Notice expiry date: 14th November 2016
Neighbour consultation period ends: N/A
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments
One representation of support from an address in Dorset – no reasoning given.

Town / Parish Comments
Forsbrook Parish Council – fully support

Staffordshire County Council Highways
Refuse due to conflicting / insufficient information. The extension to the building does appear to be within the red line. However, works are shown on drawing 'Planning 1' which involve works within the adopted highway and outside the red line. A highway embankment is affected. While there is no fundamental objection to this, further details are required. There is an existing road sign which will be close to the proposed works and may be affected and the location of this should be shown on the drawing.

Tree Officer
Acceptable subject to condition.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development
In the Green Belt, policy SS6c is that strict control over development will be exercised in accordance with government policy. NPPF paragraph 89 provides for 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.

It is estimated that in ground plan area the original building (pre-1948) was c.101m2 and in floor area c.202m2. However, it should be noted that the existing single storey extensions occupy c. 83m2 representing a growth of c.80% on the original footprint or c.40% of total floor area.

The proposal would add a further 22m2 of extension bringing the above totals to c.100% and 52% respectively. This is a figure which would normally be considered to indicate a disproportionate addition. There would need to be very special circumstances if the proposal were to be acceptable in principle. The disproportion of the proposal may also be considered evident from the dimensions of the elevation facing the road which at 7.8m in width is c.73% of the width of the old two storey part of the building.

Design
The design involves the formation of a prominent gabled front to the road which is at right angles to the run of the alignment of the original building. Contrary to the Council's adopted design guidance the extension is not recessed. The door as shown lacks 'presence' and as the only door to the front it is unclear whether it would be a main entrance or, as the layout suggests, simply a service door and fire exit. Overall by its form and dimensions the extension is not subordinate.

Amenity
The extension would create a dominant built-up frontage harsh up to the roadside edge and would necessitate the removal of the roadside embankment which otherwise typifies Boundary Road from this point for some distance southwards. Due to the alignment of the building with the road a southerly extension which continues this line would be noticeable from some distance to the north including from the road known as The Common which approaches the Cheadle Road junction from the north. The present arrangement in which the original pub building is seen with the backdrop of green roadside embankment beyond is attractive and typical of a rural building which stands largely isolated from immediate neighbouring development. The site is within the Ancient Slope and Valley Farmland Landscape Character Type (LCT) of the Council's Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008), a supporting evidence document to the Local Plan. The site faces the Dissected Sandstone Cloughs and Valleys LCT. Noted in the key characteristics of the latter are "narrow sunken lanes with hedge banks and tall hedges that limit views". A stated planning guideline is that "hedge banks which are a significant local feature should be protected and maintained". Both character types are middle ranked in terms of landscape quality in the county wide context.

Highway Safety
The degree to which the extension would encroach into highway land is slightly uncertain. In the absence of any clear information to the contrary it may be that the crest of the embankment, which historically has been planted with a hedge, should be regarded as the boundary. The proposed patio would certainly project into the highway and is not acceptable to the Highways Authority.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE
The proposed extension would result in disproportionate additions to the original building and is therefore unacceptable in principle in Green Belt terms. No case is made as to whether there might be very special circumstances to justify the proposal. The proposal is also harmful to openness and conflicts with the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The proposal is not supported by the Council's design policy guidance as the extension would not be subordinate to the original building and does not relate well to its character. In leading to the removal of a section of the roadside embankment and by the prominence of the new frontage in the street scene the proposal would be very much to the detriment of the character and amenity of this rural roadside.

The proposed patio is not acceptable to the Highways Authority. The positioning of a door of uncertain function opening more-or-less directly into the highway gives cause for further reservation.

Whilst individually some of these concerns may have been addressed through negotiation or submission of further details, fundamentally it is concluded that an extension of this scale, of this design and in this position is not acceptable and should be refused as contrary to policies SS6c, DC1, DC3, R1 and due to its encroachment into the highway. The proposal was not subject to any pre-application consultation or advice. It could be considered that the previously approved extension took full account of the limiting factors of the site and represents the limits of what is achievable in terms of building closer to the roadside.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refuse

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank
Recommendation Date: 19/12/2016

X B.J. Haywood

Signed by: Haywood, Ben

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council