

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0280
Valid 30/04/2021

TRAVELLERS REST
TOMPKIN ROAD
STANLEY

PROPOSED GLAZED CANOPY
ROOF TO FRONT ELEVATION

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Heritage and visual impact
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site is a Public House within an important part of the historic core of Stanley village. It is a 16th century previously extended building of much character. The Public House occupies a very visually prominent roadside location and is orientated so that its principal elevation faces towards the south. To the rear, there is a visitor car park area. The surrounding area is characterised by domestic dwellings of varying ages, sizes and design. At the time of visit, there was a patio area with tables and chairs to the front of the building.

For the purposes of planning policy consideration the Traveller's Rest is located within the Stanley Village Development Boundary and Conservation Area. The site is also covered with the Stanley Article 4 Direction. Whilst the building is of considerable age it is not Listed and there are no Listed buildings/structures within close proximity. Nevertheless it is regarded as a non-designated heritage asset

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a lean-to canopy to part of the front elevation to provide covering to the open seating and amenity area which is currently open to the elements.

The canopy will extend 10.5m along the front elevation and project out 3.6m. It will have a ridge height of 3m and eaves height of 2.4m. The roof will be made of clear glass and will be supported by 4 black metal round columns.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffs Moorlands Local Plan (adopted September 2020)

SS1 Development Principles
SS9 Smaller Villages Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations
DC2 The Historic Environment

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 9
Section 16

SITE HISTORY

83/12326/OLD	Ext to form bar cellar, food preparation area and formation of car park.	Approved.
95/00197/OLD	Ext to public house – Entrance porch.	Approved.
99/00166/OLD	Extension to form dining room and bottle store/cellar.	Refused.
99/00631/FUL	Extension to public house.	Approved.
SMD/2019/0602	Proposed attached store building	Approved.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 19/05/21
Neighbour consultation period ends: 13/05/21
Press Advert: N/A

Public Comments

Neighbours

One neighbour objection. The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the rural appearance of the village. The parking of high sided vehicles close to the front wall will hinder the escape of exhaust fumes. Tobacco smoke will also be trapped in this area which is designated for smokers

One neighbour support. It is an attractive, sympathetic and practical way to provide a covered outdoor seating area for customers year round, enabling people to respect social distancing whilst being protected from the elements.

The design respects and enhances the stone building and provides a welcoming area which will be attractive to potential customers without detracting from the building's history or heritage.

Endon and Stanley Parish Comments

No objection, consideration should be given to the scale and the Cast Iron construction for this area

Severn Trent Waters

No objection subject to conditions

Staffordshire County Council Highways

No objection

Conservation Officer

Objection, the proposal will be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

OFFICER COMMENTS**Principle of Development**

Local Plan policy SS9 identifies Stanley as a 'Smaller Village' where there is support for development which can enhance community vitality and/or meets local social/economic need. As there are no 'in principal' objections to the application the material planning considerations are therefore those including design, visual impact, neighbour amenity, whether there are any parking implications and drainage.

The proposal is in accordance with Policy SS9 of the Local Plan.

Heritage and visual impact

Section 16 of the NPPF sets out the government's advice on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 194 states that any harm, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset...should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 196 states that where a development proposal which will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Policy DC1 refers to design and seeks to secure development of a high quality which is designed to add value to the area and to respect the site and its surroundings. New development should promote a positive sense of place and identity through its scale, density, layout, siting, landscaping, character and appearance.

Policy DC2 states that development affecting the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset and its setting will be expected to preserve or enhance its significance.

The Conservation officer was consulted as the application site is located in Stanley Conservation Area and as such, considered a designated heritage asset. It was noted in the officer's comments that although unlisted, it is a 16th century vernacular building of historic significance with in the centre of the village. The stone and tile building is part of a consistent building line facing the road and there is a scale and rhythm to the buildings and arrangement of their openings. The detailing to the windows, the stone surrounds and evidence of building extension are all parts of the building's legibility which add to the building's character. For these reasons it is regarded as a non-designated heritage asset

For context, the property to the front is as follows:



The glass canopy to the front elevation will introduce a substantial new structure to the frontage and be a prominent addition. It is considered that the canopy will obscure views of the traditional form and appearance of the building as it juts out in front of the building line of adjoining properties. Whilst it is recognised that the canopy will use transparent glass, it will visually impair the frontage which is free of development. The canopy is a type of feature that are more common in 19th century, urban streetscapes and rear elevations. The proposal will cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In view of the above, the case officer is in agreement with the opinion that the canopy would detract from the overall appearance of the building as it will introduce a horizontal feature along the main frontage which would adversely disrupt the simplicity and strong vertical fenestration, which are typical features of this era. Whilst it is recognised that the canopy is a light weight structure and the applicant intends to use good materials such as glass, the canopy extends a significant proportion of the frontage and would have a detrimental effect to the beauty of its simplicity.

When considering the wider visual impact, the application site sits opposite a well-established residential area formed by dwellings of similar age and materials. The most notable dwelling which is similar age and appearance to the application site sits opposite the site. The dwelling appears as follows:



Taking into account the dwelling opposite, properties of this era are free of development with clean linear arranged windows. The introduction of the canopy will undoubtedly have an impact to the quality and character of the street scene which the Conservation Area seeks to retain.

It should be noted that the case officer has recognised that the building is not completely free of development to the front as there is a porch. It is believed that the porch adjoins the later addition of the building as seen by the change of brickwork. It is considered that the porch should be given limited weight when considering the overall aesthetic of the building as the porch itself is modest and does not adjoin the 16th century façade.

When considering the public benefit of the proposal, the applicant has verbally advised that the canopy will provide additional income to the public house that has been severely affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. The canopy will provide a permanent shelter for visitors who wish to sit outside in all weather-elements. The heritage statement that was submitted as part of the submission provided limited justification. The Council has considered the views made by the applicant and appreciates the difficulties that small business have faced. Nevertheless, it has not been demonstrated that the public benefits outweigh the less substantial harm to both the designated heritage asset of the Conservation Area and the non-designated asset of the pub itself. The Council is also of the opinion that the existing tables with parasols to the front will provide sufficient means to use the front as the applicant intended without compromising on character of the building. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the test set out under paragraph 196 as it is not considered to secure the public house optimum viable use than what is currently available.

In view of the above, this application is will be contrary to National Policy and, Policy DC1 and DC2 of the Local plan.

Neighbouring amenity

Paragraph 127(f) of the NPPF (2019) and policy DC1 seeks to secure development that protects amenity, including residential amenity, in terms of satisfactory daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and soft landscaping.

The proposed canopy is to be located to the front of the building. It is considered that the neighbours' amenities located to the front will be maintained as the use of the public house's frontage has already been established for outdoor siting. In addition, the properties are well screened by mature hedging and set back from the main road to not cause any undue overlooking.

In terms of the properties on either side of the application site, these will not be adversely affected by the proposal as the canopy sits to the front of the public house and directly faces the highway. The use of the canopy will be associated with the opening hours of the public house and as such, will not extend beyond what has already establish by the use of table and chairs already to the front of the building. Therefore, the neighbour's amenity will be maintained and accords with Policy DC1.

Highway Safety

Section 9 of the NPPF states that developments should achieve safe and suitable access to the site for all users. Policy T1 of the Local Plan states that permission will only be granted for development incorporating adequate and satisfactory parking provisions.

County Highways have been consulted. The proposed canopy will be sited over the current outdoor seating area to the front of the property. The canopy will be set back from the existing stone wall and not overhang the highway. It is considered visibility exiting the carpark will not be affected. The proposal is considered not to have a detrimental impact on the adopted highway I therefore have no objection.

This application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Section 9 of the NPPF and Policy T1 of the Local Plan.

Other matters

Concerns were also raised by the neighbour relating to impact it will have to the rural appearance of the village and the trapped fumes underneath the canopy that will arise from heavy vehicles and smokers. The impact to the village has been addressed above. The matter relating to trapped fumes is not a planning matter.

Severn Trent Waters were consulted. They have raised no objections to the proposal subject to drainage plans for the disposal of foul and surface water flows have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The applicant has verbally confirmed that he wishes for the application to be considered without the additional information. However, this information could be secured by condition if consent were to be granted.

CONCLUSION:

It is considered that the presence of the canopy would have less than substantial harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and the non-designated heritage asset of the pub. The public benefits are insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm that would occur. Accordingly, the application is not to be in accordance with the NPPF and the Local Plan. It is therefore recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refusal

Case Officer: Lisa Li

Recommendation Date: 24/06/21

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council