
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/17/3170548

The Moon Inn, High Street, Stoney Middleton, S32 4TL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dave Duroe against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0716/0629, dated 7 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as "retrospective planning approval for replacement shed in garden of public house".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement shed in garden of public house at The Moon Inn, High Street, Stoney Middleton, S32 4TL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/DDD/0716/0629, dated 7 July 2016, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development given in my formal decision omits some of the text from the description provided on the planning application form. The omitted text simply states that the proposal is a retrospective application, and as such it does not describe acts of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Stoney Middleton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is located within the Stoney Middleton Conservation Area, which encompasses the historic core of the village. Stoney Middleton has a long history, and it retains a large number of attractive stone fronted buildings in a vernacular style. The Moon Inn is finished in render and is set back from the main road. It is an attractive building located in a prominent position that clearly makes a positive contribution to the wider conservation area.
5. A large extension to The Moon Inn was under construction, and approaching completion, at the time of my site visit. The extension significantly restricts the visibility of the appeal building in the surrounding area, and it is no longer visible from either the pub car park or from the road. In addition, only partial

glimpsed views are available from the nearby footpath. The building is visible from the rear of some adjoining properties that are located outside of the conservation area. However, given its low height and the presence of boundary planting these views are restricted in nature. Whilst the building is visible to users of the beer garden, it has an ancillary and subordinate appearance. It is positioned away from the historic part of the pub and does not detract from the pub building itself in my view. In any case, the pub's contribution to the wider conservation area derives in large part from its attractive frontage onto High Street. This is unaffected by the appeal building due to its position.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Stoney Middleton Conservation Area. It would therefore accord with Policies GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District Core Strategy Development Plan Document ('the Core Strategy') (2011), and saved Policies LC4 and LC5 of the Peak District Local Plan (2001). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is appropriately designed and does not adversely affect heritage assets. The development would also be consistent with guidance in the Framework relating to designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

7. The development before me would not involve the loss of any parking spaces and would therefore have a neutral impact on car parking within the village.
8. The building is currently used as a store and there is no evidence before me of an intention to use the building as domestic accommodation. In any case, such a change of use would require planning permission. Furthermore, the size and layout of the building does not lend itself to live music performances.
9. The Parish Council have drawn my attention to Policy RT3 of the Core Strategy. However, this policy relates to caravan and camping sites and is therefore not directly relevant to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR