



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2023

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/22/3312301

The Anchor Inn, Washhouse Bottom, Tideswell SK17 8RB

- 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 Frederic Robinson Limited against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/0921/0964, dated 3 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2022.
 - The development is erection of single storey side extension; new patio, retaining wall and railings and steps; and infilling existing window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey side extension; new patio, retaining wall and railings and steps; and infilling existing window at The Anchor Inn, Tideswell SK17 8RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref NP/DDD/0921/0964, dated 3 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) This permission relates to the following approved plans:
 - Proposed Site Plan 21111 PL04 P2
 - Proposed Ground Floor Layout 21111 PL05 P2
 - Proposed Elevations 21111 PL06 P1
 - Existing and Proposed Roof Plan 21111 PL07 P2
 - Retaining Wall Plan 21111 PL08 P1
 - 2) Within 3 months of the date of this permission 2 tree sparrow nest boxes shall be erected on the north facing gable end of the building, next to the extension hereby permitted. The bird boxes shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Park Authority (the Authority) indicates that the appeal property should be considered as a non-designated heritage asset which the appellant has not disputed. The appellant's Heritage Assessment identifies the significance of the building as its vernacular character that positively contributes to the character of the area and its historic use as a public house. Having had regard to the Assessment, and based on my observations on site, I agree that the building has a degree of heritage significance derived from its use and character. I have therefore treated it as a non-designated heritage asset in reaching my decision.
3. At the time of my site visit the proposed development had already been carried out and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and Peak District National Park (PDNP), having particular regard to the effect on its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on a staggered crossroads in the open countryside. It is made up of a main building, formerly a farmhouse, and linked outbuildings of varying height and appearance. Alterations have previously taken place which have diminished the architectural interest but, nevertheless, highlight the evolution of the site and buildings from a farmhouse and outbuildings to its use as a roadside Inn.
6. Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
7. Paragraph 203 of the Framework says that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
8. The significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is derived from its local character, and historical interest as an 19th Century Inn and its earlier use as a farmstead.
9. The appeal extension is a modest sized, and distinctly subservient addition to the building that respects the dominance of the original main farmhouse building. Due to it being at a lower level than its surroundings, the appeal extension is not prominent in public views despite being sited in a position that adjoins a busy road.
10. The extension connects to and continues an existing single storey addition along the side elevation. It includes a gable over the door, a non-traditional feature not found on this elevation, nonetheless it reflects a narrower gable incorporating barge boards found above the porch of the principal elevation of the former farmhouse which fronts onto Washhouse Bottom. As such the gable does not appear as an incongruous addition when viewed in the context of the other site buildings.
11. The Authority has expressed concerns about the roof pitch to either side of the gable feature, which it says is abnormally low. Additionally, there is some disagreement between the parties as to the extension's roof covering, the Authority stating that it is covered in concrete tiles, whilst the appellant says that it is covered in slate. However, from my observation on site, I consider that the roof closely matches that of the existing lean-to extension in respect of its pitch and materials and thereby blends in with the existing building.
12. The windows within the extension have a vertical emphasis, are not recessed, and do not have stone lintels and thereby differ from the original window

design. Nevertheless, due to historical alterations that have taken place there is a significant variation in the windows along the side elevation, with some windows having no lintels or recess. Accordingly, the windows of the appeal extension do not appear incongruous and contribute to the variety along this elevation of the public house. Moreover, I note all the window frames, formerly white, are now painted a recessive dark grey which matches the grey frames of the windows and door within the extension and assists in the visual assimilation of the appeal extension.

13. Overall, the alterations and extensions are sympathetic to the form and appearance of the rear projection of the public house and do not affect the principal front elevation. The alterations and extensions thereby cause minimal harm to the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset and do not harm the valued characteristics of the PDNP.
14. The development provides public benefits through the provision of an accessible toilet, a means of escape and by supporting the local economy. Taking such matters into account, I consider that the public benefits in support of the scheme outweigh the minimal harm to the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage and therefore meets the provisions of the Framework in this regard.
15. Consequently, the development does not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the valued characteristics of the PDNP, having particular regard to the effect on its significance as a non-designated heritage asset. It would accord with Policies GSP1, GSP3, L1 and E2 of the Core Strategy¹ and Policies DMC3, DMC5, and DME7 of the Development Management document². These policies seek to ensure that development would be consistent with the statutory purposes of the National Park and avoid an adverse effect on the valued characteristics site and buildings of the area and avoids harm to heritage assets. Furthermore, it accords with the sustainable design principles set out in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

Conditions

16. As the development has already taken place, I have not found it necessary to attach a condition limiting the timescale for implementation of the permission. Whilst not specifically requested by the Authority, I have, however, specified the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
17. A condition requiring the provision of bird boxes is necessary in the interests of nature conservation.

Conclusion

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

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR

¹ Peak District National Park Local Development Framework - Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted October 2011)

² Peak District National Park Development Management Policies – Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Peak District National Park (Adopted May 2019)