


320170674P

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE
Including Heritage Impacts and Mitigation Assessment
Moorcock Inn, Waddington Fell, BB7 3AA

For

Missrs A & S Thornber

Rev. E. For Issue 12 April 2013


CHAM AND PARTNERS
HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT ADVISERS

CONTENTS

PREAMBLES.....	1
1.0 GENERALLY.....	2
2.0 HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE AND VALUES - Use, Fabric and Setting	3
3.0 SUSTAINING THE VALUES – Heritage impacts and mitigation assessment	7
4.0 SUMMARY.....	10

Appendix A Map Regression

PREAMBLES

a) Purpose of document

Mrs A & S Thomer have commissioned Jubb and Jubb Ltd., Chartered Surveyors and Historic Environment Consultants, Regulated by RICS, to prepare an updated statement of significance in accordance with NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), English Heritage Guidance (Understanding Historic Buildings, A Guide to Good Recording Practice - Part 1 Para 4.5.1 - Level 2 Recording) to include Heritage Impacts and Mitigation Assessment for the site known as Moorcock Inn. The purpose of the document is to inform the LPA about the heritage significance of the asset during decision-making for development management purposes.

Specifically, the applicant has been advised by the Local Planning Authority that parts of the site may have historic significance and this requires further investigation, although the findings of the previous heritage statement did not draw this conclusion. That statement is appended as is the varying advice from RBVC.

A site inspection has been undertaken on the 18 March 2013; the focus of this inspection was to establish the extent and nature of survivals of historic fabric and dateable details. Desk studies have included an examination of previous data and opinion, the building control records, photographs and historic maps to establish the likely sequence of events, and to inform the weight to be given to each kind of evidence in decision-making. Archaeological interest is not considered in this report as it is excluded from previous reports by both the LPA and Applicant.

K L Jubb, the lead consultant on this assignment, is a full member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation and Fellow of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors. She is Accredited by the RICS as a specialist in Historic Building Conservation and Chairman of the RICS Building Conservation Forum. She is a qualified expert witness and former English Heritage Historic Environment Adviser. Her CV is appended.

b) Client

This report is confidential to the client for use only for the purposes for which it has been commissioned.

1.0 Generally

- 1.1 Moorcock Inn is located on Slaidburn Rd (Formerly Tittlington Brow) North of Waddington, Lancashire OS Grid Reference: SD 71987 46618.
- 1.2 The property is a large derelict public house with accommodation to the rear and upper floors, with some historic fabric dating from before 1847. The front elevation is masonry with planted timber panelling. Other elevations are painted rendered masonry. It is believed that when the front range of the building was extended between the wars and later rebuilt following a fire in 1976, a substantial amount of architectural salvage materials were used, which have been differentiated in this report to avoid any confusion to the record. Internally, the building has been subject to extensive alterations and additions, most notably the addition of the dance hall and accommodation block to the rear.
- 1.3 The building is not listed or within a conservation area. The building has no statutory or local heritage asset designation. The building is situated within the Forest of Bowland area of outstanding natural beauty.

2.0 Historic Significance and Values - Use, Fabric and Setting

- 2.1 The 1847 map shows a typical linear farmhouse – barn plan building on the site (which we refer to in the footprint analysis as Range A). The name appears as 'Moor Cock' on the map. As there is no reference to an inn or public house, one might suggest that the building could have been in domestic or agricultural use at that time.
- 2.2 The 1890 map shows the name changed to Moor Cock (P.H) suggesting that the building was, by 1890, in use as a public house. Maps show what also appears to be a paddock or pound to the north. (Farmers moving livestock in the traditional way may have used a secure pound on overnight journeys to or from markets in Clitheroe).
- 2.3 The 1909 map shows the name changed to Moorcock Inn and the paddock or enclosure at the rear is no longer shown. A single storey outbuilding is shown to the rear which is clearly ancillary to the main building and traditionally-built from stone and slate. There is also a lean-to on the east side of the building, possibly to provide travellers with cart storage. Image 5 of Appendix B we believe could be dated between 1890 and 1909 by tallying the name of the building in the photo to the map regression. This image also shows that the east road-facing section (referred to in the footprint analysis as Range B, as not yet being built).
- 2.4 The photograph dated 1925 shows Range A altered: The rear single-storey shed facing the road had been replaced by a two-storey building, with a chamfered south-east corner – Range B. The barns to the west had been extended with a two-storey bay in linear form.

- 2.5 The map dated 1955 shows a further two-bay, two-storey, double piled, extension to the west of Range A – Range C. This large bay was extant at inspection and contains a dining room and kitchens to the rear with the "Honeymoon Suite" above; only parts of this range at ground floor survived the fire in 1976.
- 2.6 Much of this bay (westerly two-storey bay pre 1955) is constructed in an inter-war interpretation of the 'Jacobethan' style, introducing mock half-timbered gables and various stylisations to lend a period appearance to the property. This stylisation was subsequently been adopted for the entire south-facing façade, and poorly reinstated in 1976 following the fire. The look was achieved using architectural salvage materials which have been post-dated by inscription to 1933 and further confuse the architectural record. In architectural terms, it is considered poor practice to use or perpetuate this approach to styling unless it has been carried out to a very high standard, or within an appropriate context.
- 2.7 Image 7 of Appendix B shows that much of the oldest part of the building, Range A, was destroyed and then rebuilt following a fire in 1976. The Building Control Officer's inspection notes are appended showing that all of Range A was lost above ground floor level, and more than 50% of the walls were lost at ground floor level. Much of that which remained was unstable and had to be demolished and rebuilt or repaired. During our inspection of Range A the historic fabric could not be identified with any certainty. The plan appeared to be much extended and altered to accommodate the requirements of post war pub and hotel use, and to mitigate the losses of historic fabric to fire. In fact, the only evidence present at inspection to suggest that any fabric which pre-dates 1847 may remain is the apparent thickness of the walls to parts of the ground floor (less than a third of Range A). Even these have been much altered with modern

plasters, padstones to bear pairs of steel beams, and the formation of wide openings to the point where the remaining walls are little more than piers in places.

2.8 Although these potential remnants of historic fabric could have been conserved in previous schemes, which have gained planning approval (3/2012/0356/P), the on-going conservation in-situ of these elements is difficult to justify in policy terms. In NPPF Chapter 12 Para 134, the first leg of any determination should be whether the proposed development causes substantial or less than substantial harm to the heritage values. As the applicant wishes to argue that because the heritage values are very low, the harm, by definition, cannot be substantial, and must be considered less than substantial. The second leg of paragraph 134 advises that less than substantial harm should then be weighed against the public benefits. In this case, the extant approval 3/2012/0356/P offers little public benefit in terms of heritage protection because the remains of any historic fabric (pre - 1847) are all concealed within the private house and not available for public view or enjoyment of any kind, even by the owners. The external parts conserved in that scheme preserve the appearance of the building as a 1930's mock-Jacobethan pub. This is also of marginal public benefit, as it is both so incongruous and poorly executed as to detract from the overriding interest of the area as an ANOB, or interpretation of the sites former (and essential) historic value, as a traditional barn-farmstead

2.9 The quality of the 1914 and 1930 maps are poor and show little change to the building. By 1955 there appears to be a side extension and the chamfered cornered building (Range B) extant. In fact, Image 2 at Appendix B is dated 1925 and also shows Range B as extant. It is fair to conclude, then, that the single storey range to the rear of the old farmhouse (Range A) was demolished and Range B was constructed between 1909 and 1925. This observation is wholly consistent with the observations made on site.

- 2.10 The Local Planning Authority's heritage adviser (in pre-application advice on 9 January 2012) suggests range B is 19th century and could have been a toll house because it has a chamfered quoin. This observation is inconsistent with the dating evidence (photographic and mapping). We therefore find the subsequent advice in the LPA's planning committee briefing of 31 October 2012, advising that "Total demolition ... is considered to be inappropriate and unjustified" to be poorly drawn and not consistent with the dating evidence.
- 2.11 Although all the skirtings and windows to Range B have been modernised, we observed that the floor joists are machined softwood, to early C20th proportions; the boards are tongue and grooved machined softwood and the walls are rendered masonry. These construction details appear contemporary to first build and tally consistently with the map and photographic evidence, to enable confident dating of the building as early C20th, and specifically inter-war.
- 2.12 The 1975 Building Control plans show the site largely developed to include a ball room. This is in keeping with the post-war vogue for Inns to provide conference and event hosting facilities. The inter and post war accretions in plan form are referred to as Range C in the footprint analysis. Planning permission has been granted in 3/2012/0356/P for demolition without record of all post war accretions in Range C.
- 2.13 On the wider site there are fairly good examples of stone boundary walls, which lend character to the area, and which pre-date 1847. The stone built shed in the grounds south of the quarry access road is modern but not harmful to the character of the landscape. Image 2

at Appendix B also shows a timber garage on the quarry access road and the attached barns apparently in use as workshops, so the use of ancillary domestic buildings on the site is well established.

3.0 Sustaining the heritage values - Heritage impacts and mitigation assessment

- 3.1 English Heritage Principles of Selection - Commerce and Exchange Buildings April 2011 states - *'Most commercial buildings post date 1840. Many other commercial building types – offices, pubs, shopping arcades, departments stores, and hotels – are largely nineteenth-century creations. Because they survive in such large numbers and were subject to a high degree of standardisation, selection for designation needs to be very discriminating'*.
- 3.2 Although the LPA's pre-application advice 9 January 2012 suggests that *'further work should be done to establish whether it [the site] has provenance as a designated asset'*, it is our opinion that this building, or any part of it, could not be considered for a national designation or statutory protection on the grounds of architectural or historic interest for the following reasons:
- The building itself, and the ranges are not especially typical or atypical and therefore not instructive to future generations of any themes or mores. They lack evidential value.
 - The loss of historic fabric to Range A is so substantial as to have removed any historic interest. Moreover, the subsequent alterations are of varying quality and are architecturally and historically confusing. For instance, the imposition of half-timbered gables and jetties is a corruption of the plain, lime-washed Lancashire farmhouse façade that would have lent character to the area until it was re-modelled in the mid-twentieth century.

- The historic interest in Range B is minimal – the building is apparently inter-war, and is much altered with the joinery, fireplaces and purpose all lost under modern accretions. The historic fabric we observed, which is contemporary to the build date, is all concealed, and somewhat everyday; it is material which survives in over a fifth of British buildings – i.e. machined softwood floor joists, tongue and grooved floorboards, lath and plaster ceilings.
- The use of the building as traveller accommodation was not sustained for more than about a century, and during that time, the use has lent little social value to the area of the building, even by association.

The LPA has (contrary to its own advice first given in January 2012) later upheld this opinion at the Planning Meeting on the 31 October 2012 by referring to the site as a non-designated heritage asset.

- 3.3 In considering whether the building has local or contextual value, we have considered the English Heritage Guidance on Local Listing (May 2012). We note that this guidance was published after the advice of the LPA regarding local listing and this guidance therefore applies in this case. One should take into account that every pub and inn has social value, often highly cherished by the community. We saw relatively little evidence of this type of value in examining the Moorcock. The passing trade of tourists to Forest of Bowland would have been adversely affected by the location (other hosteleries are better-placed, or within settlements with regular community use) and lack of architectural or historic merit. Trade was sustained through hosting wedding-parties and this was dependant on the functionality of the modern rooms and ample parking. In the context of pub closure, CAMRA reports a rate of 18 per week nationally, the sustenance of the current use has proved impossible, and therefore any application of the local designation would inevitably entail further substantial change to the meagre survivals, as upheld in the LPA's decision in 3/2012/0356/P.

- 3.4 The good practice guide for Local Heritage listing suggests that in designating local lists LPA's should adopt published criteria. This LPA has no such list or adopted criterion but we have nevertheless tested the site against the suggested generic criteria to inform opinion as to whether the LPA's suggestion of designation of the Moorcock Inn in planning decision-making as a locally-designated heritage asset is reasonable. The analysis below suggests not.

Criterion	Boundary Walls	Range A	Range B
Age	Before 1847	Less than 30% of extant ground floor walls could be pre-1847. Some ground floor possibly interwar	Mid-C20th much altered with some architectural salvage.
Rarity	Not rare	Not rare	Not rare
Aesthetic value	Good	Poor – impaired by modern accretions	Poor
Group value	Good	Not evident	Derives from range A which is itself impaired
Evidential value	Good – mapped at 1847	Poor – much impaired by use of architectural salvage. Dating 1933 poorly supported by document evidence.	Poor – modern details obscure evidential value
Historical Association	None	Salvage - none	None
Archaeological Interest	Not considered	Not considered	Not considered
Designed landscape	None	None	None
Landmark Status	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social Value	None	Poor	Poor

3.5 In addition to recognised and rational selection criteria, the adoption of local lists also requires a transparent ratification procedure within the LPA Local Plan policy development functions. This procedure has not been commenced by RVBC. Guidance suggests that the status of a non-designated heritage asset is likely to carry less weight as a material consideration within planning decisions if it has been applied without due process or is unjustified. Indeed, although specifically referring the processes LPA's should follow in designating Conservation Areas, NPPF Chapter 12, para 127 warns LPAs about this principle – "that the concept of conservation is devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest."

3.6 In terms of understanding and sustaining the building's significance, we concluded that neither local nor national designation are viable options and that, given that re-use of the site is proposed and largely permitted, recording would be the most effective measure following the advice of NPPF Chapter 12, Para 141.

4.0 Summary

4.1 The building is undesignated, locally or nationally.

4.2 The building can be considered in three ranges.

Range A

The South-facing former farmhouse-barn (Range A) pre-dated 1847 and was historic but was almost entirely lost to fires by 1976. The remnants of the historic form are no more than a third of the ground floor walls but we have been unable to confirm that any historic

fabric from before 1847 survives as these remnants are much altered and, according to the Building Control records, quite possibly rebuilt. These are therefore do not lend themselves to re-use or interpretation of the heritage values, even with substantial repairs and reinstatement. The architectural, evidential and historic value of this range is much corrupted by the modern accretions and the inappropriate use of architectural salvage items. The elevations of Range A are much altered and are inappropriate to the historic form of the building, to the point of being harmful to the character of the surrounding protected landscape. *The building is redundant and in poor condition. Re-use in the passing is use is accepted as not viable.*

Range B


Dates from between 1909 and 1920 and replaces a smaller single storey outbuilding. The materials and styling are plain. Little historic fabric survives internally other than to floors joists, floor boards and lath and plaster linings. The surviving elements provide little historic or architectural interest and, as they are mostly concealed, lend little to the overall interpretation of the building as a historic entity. As the marginal historic interest of Range B mostly derives from it's relationship to Range A, retention of Range B is not in our opinion justified in the absence of Range A. The LPA suggestion that the purpose of the this range was as a former toll house is excluded by the dating evidence, as toll houses had fallen out of use about 50 years before this building was erected. Moreover, the LPA's suggestion of a nineteenth-century build date for this range, and subsequent advice to the Planning Committee is firmly contradicted by the evidence. After analysis of the evidence, we are content with a date of circa 1920.

Range C The post war range is not of historic or architectural interest

- 4.3 The boundary walls are not unusual but worthy of retention as having heritage value as they are historic, intact and contribute positively to the character of the landscape. The modern stone shed is not harmful to the character of the landscape.
- 4.4 There is little to recommend the building ranges A to C for protection, re-ordering or re-use. Therefore the conservation of the heritage values for this site, in our opinion, is best undertaken by
- Recording the buildings to level 3 prior to demolition and offering the record to Lancashire's HER.
 - Conserving in-situ boundary walls and outbuildings where these contribute positively to landscape character.

Appendix A

Moorcock Inn 1850




EDINA Digimap®

Scale 1:7500
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 900 1000 ft

Mar 27, 2013 12:49

Moorcock Inn 1890



EDINA Digimap®



Mar 27, 2013 12:47

Moorcock Inn 1909



Scale 1:7500

Mar 27, 2013 12:46

EDINA Digimap®



Moorcock Inn 1914



Scale 1:7500

Mar 27, 2013 12:42


EDINA Digimap®



This is a detailed topographic map of a rural area, likely in the Pacific Northwest. The map shows a network of roads, trails, and land parcels. A river, possibly the Columbia River, flows through the lower right portion of the map. Numerous land parcels are labeled with their section numbers, such as 'S.E. 1/4 Sec. 10', 'S.E. 1/4 Sec. 11', and 'S.E. 1/4 Sec. 12'. The map also includes various other labels, such as 'Columbia River', 'Columbia River Bridge', and 'Columbia River Ferry'. The map is oriented with North at the top.

Mar 27, 2013 12:40

Moorcock Inn 1955




Scale 1:7500

Mar 27, 2013 12:38

EDINA Digimap®



Moorcock Inn 1972



EDINA Digimap®

Scale 1:7500
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800 900 1000 m

Mar 27, 2013 13:11