
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/17/3171864
25 Brincliffe Crescent, Sheffield S11 9AW

- 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 James against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03110/FUL, dated 12 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a conservatory to the front of the bungalow and a raised patio area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Nether Edge Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a bungalow that is situated in an elevated position on a corner plot at the junction of Brincliffe Crescent, Kingfield Road and St. Andrew's Road. The bungalow is set in from these boundaries of the site by the front garden area. The boundaries are defined by prominent natural stone walls and a hedge is also found on part of the Kingfield Road frontage. New hedgerow planting is found around the perimeter of the site behind the stone walls, some of which has been recently planted.
 4. The Conservation Area in the vicinity of the site comprises substantial villas, with more modern detached dwellings, including bungalows and apartments. The properties are sited well back from their site frontages, to give a spacious character. Stone walls, hedgerows and substantial planting add to the pleasing unifying elements of the area. Buildings are constructed of natural stone or, as with the appeal property, of lighter coloured brick, with darker coloured roof materials. The site contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area with the position of the bungalow set back from its site frontages, the front garden area and the stone walls.
 5. The proposed conservatory would be markedly noticeable because of its location on the corner plot and its prominent positioning in relation to the streetscene around the road junction. From my site visit, it was apparent that ground levels would also have to be raised to provide a flat platform for the
-

conservatory, and this would further emphasise the conspicuousness of the proposal.

6. The conservatory, by virtue of its built footprint, would considerably reduce the distance the bungalow would be set back from the Brincliffe Crescent frontage, therefore reducing this aspect of its contribution to the Conservation Area. I am aware that the appellant intends to create a courtyard effect on the site, however this is also not characteristic in this part of the Conservation Area.
7. The design, form and materials of the conservatory, with glazed panels set in a pyramidal roof and openings on the side of the conservatory, would be out of keeping with this part of the Conservation Area. Although the brick parts of the conservatory would match the existing house, they would only form a minor part of its exterior and would not make an appreciable difference to its discordant appearance.
8. The bungalow is more recent than much of the development in the area and whilst the conservatory would be modern in design, this does not reduce the requirement that development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. The growth of the new planting to potentially screen the prominence of conservatory would make no difference to its design, form and materials or the loss of part of the front garden. There is also no certainty that the growth of the planting would be sufficient so as to be effective in its screening qualities. Whilst evidence submitted by the appellant shows substantial planting on the site previously, this has been removed and the appeal is to be determined on the site characteristics and proposals before me.
10. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is of considerable weight and importance. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and thus not comply with the statutory duty, or 'Saved' Policies BE16 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998). This must attract considerable weight against the proposal.
11. For the purposes of paragraphs 132 to 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Whilst I note that the proposal seeks to make use of existing doors which open out into the front garden and the existing patio, increase living space and provide a more private enclosed patio, these are benefits to the appellant and would have very limited public benefit. I do not consider the public benefits that have been put forward would outweigh the harm.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated asset that is not outweighed by the public benefits. Accordingly, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR