



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/J4423/W/20/3244284

Chantreyland Nursery, Norton Grange, Bunting Nook, Sheffield S8 8JW

- 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 Roger Bell against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02747/FUL, dated 25 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a glass covered canopy to east elevation of nursery building.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J4423/Y/20/3244282

Chantreyland Nursery, Norton Grange, Bunting Nook, Sheffield S8 8JW

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Roger Bell against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02748/LBC, dated 25 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The works proposed are the erection of a glass covered canopy to east elevation of nursery building.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issue

4. The main issues in both of the appeals are whether the development and works would preserve the grade II listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses the character and appearance of the Norton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises of an 18th Century wash house which has been converted, latterly for use as a day nursery. It is a 2-storey linear building with

- coursed stone and a stone slate roof with chimney stack. Windows are casements with paned lights. It has been extended, including a modern glazed porch.
6. The wash house originally served Norton Grange, a large 18th Century dwelling with 19th Century alterations. Together, and along with stables and boundary wall, these are grade II listed buildings. The special interest of the nursery building relates to its historic interest as a subservient wash house to Norton Grange. While the building has been converted from its original use and form, it still maintains a relationship with the main house. It also has architectural interest, utilising the local building materials as a subsidiary vernacular building to Norton Grange.
 7. Norton CA is a small conservation area which covers the historic core of the settlement, including the Church, Norton Hall, almshouses and other historic and modern residential properties. It has a rural and verdant character with large areas of open space and a legible hierarchy of historic buildings, including Norton Grange and the wash house which makes a positive contribution to its character and appearance.
 8. The proposed development and works would involve the erection of an aluminium canopy with glazed panels attached to the wash house. It would be around 12m in length and with a 2.5m projection. Its design would be akin to glazed iron canopies which were commonplace in the Victorian era, with ornate columns and supporting bracket detailing. However, it would also incorporate modern detailing such as wall plates and gaskets linking the roof of the structure to the stone walls and aluminium roof bars supporting the glazing and integrated guttering.
 9. The structure is simple in its form and would effectively comprise a reversible addition which has been designed to limit the effect on the fabric as much as possible. However, the design would be significantly at odds with the character of the building it would be appended to, taking reference from a period in time which would not reflect the architecture of the building, which dates from an earlier period.
 10. Notwithstanding this point, I also have concerns regarding the success of the mock Victorian design of the veranda. In particular, the roof would utilise modern and heavy roof bars, eaves beams and gaskets which would not be an adequate or faithful replication of more traditional Victorian detailing.
 11. Overall, the proposed veranda would be a visually assertive and incongruous addition to the building. It would convolute and diminish the historic and architectural significance of the former wash house, causing harm to the listed building.
 12. In terms of the CA, the property is largely hidden from the streetscene due to the presence of tall boundary walls and gates. That said, views of the roof of the building are gained from Matthews Lane and the veranda would be visible in specific static views. However, the harm in the context of the CA would be negligible and my primary concerns relate to the harm to the listed building. The minimal visibility within the streetscene would not justify the harm to the listed building.

13. My attention has been drawn to other examples of verandas attached to Georgian buildings and to outbuildings, barns and other high-status buildings. However, those examples all significantly differ from the proposals before me; for example the photographs of Chicheley Hall depict an overtly modern design solution, the Blenheim Palace example is of a roof and not a veranda. The architecture of the Georgian dwelling example is also markedly different to the appeal property as a vernacular building as opposed to the classical style.
14. The proposal would therefore result in a negative impact on the listed building and would fail to preserve its special architectural and historic interest, as sought by Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The works would affect only part of the listed building and therefore in terms of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the harm caused to the significance of the asset would be less than substantial. In such cases, under Paragraph 196 of the Framework, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
15. In my view, the public benefits of proposed veranda are minimal in providing shelter for the users of the nursery. There is limited evidence, however, to support claims that the works are needed to secure the viability of the asset and its repair, particularly as the use is extant and the building appears to be in a good state.
16. I therefore find that there would be insufficient public benefit to offset the identified harm or outweigh the special regard to be had to its preservation under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The development and works would thus fail to accord with the Framework which gives great weight to heritage assets, and seeks to conserve assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
17. Overall, taking into account the particular circumstances and having carefully considered all the evidence, I conclude that the works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed building and would have a negligible harmful effect on the character and appearance of the CA. This would be in conflict with Policies BE15, BE17 and BE19 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Core Strategy (2009). Together these policies seek to preserve special interest and character of heritage assets, using sensitive design.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both of the appeals should be dismissed.

C Searson

INSPECTOR