
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/21/3271851
80 Brincliffe Edge Road, Sheffield S11 9BW

- 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 Dr Alex Griffin (Oblong Architecture) against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04322/FUL (Formerly PP-09313752), dated 3 December 2020 was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement of door with window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. However, there is no evidence that the change has been agreed between the parties and the original description adequately describes the proposal. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the replacement of the door with a window on the character and appearance of the host property and the Nether Edge Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. This part of the Conservation Area comprises largely of traditional stone-built 19th century dwellings of established and attractive appearance. The form, materials and detailing of these buildings are defining features of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.
5. The appeal dwelling can be broken down into two parts. The eastern section incorporates a slated pitched roof, two traditionally proportioned windows and a door. A successful, contemporary extension has been added to the western side of the dwelling which features a recessed front door which functions as the main front entrance to the house. This has rendered the pre-existing front door on the eastern side of the house surplus to requirements.
6. I accept that the evidence indicates that there may have been a larger door to the side elevation of the house. However, other properties on Brincliffe Edge Road to the east, of similar style and design, generally incorporate a variety of

- timber front doors facing onto the street, in a range of colours, which form common and characterful features within the street.
7. Even accepting that the door proposed for removal is not the original front door, it is constructed in timber and incorporates a substantial, established, and ornate stone surround and there is a fanlight above the door. These features are an indication of its intended function as an entrance to the dwelling. The original function of the opening would be somewhat lost if it were replaced with a single, glazed window.
 8. The new front door within the extension has a dark finish and is cleverly recessed within the shadows of the front elevations. It has been so discretely incorporated that it does not obviously appear as a front door to the casual passer-by. This, correctly, allows the more traditional timber door within the eastern section of the dwelling to take primacy. The existing arrangement allows the traditional and contemporary elements of the property to be successfully visually separated.
 9. This clean, concise, and visually pleasing arrangement would be blurred if the door were to be removed to be replaced solely with glazing which would have a more modern appearance more in keeping with the extension.
 10. The proposed changes would therefore be detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling. Subsequently, they would detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which lies in part with the form, detailing and materials of its buildings.
 11. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the Framework¹ requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
 12. One such benefit in this instance would be environmental. The evidence indicates that the provision of the window would improve the thermal qualities of the opening. Whilst I acknowledge these environmental benefits, they would nonetheless be very modest bearing in mind the limited scale of the development. Any benefits in terms of sound insulation would primarily be a personal one for the appellant.
 13. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to Conservation Areas, the benefits identified are not sufficient to outweigh this harm.
 14. The development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It therefore fails to accord with Policies BE5, BE16 and BE17 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) (SUDP) which amongst other things require good design and state amongst other things that permission will only be given for proposals which comprise development which would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
 15. The proposal would also conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) which amongst other things requires high quality development which would amongst other things respect and enhance

¹ National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

the distinctive features of the city including townscape character and its associated built form and materials.

16. I have not found direct conflict with Policy H14 of the SUDP which relates more specifically amongst other things to the design of new buildings and extensions within housing areas. Policies BE5 and BE16 are relevant to the proposal as they effectively seek good design and the protection of heritage assets when carrying out refurbishment and development respectively.

Other Matters

17. The appellant expresses concern regarding communications with the Council, although this is a matter that should be directed through the Council's complaints process, should the appellant wish.
18. The evidence indicates that planning permission has previously been awarded to replace windows to the front of the house which would have the same window section as the window within this proposal. The matters relating to this proposal are quite specific however, and such an approval does not provide justification for the scheme before me.

Conclusion

19. The replacement of the door with the window would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and no public benefits outweigh this harm.
20. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR