



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2024

by C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 DECEMBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B2002/W/24/3347464

204 Welholme Road, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire, DN32 9JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Omed Mohammed against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/0250/24/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use from shop to barber shop new shopfront and metal shutter to same.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Whilst a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published on 12 December 2024 (the Framework), the sections relevant to this appeal remain unchanged. Therefore, the principles that apply to this decision remain the same.
3. The change of use to a barber shop has been completed. A shutter has been installed on the inside of the shopfront window, which differs from the details of the proposal submitted as part of the application. However, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the historic shopfront.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey brick-built property located in a terrace of dwellings. It has a traditional proportioned shopfront, with a recessed doorway and a range of traditional features including timber fascia, stallriser and pilasters. This gives it a distinctive appearance which makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. The appeal site is located near to the junction with Heneage Road and there are a range of uses in the immediate area including a primary school and local convenience store.
6. The proposal is for the removal of the existing timber framed windows to be replaced with UPVC windows. The recessed door element would be brought into line with the windows and a metal, solid shutter would be installed to the front. The existing timber pilasters would not be altered. The roller shutter would be positioned across the shop window below the fascia.

7. Policy 39 3(b) of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032 (2018) (LP) states that development will be supported where proposals conserve and, where appropriate, enhance other historic landscape and townscape features, including historic shopfronts. Although the appeal site is not a designated heritage asset it makes a clear, positive contribution to the historic character of Welholme Road. I note that it is one of only 66 properties within North East Lincolnshire which has an intact or virtually intact historic shopfront.
8. The proposed replacement of the timber windows with UPVC would erode the traditional appearance of the shopfront. Although the replacement windows would be charcoal in colour, they would replace two windows with three, whilst the horizontal timber transom detailing would also be removed. These changes would significantly alter the traditional proportions of the shop window and fail to preserve its historic character. Despite the retention of the pilasters and fascia the proposed alterations to the shopfront would harm the character and appearance of the host property.
9. The use of a solid roller shutter would obscure the traditional shop window when it is closed. Although this usage would be limited to when the shop is shut, there would be extensive periods of time when it is down, during which, harm would be caused. When the roller shutter is open, the eye would be drawn towards the shutter box and its side guides, detracting from the original features of the shopfront. I note the appellants comments that the shutter box could easily be removed in the future, however it would still cause harm to the character and appearance of the shopfront whilst it remains in place.
10. The appellant has referred me to the primary school opposite the site, which is also a building of local historic or architectural interest and has UPVC windows. I have no details before me including the circumstances which led to permission being granted for these windows. I also note that the property was locally listed after the changes to the windows. Nevertheless, this building has different architectural features to the appeal site and therefore is not directly comparable.
11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the historic shopfront. It thereby conflicts with policies 5, 22 and 39 of the LP, which seek amongst other things to provide high standards of sustainable design and conserve and enhance historic townscape features including historic shop fronts.

Other Matters

12. The appellant states that the roller shutter is required to prevent the shopfront glazing being broken. However, I have not been provided with any alternative solutions which could protect the glazing and therefore cannot be satisfied that there are other no alternative options which would be less harmful than the proposed solid shutter.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR