
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2015

by Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 November 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/15/3133307

The Grey House, Main Street, Harome, York, YO62 5JF

- 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 John Marwood against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
 - The application 15/00570/HOUSE, dated 13 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2015.
 - The development proposed is replacement windows to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Harome Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Grey House is a prominent and attractive property in the heart of the Harome Conservation Area. The building features traditional style, horizontal sliding sash, timber-framed windows, the detail of which is readily apparent due to the proximity of the front elevation of the dwelling to the footway.
4. Such windows are a distinctive and attractive feature of a number of traditional properties in the village. Given this, and the prominence of the building, its existing front elevation windows are an important aspect of the significance of the Conservation Area as a heritage asset.
5. The proposed windows would differ significantly in terms of materials, form and appearance from the existing ones in having foiled upvc frames, being side-hung casements and featuring 12, rather than the current 18, panes. Whilst I note that the Council has not advised the appellant of a type of replacement window which would be acceptable, I conclude that, in combination, these differences would result in the loss of the distinctiveness of the property's windows and would, thus, significantly undermine the contribution the dwelling makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, albeit that the harm would be less than substantial in terms of the guidance set out in paragraphs 132-134 of the *National Planning*

Policy Framework. Nonetheless, the scheme would thus conflict with policies SP12 and SP16 of the adopted *Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy*, which indicate that distinctive elements of the district’s historic environment will be preserved and, where appropriate, enhanced and that development proposals should be of high quality design, respecting the context of their surroundings in terms of, amongst other things, architectural detail.

6. I recognise that there are a number of properties in the village which feature upvc windows of various styles. However, they make up less than a third of the dwellings along Main Street and their existence, and the lack of objection from neighbours and the Parish Council, do not justify the proposal given the harm I have found it would cause. I also note that permission was granted for windows of the same style as those proposed for The Grey House at Greystones Cottage, although I have no details about the nature of the windows they replaced and, thus, it is not clear to me that the situations are comparable.
7. I appreciate the scheme would have daylight, heat retention, water ingress, condensation, maintenance costs and fire escape benefits which would, no doubt, improve the living conditions for the occupants of the dwelling. However, whilst giving these factors, and the age of the appellant and his wife, weight in my decision I ultimately conclude that they do not outweigh the harm the proposed windows would cause to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Malcolm Rivett

INSPECTOR