



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by C Megginson

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/21/3285983

18 Priory Street, York, YO1 6EX

- 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 Peter Thomas Charlton against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01614/FUL, dated 30 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the removal of existing timber single glazed vertical sliding sash windows and replacement with UPVC double glazed vertical sliding sash windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the York Central Historic Core conservation area (CA). The Conservation Area Appraisal¹ notes that Priory Street is recognised for its tall and grand 19th century terraces with bay windows and decorative doorcases. The appeal site is located on the southern side of Priory Street and forms part of a distinct, well preserved terraced row of three storey townhouses, dating from the 1880's such as is recognised in the Appraisal. The terrace makes a positive contribution to the character of the CA and the appearance of the area. The terraces have not been altered significantly and a key part of this contribution is the uniformity of details across the houses within the terrace and the high quality nature of their regular, rhythmic design.
4. The proposal seeks to replace the existing wooden sash windows of No 18 Priory Street with UPVC windows of the same design. A building's fenestration is an important component in defining its visual and architectural character. The appellant states that the frames would be produced to a mid-shewn design

¹ York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal Area Twenty One Micklegate

with the option of a subtle 'woodgrain' texture. However, I am not convinced based on the evidence provided that this finish would be similar to that created by painted timber, and consider that this would introduce a material finish to the appeal building that is not prevalent in other buildings found elsewhere within the CA. UPVC is a material that has an artificial texture and a more uniform finish, when new and when aging, than painted timber windows. While the matching colour of the proposed UPVC windows would provide some harmony with other windows in the street, it would still be possible in my view to discern them as modern insertions that would be an incongruous intrusion into the historic street scene.

5. Furthermore, although the appellant states that the drawings provided demonstrate that the proposed sectional profiles are the same as the existing timber profiles, many of the measurements would be wider than the existing sections. While such differences may not be significant, cumulatively they would add to the adverse visual effect of the proposed windows over the existing and I do not consider that they would appear as 'like for like'.
6. I noted that UPVC windows have been installed in other properties in the wider street, but that these tended to be isolated examples that failed to harmonise with the overall character and appearance of fenestration in the CA. In any event, the presence of UPVC elsewhere in the street is not a strong point in favour of the appeal scheme.
7. The harm that would arise would be localised and therefore the impact on the CA as a whole would be less than substantial within the meaning of Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In weighing the public benefits of the proposal against the harm identified, the appellant has suggested that the proposal would have lower maintenance requirements and would provide a stable and consistent aesthetic. They have also stated the benefits of lower capital and maintenance costs and energy efficiency benefits. However, I have not been presented with substantive evidence to suggest that UPVC windows significantly outperform well installed and maintained timber windows in this regard, which could also be double glazed. Maintenance requirements and costs and initial capital costs are private benefits, and, as such would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to which I am required to give great weight.
8. As such, the public benefits of the appeal scheme are of no more than limited weight. As a consequence, the public benefits arising from the proposed development would not outweigh the harm I have identified, to which I am required to give great weight.
9. Thus, my overall conclusion is that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the CA, and in doing so would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA and public benefits would not outweigh this harm. The proposal would be in conflict with Policies D1, D4 and D11 of the Publication Draft City of York Local Plan (2018) and Policies GP1, HE2 and HE3 of the Development Control Local Plan (2005), which seek to secure high quality design that enhances or reinforces local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C. Megginson

INSPECTOR