



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2022

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/Y/21/3282900

Bay Horse, 28 Long Street, Easingwold, York, YO61 3HS

- 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 James Newton against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01657/LBC, dated 28 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2021.
 - The works proposed are to replace the existing single glazed semi rotten sash windows with replacement wooden double glazed sash windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. There are discrepancies in the information submitted around the exact nature of the works proposed and the particular windows involved. The appeal documents clarify that the proposed works relate to the sashes of the five windows within the front elevation of the property only. The existing box frames are to be retained. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Easingwold Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The property is a Grade II listed dwelling constructed from red-brown brick under a pantile roof. The existing wooden sash windows are set in flush wood architraves with painted splayed lintels with keyblocks and cills. The building is located within the Easingwold Conservation Area and its traditional design, including the windows, contribute to its character and appearance.
6. The existing two over two sashes incorporate single glazed panes with a central glazing bar. It is clear from my site visit, and the evidence provided, that the existing timber is rotten in some areas and in need of repair. However, it has

not been demonstrated that the existing timber cannot be satisfactorily repaired or that wholesale replacement of the sashes is necessary. Historic fabric should always be retained where it is possible to do so.

7. The proposed replacement sashes would seek to reflect the general design of the existing windows and be constructed from timber. However, the use of double glazing with its different reflective qualities and a chunkier profile would result in a far more modern appearance. This would be compounded by the proposed 'plant-on' glazing bars, which would not accurately reflect the existing window design, instead appearing contrived. This would amount to less than substantial harm to the listed building in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but is nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
8. Great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation. I have had regard to the potential for improving thermal efficiency within the building and the safety benefits that would arise from stronger double glazing. However, these are predominantly private benefits and whilst to some extent, they could be considered public benefits as well, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the listed building and its special architectural features.
9. For the same reasons, the works would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, which derives much of its significance from the traditional architectural detail of the buildings within it. Again, this would amount to less than substantial harm but there would be no public benefits arising that sufficient to outweigh the harm.
10. Therefore, the proposal would be in conflict with the Act, paragraph 197 of the Framework and development plan policies insofar as relevant.
11. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR