



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2018

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/18/3193704

21 Yearby Road, Yearby TS11 8HF

- 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 Stephen Coverdale against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2017/0618/CA, dated 30 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing sub-standard double glazed false sash softwood front windows with FENSA approved uPVC false sash windows to match existing fenestration and replacement of existing softwood/single glazed front door with GRP/Wood composite to match existing fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the Yearby Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within the Yearby Conservation Area (CA) which consists of a two-row arrangement of buildings which reflect the development of the village from its historic form to the present day. The appellant confirms that the appeal property dates from the 19th Century and I saw that this brick built terraced cottage is of a traditional appearance which contributes to the CA's importance as a designated heritage asset.
5. It is proposed to replace the existing timber windows and front door with uPVC which reflects the extant fenestration as well as the false sash design of the windows. I saw that the existing windows at the appeal site and neighbouring properties have a relatively flat profile which limits their effectiveness in

- replicating traditional sash windows, which the false sash horns do little to ameliorate. The top hung design would also detract from the traditional appearance of the property when the windows are open.
6. Although no detailed drawings of the proposed frame profiles have been submitted, the appellant contends that the proposal would not add to the bulk of the existing frames and would be less bulky than a sash window design. However, the bulk of the window frames is not the only consideration and this should be balanced against the overall effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the CA. The replacement of the windows and door with a non-traditional material would alter the character of the property due to the flatter finish of uPVC and the angular appearance of the frames and glazing bars constructed from this material. I saw that this crude appearance was reflected in some other properties in the area with uPVC windows. This change in character would detract to a small but material degree from the existing windows and door of the property and would exacerbate the harm arising from their unsympathetic design. Whilst the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, I consider that the public and other benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the identified harm.
 7. In support of the appeal, the appellant has referred to a number of properties which have been granted planning permission for uPVC windows. However, the dwellings at 9 Yearby Road and Rose Cottage are more modern properties where the use of uPVC may be considered to be more appropriate. The permission for 4 Yearby Road dates from 2008 and is therefore of some age and pre-dates the advice of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2013 (SPD). I saw that the windows at Cruck Cottage appeared to be of a more suitable design reflecting traditional sash windows, and I note that this reflects the comments of the Council's Conservation Advisor where non-timber window frames may be acceptable if their appearance is appropriate. The circumstances of those decisions are therefore materially different to the appeal before me, which I have in any event determined on its own merits. Furthermore, whilst a number of properties within the CA may have uPVC windows, these served to confirm that such features can be at odds with the character and appearance of the CA.
 8. I note the frustrations expressed by the appellant in relation to the discussions with the Council leading up to this appeal. However, this is not a matter for this appeal which I have determined on its planning merits.
 9. I conclude that the proposal would fail to complement the character of the host building and to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS25 of the Council's Core Strategy 2007 and Policy DP9 of its Development Policies 2007 which require development to contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment as well as to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the SPD in respect of the use of materials which reflect the character and significance of the CA.

10. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR