From: planning@northyorkmoors.org.uk
Sent: 01 June 2021 16:49
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on NYM/2021/0348/FL - Case Officer Miss Kelsey Blain - Received from Building Conservation at The Old Vicarage, Bondgate, Helmsley, York, YO62 5BP,

The proposal seeks to replace existing timber windows and doors with uPVC composite windows and doors.

The existing building is one half of a former range of agricultural outbuildings associated with nearby farmhouse formerly named Raincliffe Farm. It is built in the local vernacular style of stone under a pantile roof.

The existing windows are not a style we would permit today in an agricultural conversion, yet they are still timber, the material of choice for windows and shutters historically. The principle of replacement with uPVC with is a modern material is wholly objectionable. There are a number justifications put forward by the applicant for the proposal and I will discuss each in turn.

Modern materials will improve the longevity of the windows This is entirely misinformed as uPVC has an estimated service life of 30 years and that is with regular maintenance. Timber on the other hand, when serviced will last for 100s of years. Accoya for example can come with a 50 year guarantee, far in excess of any uPVC window

uPVC will improve the energy efficiency of the building Timber is proven to be a superior insulator when compared to uPVC. In addition to this is it also lower in embodied carbon and more easily recycled.

Stratigic policy I is not considered by the applicant which covers the historic environment, it specifically reference the qualities of vernacular building and materials. In exercising of its planning functions section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that LPAs shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The replacement of timber with a modern material in a historical building will not preserve the buildings. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that “Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.” Paragraph 196 “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal”. There is no clear and convincing justification as the arguments put forward are ill conceived. There is also no public benefits outlined to this proposal.
I therefore recommend it for refusal.

Comments made by Building Conservation of The Old Vicarage Bondgate Helmsley York
YO62 5BP

Comment Type is Strongly Object
Letter ID: 566628