



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

**by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 05 JUNE 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/D/24/3340244**

**30 Farleigh Road, Hackney, London, N16 7TH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Andre Fairweather of Place for People against the decision of the London Borough of Hackney Council.
  - The application Ref is 2023/2928.
  - The development proposed is the replacement of existing single glazed timber framed windows and doors with new double glazed slimline uPVC framed windows and doors.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The name of the appellant in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. It differs from the name that appears on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of 30 Farleigh Road and surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal building is a three-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on the southern side of Farleigh Road. It has a traditional appearance, featuring timber sash windows and a timber front door, which is consistent with most of the other buildings on the road.
5. The appellant states the proposed doors and windows would be 'slimline' and a like-for-like replacement in terms of appearance. However, they would have noticeably thicker frames and a plainer, unadorned appearance. The use of uPVC rather than painted timber would jar with the traditional appearance of the building. The replacement windows would be easily visible within the streetscene and would be read as incongruous features. Given this, the resultant façade would contrast with the properties in the direct vicinity. The introduction of uPVC framed windows and doors would thus erode the appearance and historical character of the appeal property and the street scene.
6. The appellant also contends that the character of Farleigh Road is varied and refers to properties featuring uPVC windows and doors. However, the properties referred to are either more modern buildings that are not reflective

of the mostly traditional character of the street or are properties which lie some distance away from the appeal site. I am also not aware of the full circumstances that pertained at the time that they were installed.

7. I also have had regard to the replacement windows referred to at 69 and 84 Farleigh Road which are similar to the appeal scheme. However, the street scene is still predominately characterised by traditional timber windows and doors. Therefore, these particular references do not lend any significant weight in favour of the appeal.
8. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of 30 Farleigh Road and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan (2033) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which, together, aim to ensure that development is well-designed, responds to local context and complements historic character. I have also had regard to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2009) which states that modern materials, such as uPVC, are generally unacceptable for traditional building forms.

### **Other Matters**

9. The appellant states that the installation of new double glazed slimline uPVC window and doors would improve safety as well as thermal and acoustic performance. Whilst I have little before me to suggest the proposal would be the only way of achieving the sought improvements, these factors attract a limited amount of weight in favour of the development.

### **Conclusion**

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*Thomas Courtney*

INSPECTOR