



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2025

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/24/3355905

Flat 12A, 24 Palace Court, City of Westminster, London W2 4HU

- 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 Dr James Gillies against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02620/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as “I propose to replace the flat's 10 sash windows, like-for-like, with the exception of installing double-glazed instead of single-glazed panes.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and area, bearing in mind the sites location within the Bayswater Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The scheme seeks the replacement of ten windows to a fifth-floor flat at the appeal site. The details state that the existing single glazed windows would be replaced with double glazed units, on a like-for-like basis. The appellant has provided a quotation for the works which shows the particulars of the proposed windows. However, in terms of the specifics of the design and detailing of the windows themselves, this is somewhat lacking. While there is a brief written description, there is only a basic and insufficient drawing of the appearance of the units. Furthermore, there are no details provided of the windows that are proposed to be replaced. The appellant alludes to being able to provide photographs of these, yet none have been provided. In the absence of details of the existing windows, together with sufficient details of the proposed, it is not possible to assess any effect that the development would have.
4. Accordingly, it is not possible to ascertain if the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and area, including whether the scheme would preserve or enhance the Bayswater Conservation Area. Thus, it can not be concluded that the development would accord with policies 38, 39 and 40 of the City of Westminster – City Plan (adopted April 2021). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development employs exemplary standards of design, that heritage assets are conserved and enhanced, and that development is sensitively designed.

Other Matters

5. The appellant draws my attention to the provision of statements to cover a variety of matters, which it is contended are irrelevant to the development applied. However, these are matters unrelated to the particulars of the appeal that is before me.
6. It has also been stated that there are numerous examples of window replacements that have taken place which, in the appellant's opinion, have resulted in harm to the character and appearance of the area. None of these examples have been provided to me. In any event, this matter has little bearing on my decision.
7. Further comment is made of the lack of co-operation on the part of the Council in dealing with the application and the requirements which it has sought. I am unable to make any comment on this matter and it is not something that affects my consideration of the merits of the appeal.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR