
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2026

by **N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/25/3375726

66 Sunderland Road, Forest Hill, Lewisham, London SE23 2PY

- 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 Mr Sakib Ajaib against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/140331.
 - The development proposed is for change of existing timber single glazed windows to timber double glazed windows at the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The plans of the windows that were provided (plan ref: 01311 A3/06 Rev A) do not match the windows that have already been installed at the property, and I have therefore considered the “as built” scheme here.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed windows on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Perry Vale and Christmas Estate Conservation Area (PVCECA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house which is set within the distinctive PVCECA. The house is highly characteristic of the homes within this area featuring white render to the first floor and set under a tiled roof. This is notwithstanding that the otherwise characteristic red brick façade to the ground floor of the property has been painted in green.
5. The property features a front bay window that spans both floors, decorative roof tiling and finials. It shares these features in common with many of the other similarly styled homes within the conservation area. The windows to the houses within the PVCECA are traditionally sash windows with glazing bars to their upper elements. Windows are timber and painted white and noteworthy for their decorative joinery and slim form.
6. The PVCECA derives its significance from the style, architectural quality and historic relevance of the design of the homes within it and this includes the exceptional detailing of the windows which were carefully considered as part of the

overall design ethos for the group of homes. Whilst number 66 Sunderland Road is not particularly unique in this context, except for the recently added green paint, it possesses important group value in contributing to an area where a very high number of properties have retained many original features.

7. The windows to number 66 have been replaced with new timber windows. These have replicated some of the form and features of the previous windows including smaller window panes to the upper sash, oriel window to one side of the front door and the use of timber. However, the windows are of a casement type and are hinged. The proportions between the upper and lower panels are unbalanced. The meeting rail between them is substantially thicker than examples at surrounding homes as are the window frames themselves.
8. Moreover, the new windows lack the detail and joinery care of the original examples and undermine the architectural integrity of the house. This is harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider PVCECA. Given the otherwise, largely intact, features to the remainder of homes within the conservation area, this is significant. The harm is at the moderate scale of less than substantial harm given the importance of the windows to the integrity of the PVCECA.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area by attaching considerable importance and weight to that desirability. This is covered in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which sets out, at paragraph 215, that 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. No direct public benefits have been drawn to my attention.
10. The appellant has nominated that other properties in the locality have UPVC windows or casement windows. However, I was unable to identify any of these during my visit to the area. Those at the appeal site are discernibly different and harmful for the reasons I have explained.
11. I have been mindful of the needs of the residents and their personal circumstances that were put forward in the appeal statement, including persons with protected characteristics, and I must have due regard to this considering the public sector equality duty set out in the Equality Act 2010. The appellant's statement indicates that one or more residents may have difficulty operating sash windows. Whilst I do attach weight to this and, although recognising the needs of those with protected characteristics, I am unable to conclude that this outweighs the harm to the PVCECA.
12. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), policies HE2 and QD9 of the Lewisham Local Plan (2025), the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) and provisions of the Framework. This is insofar as the proposal would not preserve the character or appearance of the PVCECA.

Conclusion

13. The proposal is detrimental to the character of the host property and fails to preserve the character or appearance of the PVCECA and thus conflicts with the development plan. On balance, I am satisfied that the harm caused by the development outweighs the other considerations to the extent that planning permission should not be granted.
14. The appeal is dismissed.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR