



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/25/3370082

1-19 Lancaster Close, Hackney, London N1 5TU

- 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 Habinteg Housing Association Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0518.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing timber windows and doors with wood effect uPVC windows and doors with matching profiles.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of existing timber windows and doors with wood effect uPVC windows and doors with matching profiles at 1-19 Lancaster Close, Hackney, London N1 5TU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2025/0518 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no's: Location Plan (Scale 1:1250), Location Plan (1655-30-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-101 P1), Proposed Elevations (1655-30-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-103 P1), Typical Window Detail Drawing (D01) and Customer Window Drawing (Ref: 305995).
 - 3) The proposed windows and doors shall be uPVC with a Rosewood timber appearance to replicate the existing windows and doors.

Preliminary Matter

2. A nearby appeal¹ within the same Conservation Area similarly proposes replacement windows and doors. Although there are similarities between the appeal proposals, each appeal is considered separately on its own merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kingsland Conservation Area.

¹ APP/U5360/W/25/3370081

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises of a predominantly three storey property on the corner of Downham Road and Hertford Road. It has a long rectangular form and a generally simple elevation to Downham Road which is punctuated by two projecting gables. The Kingsland Conservation Area² (CA) within which it is located contains a range of uses and buildings of different periods, styles and scales, which most immediately can be seen on the opposite side of Downham Road with buildings ranging from 3 to around 6 storeys in height and with an equally varied elevational form. This variance reflects the historic development of the area and contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
5. The appeal property is part of a group of buildings of a similar architectural style and dates from the late 20th century. It forms a relatively recent development compared to much earlier buildings referenced in the Kingsland Road Conservation Area Appraisal. The differing ages of buildings contributes to the significance of the CA through an understanding of how the area has evolved over time, but the appeal property's modern origins mean it does not share the same historic or architectural value of older buildings. It has a simpler elevational form and utilises modern brick facing material and roof tiles, despite the property having some traditional elements.
6. This includes the existing windows and doors that are formed of timber. However, the Council has acknowledged that these are not historic. As the proposed windows would have a timber effect finish, with other features that the appellant sets out would authentically replicate the existing timber windows, I consider that they would be of a sympathetic design and not appear overly regular and shiny in their appearance.
7. The use of timber is a consistent feature in the CA, however, from my site observations, there are a variety of windows and doors of differing designs and materials that can be seen in the immediate context around the appeal site. As such, and given the proposed windows and doors are similar to the existing, and on a modern building, I do not consider that they would be detrimental to the significance of the CA or the setting of the nearby De Beauvoir Conservation Area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would be compliant with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Hackney Local Plan 2033 and Policies D1, D3 and HC1 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, to preserve the significance of the historic environment. The development would also not conflict with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).
9. Reference has been made to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which states that modern materials, such as uPVC may not be appropriate and seeks for new windows to match the originals with regard to choice of materials. Whilst the proposal would be contrary to this, it would not conflict with the SPD's aims, which include maintaining townscape character.

² Also referenced as the Kingsland Road Conservation Area

Other Matters

10. Reference has been made to maintenance and sustainability considerations by various parties. Given my conclusion on the main issue, it is not necessary for me to consider these matters further.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. I have imposed a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans.
12. A materials condition is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host building and to preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR