



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/25/3370084

1-6 Watercress Place, Hackney, London, N1 5TS

- 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 2025/0523.
 - 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 1-6 Watercress Place, Hackney, London N1 5TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0523 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 (1:1250), Location Plan (1655-30-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-301 P1), Proposed Elevations (1655-30-AWSM-XX-XX-DR-A-303 P1), Customer Window Drawing (Ref: 305995) and Typical Window Detail Drawing (D01).
 - 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 De Beauvoir Conservation Area.

¹ APP/U5360/W/25/3370083

Reasons

4. The De Beauvoir Conservation Area (CA) covers a regularly laid out, primarily residential area of short terraces and semi-detached villas, which also features an open space area at De Beauvoir Square. The formal layout and the architectural quality of the buildings, and the historic interest deriving from the area having been developed as part of a planned estate contribute to the significance of the CA.
5. The appeal building is situated along Downham Road with a rear parking area accessed off Hertford Road. The appeal property was constructed in the late 20th century and differs from the largely Victorian architecture in the CA. It has a simple appearance, lacking the architectural detailing of the short Victorian terraces and semi-detached villas. It also differs from the attractive arrangement of buildings set behind high quality boundary treatment, as the appeal property is set behind a tall boundary fence along Downham Road.
6. The proposed windows and doors would reflect the design of the existing windows. They would be formed of uPVC which the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out can have a different appearance to timber. The existing windows and doors on the appeal property are not however of a historic design, and in this instance, having regard to the details of the proposal before me, I consider they would authentically replicate the existing timber windows.
7. It is acknowledged that windows in the CA are almost universally timber, but the differing material in this instance would not be apparent given the design and finish proposed and the modern appearance of the subject appeal property.
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). Although the development would be contrary to certain specific guidance in the SPD, it would not conflict with the SPD's aims, which include maintaining townscape character.

Other Matters

9. Reference has been made to maintenance and sustainability considerations but given my conclusion on the main issue, it is not necessary for me to consider these matters further.
10. As the proposal is limited to replacement windows and doors and given the relative position of the appeal building to the Kingsland Conservation Area, which is to the east of Hertford Road beyond other buildings, there would be no harmful impact on the setting of this nearby heritage asset.

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