
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3368871

62 Casewick Road, Lambeth, London SE27 0SY

- 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 Mrs Ksenia Kaminker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/00930/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of single-glazed windows with double-glazed uPVC sash windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Based on the evidence before me and at my site visit, the development has commenced and is now substantially complete. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The appeal submission includes additional evidence which was not before the Council at the time of its decision. This includes photographs of some of the windows which were in situ prior to their replacement, and images of the now installed windows. The Procedural Guide states that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought.
4. I have considered this additional information taking into consideration the principles established by the Courts in *Holborn Studios Ltd*¹. In this case, the additional information provides further evidence in relation to the Council's reasons for refusal, rather than significant amendments to the proposal. For this reason, I consider that there would be no prejudice to any party, and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of this additional information.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises the upper floor flat within a mid-terraced, two-storey building. The properties on this side of Casewick Road appeared to be mostly sub-

¹ *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

divided into flats, whereas the opposite side of the road appeared to be mostly single dwellings. There is considerable variety of windows styles and materials within the surrounding area. The appeal property is not a listed building, nor is it located within a Conservation Area.

7. The appeal proposal seeks approval retrospectively for the installation of double-glazed, sliding sash uPVC windows.
8. Policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035, adopted September 2021 (the LP) states that when considering proposals for the alteration or extensions of buildings the council will generally expect proposals to have a design which positively responds to the original architecture, roof form, detailing, fenestration (including design, materials and means of opening) of the host building.
9. The Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 – Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit Supplementary Planning Document, adopted August 2023 (the SPD) sets out the minimum requirements for the submission of plans and drawing to support applications for replacement windows, which include clear elevations with each window proposed for replacement identified and numbered and detailed drawings (1:20 scale elevations and larger scale 1:5 or 1:2 detailed cross sections) of the original and proposed windows.
10. I understand that when the application was originally considered that the Council requested additional plans to be provided. This information was not received, and they refused the application on this basis. I have had regard to the appellant's concerns that they did not receive correspondence requesting this information which was sent by post before the application was refused. However, the appellant was aware that additional information was required prior to submission of the appeal.
11. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge that the appeal is supported by additional evidence and I was able to view the windows which have been installed, I have not been provided with any detailed plans showing the 'existing' or 'proposed' windows. Furthermore, the submitted photographs only show some of the windows. On this basis, I cannot be certain that development which has been applied for is the same as the development which has been carried out.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the replacement windows respect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Thus, the development fails to comply with Policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the LP. It would also fail to comply with the guidance set out in the SPD. Taken together, these seek to ensure development is high-quality and sustains and reinforces local distinctiveness, including architectural detailing.

Conclusion

13. 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. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR