



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019

by Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Y/19/3223619

35 Lansdowne Gardens, London SW8 2EL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Edward Falinski against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref.18/03812/LB, dated 5 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2018.
 - The works proposed are described as 'refurbishment and minor modifications to lower ground floor of a listed dwelling-house'.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. In their decision notice, the Council better described the works as the enlargement of two doorways to the existing kitchen/dining room and the reconfiguration of the hallway and store rooms, together with a partial alteration of a partition wall at lower ground floor level. I have therefore adopted this description in my decision below.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the enlargement of two doorways to the existing kitchen/dining room and the reconfiguration of the hallway and store rooms, together with a partial alteration of a partition wall at lower ground floor level at 35 Lansdowne Gardens, London SW8 2EL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref.18/03812/LB, dated 5 September 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the condition that the works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.

Main Issue

3. Nos.35-41 (odd) date from the mid 19th Century and form a quadrant-shaped terrace. The terrace is listed at Grade II and lies within the Lansdowne Gardens Conservation Area. Given that the works are internal, and would have no external manifestation, the main issue to be considered is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Reasons

4. I can readily appreciate why the Council is keen to protect the plan form of the dwelling as this is an important part of the special interest (or significance) of the listed building (a designated heritage asset).

5. However, the evidence of the appellant is clear that the lower ground floor is much altered, following the relatively recent conversion of No.35 back to a single dwelling (1998), and bears limited resemblance to what would have been the historic layout at this level. I saw as much at my site visit. Moreover, while the Council sets great store on the importance of single door openings, a point I can understand in principle, the appellant's evidence shows that larger openings at lower ground floor level of houses in the terraces around Lansdowne Gardens, are not alien features.
6. In that context, I am of the view that the relatively minor alterations proposed would respect what remains of the historic plan form of the building at lower ground floor level, and involve no harmful removal of historic fabric. As a result, I am content that the works proposed would have no detrimental impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
7. There would be accord, therefore, with the requirements of s.16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy Q20 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) that seeks to protect listed buildings, and the general approach of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the significance of designated heritage assets.
8. I read with interest the appeal decision referred to by the Council¹ relating to No.28 Lansdowne Gardens but would observe that the openings the Inspector was concerned about in that case were on the upper ground floor which places the analysis in a different context. The upper ground floor is home to the main reception rooms of these houses which have a completely different character to the more functional spaces at the level below that I am concerned with. As such, the approach taken, and the decision, is of limited relevance.
9. For all those reasons, I conclude that subject to a condition to deal with the commencement of the works, the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Griffiths

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/N5660/E/10/2130676