



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2023

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Y/23/3325260

26 Roupell Street, Lambeth, London SE1 8TB

- 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 Charles Oakley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 23/00654/LB, dated 28 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2023.
- The works proposed are the partial demolition of partition at ground floor level, relocation of kitchen to front reception room, reopening of original rear-facing window with installation of a door and construction of an ensuite shower cubicle within existing bathroom space.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeal relates to a listed building consent, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building.

Reasons

4. 26 Roupell Street is a 2-storey dwelling that forms part of a terrace of properties, 26-42 Roupell Street SE1, of a similar design. These are consecutively numbered dwellings on the southern side of the road which are said to date from the early to mid-19th century and are Grade II listed¹.
5. The building is a purpose built dwelling constructed of yellow stock bricks and with stone coped parapets, with two mono-pitched roofs and a central valley gutter between. It includes a front lounge accessed from a short, panelled corridor, with a six panelled entrance door with fanlight above by the street and a non-original internal doorway next to an arched opening with pilasters at the other end. This leads into a second lounge with stairs to the first floor level.
6. Beyond this room is a dining room and kitchen, leading to a rear walled garden area, with rear vehicular access.

¹ List Entry Number: 1338587

7. At first floor level there is a landing area and separate bathroom, each with a rooflight, with a further bedroom to the front. There is also a rear bedroom with two timber sliding sash windows and where a butterfly-type roof is clearly evident in the shape of the ceiling.
8. The Council states that a 2-storey rear infill extension was constructed in the late 20th century, containing the ground floor dining room and the first floor rear bedroom; the ground floor kitchen is in a small outrigger to this extension, with mono-pitched roof, to partly match the butterfly-type roofs at upper floor level.
9. In my view, the significance of this designated heritage asset, insofar as it relates to this appeal, stems from its location and historical development as part of the Lambeth Estate, together with the remaining original aspects of its construction, including the internal layout.
10. I note the planning history of the building, including previous approvals awaiting implementation. The proposal would entail the creation of an opening in the wall between the front lounge, which would become a kitchen, and the second lounge, which would become a dining room. Sliding doors would be used to separate these rooms. The larger of the two existing openings between the second lounge and the existing dining room would also be reduced in width slightly, by reinstating part of the wall to its original location and adding glazed doors.
11. At first floor level, the bathroom would be subdivided and an ensuite for the rear bedroom created; this would be what is described as a 'joinery item within the original volume' of the bathroom, rather than a conventionally separate room. Access would be through a new door opening, using an original window opening extended to the floor, which had been sealed within the northern wall of the rear bedroom at the time of its construction in the 1980s, as part of the 2-storey infill extension.
12. Whilst this building has been subject to various and substantial changes since it was originally constructed, it is still possible to appreciate much of its original layout and function as a 19th century dwelling.
13. The front lounge, as a separate room accessed from the entrance corridor, is part of this and contributes to the building's special interest and significance. The creation of a new and substantial opening in the southern wall of the front lounge would significantly detract from that, and would create something of an enfilade effect, which would be out of keeping with the original building. This would cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset.
14. At first floor level, the creation of a new access from the rear bedroom and the subdivision of the bathroom to include a separate ensuite would be inconsistent with the historical layout of rooms within the building. I do not accept that the design, scale, massing and position of the proposed ensuite within the bathroom would preserve the special interest and significance of the building as the appellant intends. In my view this too would cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset.
15. The reinstatement of part of what was the southern elevation of the dwelling at ground floor level, and the insertion of glazed doors, would be more akin to the original layout than the current arrangements. However, this would concern the

interface between the original building and the late 20th century infill extension, and a doorway at this location was not part of the original building. Consequently, whilst a public benefit, I consider this would be very limited.

16. I also note the intention of the appellant to reveal historic features of the building as part of these works. This would include the chimney within the bathroom, as well as details of the original window opening. The window is currently hidden within the wall separating the bathroom from the rear bedroom, and the opening would be revealed but enlarged so as to accommodate a doorway to the ensuite.
17. Whilst I consider these works would also benefit the special interest and significance of the listed building, and so would be a public benefit, very little detail has been provided by the appellant, they are limited in scope and, with regard to the window, would not be a full restoration. Consequently, I give this public benefit very limited weight.
18. In the round, I do not consider the very limited public benefits of the proposed works at ground or first floor level would outweigh the less than substantial harm I have identified to this designated heritage asset.
19. For these reasons, the proposed works would fail to preserve a Grade II listed building. In so far as relevant, the proposal would conflict with Policy Q20 (statutory listed buildings) of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 and with the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, in this regard.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin
INSPECTOR