
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Y/25/3360634

298 South Lambeth Road, Lambeth, London SW8 1UJ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Claire Rose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/01441/LB.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of existing timber framed sash windows and French window at the rear of the property with timber framed double glazed sash windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to the Grade II listed building known as '282-298, South Lambeth Road SW8', which is located within the South Lambeth Road Conservation Area (CA). In reaching my decision, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
3. Submitted plans E01 and E02 are annotated with references to 'new slab', 'under floor heating', a 'new shower room layout', 'Proposed pushing back of stud wall...'.
4. The appellant has confirmed that these elements are not part of the works to be considered, and I have considered the proposal solely on the basis of the works described in the banner line above.

Main Issues

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the South Lambeth Road CA.

Reasons

6. The appeal site consists of one dwelling of a lengthy terrace, '282-298, South Lambeth Road SW8' that is Grade II listed¹. The early 19th century terrace was listed in 1981 and consists of stock brick, three storey properties with two windows on each floor and a parapet front. The listing description makes reference to gauged flat brick arches to sash windows with glazing bars in stucco lined reveals,

¹ List Entry Number:1357947

and six-panel doors with a cornice head and fanlight (mostly radial patterned) under a round gauged brick arch with impost blocks, in a slightly projecting brick panel with a mutated cornice.

7. Given the above, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests as a good illustration of a well-preserved late-Georgian terrace, which displays many strong architectural features that are typical of its period. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are its architectural detailing, consistency and group value.
8. No 298 sits at the end of the listed terrace, and whilst attached to a large modern nondescript three storey apartment block, makes a valuable contribution to the architectural consistency of the building and is integral to the special architectural and historic interest, and group value, of 282-298, South Lambeth Road SW8 as an entity.
9. Pertinent to the appeal and as noted in the listing description, the existing timber sash windows are of a form, design, materials and finish that are in keeping with the age and style of the property. They provide a degree of authenticity to the fenestration with proportions and details that are historically appropriate. Whilst I observed examples of alternative fenestration details within the terrace, in general the fenestration is appropriate and is an integral contributor to the consistency and group value of the wider terrace. In these respects, the fenestration contributes in a positive way to the architectural integrity of the property and therefore its special interest and significance.
10. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the South Lambeth Road CA are mainly derived from its domination by 19th century residential housing, which provides a good representation of suburban development of the time along a main route into London. It follows, therefore, that the appeal property, being a prominent early 19th century residential terrace of historic and architectural interest, makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
11. The replacement windows would result in a loss of historic fabric. The submitted conditions surveys of the existing door and windows make it clear that they are in poor condition, have been repaired numerous times previously and are, in part, now beyond further repair. From what I observed I have no reason to disagree in this respect, indeed a recent consent² has been given for the replacement of the existing windows with 8.8mm acoustic laminate glass. The proposed 2mm increase in the width of the internal glazing bar to accommodate the heavier glazing panes, with external glazing bar detail unchanged, was considered by the Council to be acceptable.
12. The proposal before me seeks consent to replace the three rear elevation sash windows with slimline (12mm total depth) double glazing (insulated glass units), with 22mm glazing bars. The ground floor rear French window door would also be replaced with similar double glazing.
13. Whilst the replacement timber units would be of an appropriate material and glazing bar pattern, the appellants do not dispute the Council's assertion that the

² Application reference 23/04091/LB and 23/04090/FUL

external element of the glazing bar would be double the width of the existing (increasing from 4mm to 8mm), and its depth would be reduced from 6.3mm to 4mm. In addition, the new units would have a shallower rebate compared to the existing single glazed fenestration. The double glazing would also result in greater reflectivity, and the example showroom images provided shows a prominent black spacer strip.

14. At close inspection, these alterations would result in an alteration to the external appearance of the fenestration, with an inaccurate, flatter, less elegant appearance and would result in an unsympathetic design. I do not agree with the appellants assertion that this 'moderate difference' is 'entirely minimal'. Whilst the differences may each be subtle, when taken together across the entire rear elevation, they would be apparent. Overall, in this instance, the proposed windows would not match the detailing, definition nor merit of the existing windows, alter their character and would erode the authenticity and integrity of the listed building.
15. Whilst views of the rear are limited, the upper floor windows are visible from Teversham Lane. In any case, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether changes to them are apparent from public vantage points. Examples of differing fenestration design and materials within the terrace are referred to by the appellant, however no substantive details of these examples of provided, including the circumstances and policy context of any consents, which prevents direct comparison. However, even if non historical details were permitted, this is not a sufficient justification for the further weakening of the architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
16. I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, 282-298, South Lambeth Road SW8' and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
17. Whilst public views of the rear are limited, given the prominence of the building, the above harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA. It would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
18. The submitted heritage statement³ concludes that the works would result in less than substantial harm. I agree with this. Given the fairly localised nature of the works relative to the building and CA as a whole, I find the harm to both heritage assets to be, individually and cumulatively, at a minor level of 'less than substantial' but nevertheless is of considerable importance and weight.
19. There are aspects of the scheme that would undoubtedly be positive and of public benefit. Heritage benefits would result from the installation of hardwood cills where they are currently rotten, as this would be more historically and visually appropriate. This element of the scheme would sustain and enhance the listed building and preserve the character and appearance of the CA in which it sits.
20. It is not demonstrated that the proposed scheme is the only way of achieving improvements in relation to matters such as ventilation, enhanced acoustic and thermal performance, particularly given the previously approved scheme. As such, these benefits carry modest weight in favour of the appeal.

³ Heritage Impact Assessment by Winterburn Heritage & Planning February 2025, para 5.4

21. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. Given the scale of development, these benefits would be small. There is no substantive evidence before me that the development and works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the listed building.
22. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.
23. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policy Q20 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021), which amongst other matters, requires development proposals to conserve and not harm the significance/special interest of listed buildings.

Conclusion

24. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR