
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Y/18/3210024

Peckham Rye Railway Station, Station Way, London SE15 4RX

- 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 Thomas Johnston of JCDecauxUK against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 18/AP/1066, dated 29 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2018.
 - The works proposed are the installation of two iVision displays within the station building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the installation of two iVision displays within the station building at Peckham Rye Railway Station, Station Way, London SE15 4RX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/AP/1066 dated 29 March 2018 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) Unless modified under the conditions below the works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 7891V01000000 Rev A; A01279/01; A01279/02 and A01279/03.
 - 3) All works of making good associated with the installation of the two iVision displays shall match existing original work adjacent in respect of materials used, detailed execution and finished appearance.
 - 4) The intensity of the illumination of the two iVision displays permitted by this consent shall be no greater than 600 candelas per square metre.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the works would preserve the grade II listed building (listed as Peckham Rye Station) or any features of special architectural and historic interest it possesses and whether any harm would be caused to the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a railway station that the listing description states dates from 1864-6 with later alterations and additions. It was designed by Charles Henry Driver for the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway. The front

façade is of an impressive Continental Renaissance style with round headed windows.

4. The list description indicates that the special interest of this building is concentrated in the front façade including its balconettes, the booking hall, the grand stone and cast-iron staircase and the waiting room. From the evidence before me, including the list description and my own observations I consider that the special interest/significance of the listed building is derived from its historic age, architectural features, its use of materials, its use and its association with a notable designer and historic railway company. As such, the station has communal and historic value through its role as part of the development and expansion of the railways during the Victorian period and it has aesthetic and historic value arising from its architectural qualities including the quality of the spaces associated with the booking hall and waiting room.
5. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
6. The proposal would involve the insertion of 2 floor mounted advertisement display units that would each measure around 2.3m in height, and 1m wide and 0.16m in depth. The displays would be located adjacent to existing walls on opposite sides of a space that serves as a corridor leading to and from platform 1. The corridor appears to be formed from a later addition to the building and part of the rear of the original building. The corridor is utilitarian in appearance and use. Even though, the paint scheme provides some continuity to the spaces throughout the station the corridor itself has little aesthetic value. I noted that in other parts of this corridor, that lead to other platforms, there are wall mounted, illuminated advertisement panels.
7. The display units would be seen against the background of largely plain walls and their scale, form and simple design would not appear as incongruous within this utilitarian space. Whilst they would add to the existing signage and displays that are within the corridors there would still be relatively sizeable areas of plain walls left within this corridor. Therefore, they would not appear to visually clutter this area. Moreover, whilst they would be seen in views with window openings that are in the rear elevation of the building, I do not consider that their illumination would divert attention away from those openings. This is due to the corridor itself being illuminated and therefore the illumination of the units would not be glaring. Furthermore, the intensity of the illumination can be controlled by a condition attached to the consent.
8. The modern additions to the building and the adaptations to provide access to the platforms have some limited historic value. I note that the list description states that this rear elevation and other areas of the building, which include this corridor, have lesser or no interest. Based on my observations, I have no reason to dispute this and I consider that whilst some of the fabric of the corridor may have some historic value the proposal would not harm that historic fabric. People using the station would see the display units whilst travelling through the listed building. However, their experience of the architectural qualities of the parts of the building that make important contributions to its special interest/significance, including the booking hall, would not be harmed by the proposal.

9. A previous appeal decision for a similar display unit within the booking hall has been brought to my attention. Even though, the proposed display units would be within the same listed building as that previously proposed they would be within a totally different part of the building. In addition, as stated above the booking hall is one of the areas as highlighted as making an important contribution to the special interest/significance of the listed building. However, the corridor is one of the areas highlighted as providing lesser or no interest to that special interest/significance. Therefore, I do not consider that the previous appeal decision is directly comparable to the case before me. In any case, I am required to determine the appeal on its individual merits.
10. I have considered the Council's argument that the grant of consent would set a precedent for further advertisements within the listed building. Nevertheless, each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits and any future proposals would also need to be considered in the same manner. Hence, allowing the appeal would not necessarily set a precedent for further similar works to the listed building.
11. Within this overall context and for the reasons given above, I am satisfied that the works would not harm and therefore would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Peckham Rye Station and would not harm the significance of this designated heritage asset.
12. Accordingly, the works would be in accordance with the Act. Insofar as they are a material consideration the proposal would also comply with Policies 3.15 and 3.17 of the Southwark Plan, Strategic Policy 12 of the Core Strategy and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan. These policies, amongst other things, seek to preserve or enhance Southwark's historic environment including the special interest of listed buildings. The proposal would also accord with section 16 of the Framework.

Other matters

13. The listed building is within Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area (RLPCA). Whilst the Council make no reference in their reason for refusal to the effect of the works on the character and appearance of RLPCA, section 72(1) of the Act requires that, in the exercise of planning powers in conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
14. From my observations at the site visit I consider that the significance of RLPCA is mainly drawn from its mixed character, the range of built development within it, including the number and quality of historic buildings and the relationship of the buildings to each other and Peckham Rye Station and the railway. I note that the Council are committed to restoring and de-cluttering the area around the station. Nevertheless, due to my findings above, on the main issue, I consider that the works would have little impact on the wider area and as such the character and appearance of RLPCA would be preserved and its significance unharmed.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and the appellant against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the

Framework. In the interests of conciseness and enforceability the wording of some of the conditions has been amended.

16. A condition is needed to secure compliance with the submitted plans and to provide certainty as to what has been permitted. By their nature the materials and finishes of the display units would not match that of the adjacent original work therefore this part of the Council's suggested conditions is not necessary. However, the materials and finished of any making good works required in association with the proposal should match that of adjacent original work to safeguard the special interest/significance of the heritage asset. A condition controlling the illumination intensity of the display units is also required to safeguard the special interest/significance of the heritage asset.

Conclusion

17. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D. Boffin

INSPECTOR