
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: 14th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Y/19/3230322

5 Tabard Centre, Prioress Street, London SE1 4UZ

- 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 Mrs Ness against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref.19/AP/0849, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The works proposed are described as 'the creation of a mezzanine within a double-height space, in addition to listed building consent 18/AP/0849'.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The Council described the works as the 'creation of a mezzanine floor within a double-height space in existing flat'. That is a more succinct description of the proposal and I have adopted it for the purposes of the appeal.
2. The reference to listed building consent ref.18/AP/0849 is important however. In it, the Council authorised works to provide a mezzanine floor within the space, though it would be smaller in its compass than that before me. The grant of consent is a significant material consideration.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the creation of a mezzanine floor within a double-height space in existing flat at 5 Tabard Centre, Prioress Street, London SE1 4UZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref.19/AP/0849, dated 19 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) All works and finishes, including works of making good, shall match existing original work adjacent, in respect of materials used, detailed execution, and finished appearance, except where indicated otherwise on the approved plans.

Main Issue

4. The Tabard Centre is a former Board School, in the Gothic Revival style, that was converted into flats in the 1990s. It is a Grade II listed building. In that context, the main issue to be considered is the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, having regard to what has already been authorised.

Reasons

5. The double-height space that the proposed mezzanine floor would be inserted within is awkward in proportion, being higher than it is wide. The mezzanine floor and staircase already permitted will reduce the loftiness of the space but, like the Council, I do not believe it would have any materially injurious impact on the special interest of the listed building.
6. The additional extent of mezzanine floor in the proposal before me, which is limited in size relative to that already approved, would retain a void adjacent to the main double-height window and stop short of the smaller double-height window adjacent, allowing the lofty proportions of the space overall, and important original detailing around the windows, to be readily appreciated.
7. Part of the additional mezzanine floor would extend across the well-detailed former opening between the space and the main building beyond, but it would not run into the depth of the opening and would be read as a later insertion entirely separate from it. There would be no harmful obscuring of the former opening or its detailing as a result.
8. As a consequence, while more extensive than the mezzanine floor approved by the Council, the proposal before me would have no harmful impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
9. On that basis, subject to a condition to deal with any making good required, there would be no departure from the requirements of s.16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the approach to the historic environment in Policies 3.15 and 3.16 of the Southwark Plan (2007), or advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Paul Griffiths

INSPECTOR