



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2024 by M Long BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/24/3336673

30 Pump House Close, Southwark, London SE16 7HS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nalin Parbhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref is 23/AP/3175.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two storey roof extension to the existing family dwellinghouse, including roof terrace, materials, new windows and doors to match existing, and alterations to the ground floor level fenestration including new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The site is adjacent to the London Hydraulic Power Company former Pumping Station, a Grade II listed building. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard is had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
5. The former Pumping Station derives considerable significance from its industrial history and surviving architecture. It is a good example of late Victorian industrial architecture and exemplifies the London Hydraulic Company's design typology. It has a distinctive series of tall arched windows, as well as oculi windows in the gable ends, that are completed with red brick dressings. There is also a very tall octagonal chimney which is a highly visible and unique feature within the wider area.
6. The area around the appeal site was once open industrial land but has been redeveloped into an area dense with residential buildings. The presence of

taller residential blocks, including another nearby which is under construction, limits views towards the main buildings of the former Pump House. The modern terrace of Pump House Close and the boundary walls around the site create a distinct sense of enclosure. Therefore, views of the main buildings are limited to the immediate area around the site. Nevertheless, in these local views they are seen as a complex of buildings and their architecture reveals their industrial past. The chimney is significantly taller than the main buildings and is therefore seen in various views from some distance. The setting of the listed building therefore makes a small, but nonetheless valuable contribution to its significance.

7. The appeal site is part of a larger terrace arranged around a gated forecourt area forming Pump House Close. Although relatively modern, the terrace has 'warehouse-style' architectural detailing, which distinguishes it from other residential buildings in the area. As such, it relates more closely to the industrial history of the area and the former Pumping Station than other residential blocks nearby.
8. The appeal dwelling is a three-storey, end-of-terrace property and the closest part of the terrace to the listed building. It is set down from its neighbour, Nos 22-29, so that it is a similar height to the central building of the former Pump House. This creates a step down from the appeal terrace to the listed building, which gives a sense of deference and space between the modern and historic buildings. This step down is clearly visible from Pump House Close, and the surrounding areas in Albatross Way and Canada Estate.
9. This lower height of the appeal property ensures that the modern terrace does not dominate the lower buildings of the former Pump House. This gives a sense of space around the former Pumping Station despite the dense development close by and allows the form and architecture of the listed building to be appreciated. Therefore, the design and scale of the appeal property and the terrace affect the way the listed building is experienced, and make a positive contribution to the setting, and thereby significance, of the listed building.
10. The proposal would significantly increase the height of the appeal property. Although there are other tall residential blocks in the local area, none are as close to the listed building as the appeal property. They therefore form the backdrop to the former Pump House rather than its immediate context. Given its proximity to the listed building, the scale of the proposal would make it a dominant feature in views towards the main buildings of the former Pump House. While it would not significantly affect views of the chimney, or obscure views of the Pump House, it would diminish the sense of space around the listed building. This would detract from its setting.
11. The design of the proposed extension would include features from the existing terrace, which reflects elements of the listed building, and the materials would be consistent with the rest of the terrace. The gable would be a similar height to those of neighbouring properties, but when seen from the rear the parapet wall would be significantly higher than that of the neighbouring dwelling. From the front, the brick parapet would adjoin the timber clad element of the neighbour, which currently stands out as a distinctive design feature reflecting the warehouse-style of the terrace. Consequently, the proposal would create an awkward relationship with the neighbouring property, diminishing its prominence as a design feature of the terrace.

12. Furthermore, the existing terrace has a large space above the top floor windows to the parapet wall and gable features. The proposal would have a much smaller gap, which would stand out as notably different to the rest of the terrace. Accordingly, the design of the proposed extension would draw the eye due to its variation from the features of the terrace.
13. For these reasons, the proposal would harmfully alter the way in which the listed buildings are experienced. Consequently, it would not preserve the setting of the listed building and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. In such circumstances, the Framework states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. While appreciating the appellant's desire to improve the quality of living accommodation for their family, such benefits would be private. No substantive public benefits have been put forward. Therefore, there is no public benefit to outweigh the harm to the significance of the listed building.
15. Overall, the proposal would result in harm to the setting of the Grade II listed building. As such, it would conflict with Policies P19 and P21 of The Southwark Plan 2019-2036, adopted February 2022, and Policy HC1 of The London Plan, adopted March 2021, which seek, amongst other things, to conserve and enhance the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings.
16. Harm to the significance of the listed building and the resulting policy conflict is a matter which I give great weight and importance. The benefits to current and future occupiers of improved living accommodation are limited, so I give them limited weight and they do not outweigh the harm identified. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission contrary to the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I appreciate that this is a revised proposal and note that Council's Design and Conservation Officer was satisfied that design issues raised in relation to a previous scheme had been addressed. Nevertheless, the Council determined that the proposal was unacceptable, for the reasons given in its decision notice and set out in more detail in the officer report.
19. I have assessed the development on its own merits and have considered all the submitted evidence. I agree with the reasoning set out above and with my representative's recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR