



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2024

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T0355/Y/24/3344976

Tangier Island Water Works, Tangier Lane, Eton SL4 6BB

- 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 Mr Chris Colloff of Thames Water Utilities Limited against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application reference is 23/02172.
 - The works proposed are the demolition of a disused generator building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for demolition of disused generator building at Tangier Island Water Works, Tangier Lane, Eton SL4 6BB in accordance with the terms of the application reference 23/02172 and 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) No works shall commence until:
 - a) a methodology and programme for a Level 3 building recording and analysis in accordance with guidance set out in Historic England's *Understanding Historic Buildings, A Guide to Good Recording Practice (May 2016)* is carried out; and,
 - b) the completed record in accordance with the approved methodology; is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Copies of the completed document shall be deposited to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead's Local Studies archive and the Berkshire Historic Environment Record.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeal relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), which requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
3. Since the Council issued its decision notice, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised, with the latest version published on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal remain unchanged. As a result, I have not sought further

submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by my approach.

4. For the purposes of the Act, a listed building includes any structure that is within its curtilage which has existed since before 1st July 1948. While there is some discussion within the appellant's statement of case on whether the generator building is curtilage listed, the appellant's Heritage Consultant and the Council both consider that it is curtilage listed. The appellant has also applied for listed building consent for the demolition works and I have determined this appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a listed building, known as 'Pump Houses to North of Tangier Mill House' (Ref: 1211475) or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

6. The Pump Houses date back to around 1870 and are constructed of red brick and have Welsh slate pitched roofs, with stone coped and pedimented gable ends. They have arched doorways and large arched windows. The Pump Houses contain many high quality architectural and aesthetic features, such as pilasters, entablatures, with cogged brick decoration and round plaques with insignia pediments. The buildings contain two Fourneyron outward-flow turbines, which were built in 1873 and are believed to be a unique installation.
7. A short distance away from the Pump Houses is a smaller building, which was previously the generator building. The generator building was constructed between 1915 and 1923. The rear and sides of the central element of the building are constructed of red clay bricks, with a pitched clay tile roof above. The building has a later front projection, which is timber clad and has a felt covered, flat roof. The flat roof is in a poor condition, with sky visible internally. The building has two smaller side projections, which are constructed of yellow stock bricks and have barrel vaulted roofs, which are covered with metal sheeting. One of the barrel vaulted roofs has been covered with concrete and has collapsed.
8. Based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I find that the listed building's special interest and significance insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from its historic, architectural and aesthetic interest as an illustration of 19th century industrial architecture. The Pump Houses have historic significance given the pumps within them are believed to be a unique installation. The buildings' historic fabric, use of traditional materials, large scale of its fenestration, elaborate design details and their pleasing architectural design make important contributions in these regards.
9. The proposal seeks to demolish the former generator building. The generator building has been out of operation for some time and is in a dilapidated condition. The generator building is smaller in scale than the Pump Houses, of a later date and far more functional in its design. It was also not directly associated with the operation of the Pump Houses, whose Fourneyron turbines were powered by river water. The generator building does not possess the same level of historic, architectural and aesthetic significance as found on the Pump Houses. Furthermore, the use of metal roof sheeting to the barrel roofs

and the unsympathetic use of timber cladding to the front harmfully jars with the higher quality, traditional materials found on the Pump Houses.

10. While it appears that there has been a lack of maintenance on the building in recent times, the collapse of the roof is likely to be as a result of the concrete that was overlayed, rather than caused by deliberate neglect. The building's dilapidated condition currently detracts from the setting of the Pump Houses.
11. I appreciate that there is embodied carbon within the building. Nevertheless, the building materials could be recycled. Furthermore, additional carbon would be emitted through the restoration works, in particular the new roofs. In addition, there is no alternative viable use before me to secure the long-term preservation of this building.
12. While later additions tell a story and add to the narrative of a building, some of this can be of very limited value. Overall, I find that the proposal would result in the removal of a dilapidated and unsympathetic later addition, which would not harm the special interest of the listed building.
13. Overall, I find that the proposed works would satisfy the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies within the Framework. Listed building appeals are not subject to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Consequently, they do not need to be determined in accordance with the development plan, although relevant provisions can nevertheless be material considerations. In this case, I find that the proposal would comply with Policy HE1 of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033, adopted February 2022, insofar as this policy requires that the historic environment is conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to its significance.

Conditions

14. In the interest of certainty, a condition specifying timescales is required. A condition securing a building record and analysis is also required to ensure accurate records are retained of the building.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

A James

INSPECTOR