



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2023

by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/22/3290103

116 Bargery Road, Catford, London SE6 2LW

- 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 Ms Lauren Bryan against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/21/123057, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as “the application relates to replacing pebble dash render with hydraulic lime render to the side of existing extension and rear elevation, and removal of two structurally unstable chimney stacks to the rear at 116 Bargery Road.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacing pebble dash render with hydraulic lime render to the side of existing extension and rear elevation, and removal of two structurally unstable chimney stacks to the rear at 116 Bargery Road, Catford, London SE6 2LW in accordance with the terms of application, Ref DC/21/123057 dated 11 August 2021 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The development has already been undertaken. Accordingly, I have considered the development as retrospective.
3. In the interest of clarity, I have removed the term “the application relates to” from the description of the development in the decision as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and linked to this whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Culverley Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The building is located within the CA and as such I have had regard to the statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

6. There is an Article 4 direction that covers the CA which restricts some permitted development rights. It states that permitted development rights will only be restricted when the development is visible from the highway, waterway or open space. Whilst the rear of the house is partly screened by the brick wall that bounds Thornsbeach Road, the house is visible from the roadside and subsequently the CA. There are trees between the rear of No. 116 and Thornsbeach Road, however, they are sporadically located and do not completely screen the rear of the property from the road. Furthermore, those trees cannot be relied upon to screen the site in perpetuity because the trees are not permanent structures. Accordingly, the Article 4 direction still applies.
7. The Culverley Green Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Appraisal) (2001) states that the building detail which gives the area its special interest includes carved and moulded capitals and window surrounds, terracotta window dressings, sash windows, solid timber doors and stained glass. The front elevation of No. 116 incorporates a number of these building details. The consistent appearance of the dwelling alongside the attached house as well as the surrounding properties positively contributes to the significance of this part of the CA.
8. The Appraisal notes that pebble dashing the façade is an unsuitable façade finish and it is damaging to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the pebbledash was to the side and rear of the building the removal of the pebbledash has removed a negative feature of the property.
9. Throughout this part of the CA, there are houses that have rendered façades in varying pastel shades. Where this has been undertaken the building details have often been preserved and consequently, the features that give the area its special interest have been retained. Given that the work has already been completed it is unknown what technique was used to remove the pebbledash and whether the bricks have been harmed by the works undertaken. Nevertheless, given the prevalence of rendered elevations nearby the rendered elevations to the rear of the house does not appear out of character in the CA. Furthermore, given that these works were restricted to the rear of the property the main façade of the house retains those features that positively contribute to the CA's significance.
10. The Appraisal does not specifically identify that chimney stacks are an important feature that gives the area its special interest. However, chimney stacks are common in this part of the CA and part of the areas charm is the consistency in the detailed design of the dwellings. However, the number of chimney stacks and their location on the houses themselves varies in this part of the CA. The two chimneys to the rear of the house have already been removed. Nevertheless, the two chimneys on the main section of the roof have been retained. The retention of these two chimney stacks preserves this positive feature within this part of the CA. Accordingly, given the limited development undertaken the house maintains its consistent appearance with the attached dwelling and the surrounding properties. Subsequently, the positive group value these properties contribute to the significance of the CA has not been significantly harmed by the removal of the chimney stacks.
11. Therefore, the development has not harmed the character or appearance of the dwelling and has preserved the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. The development accords with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Local Development

Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted 2011) and Policies 31 and 36 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan (adopted 2014). Furthermore, the scheme generally accords with the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2019) as well as the heritage section of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure schemes would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Conditions

12. Given that the development has already been undertaken it would not be necessary to attach any conditions.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all matters raised, the development accords with the development plan as a whole. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

G Sibley

INSPECTOR