

Building
Name/Address

Respondant

Scott House, 185
Grove Street

Acting on behalf of
building owner

Bonhoeffer Church,
50 Dacres Road

Church group who
own the building and
represent the
building

Grove Park
Community Group

St Mildred's Church St Mildred's Church
St Mildred's Church Development Group

Catford Police
Station, 333 Bromley Acting on behalf of
Road building owner

Culverley Green
Residents Association

Friends of
Mountsfield Park

Council's Highway
dept

Grove Park Youth
Club

Post boxes in Lee Royal Mail (owner)

Segal Close

Resident

Summary of comments

Email: The proposed redevelopment of Scott House is being determined by Lewisham's Planning Committee on 30 January. Throughout the pre-application phase, the existing building has been treated by Planning Officers as a non-designated heritage asset in planning policy terms, and the Applicant team has designed the building to ensure that the building's most salient features and heritage are preserved in its redevelopment. Letter: Whilst this description appears to be generally correct and we agree that the building has some limited historic, architectural and communal interest, we feel that the description presently over-states the quality and grandeur of the architecture and the visual connection with the Victoria pub. The classical detailing of the building is fairly simple and typical of the type of building in that period. This is evident from the detailed report (the 'Statement of Significance') into the building undertaken by Montagu Evans in 2017. The building is not considered to be particularly 'aspirational' or 'dignified'. We also disagree that there is a significant visual link between the pub and Scott House. These buildings are of a different style, use and appearance – the connection is perhaps more historic association than visual, in that both were built c.1880-1910. The primary interest of the building is historic, in that it is one of the last remaining buildings relating to the former industrial uses which used to characterise the area.

We note that the building has been greatly altered and agree with the conclusion of the Montagu Evans report that the building qualifies as a non-designated heritage asset.

First of all, it is very positive that you thought of the Church building being included into that list - the current building being of 1959, but the German congregation being in Forest Hill since 1875. • what impact will the listing have on any future planning issue aside from the normal planning application (i.e. will there be any restrictions or implications for us when it comes for example to resurface the parking area or window replacements when putting forward a planning application for such work)

- the text about the building: would it be possible to write a couple of lines to send to you - there were a couple of points which could/should be slightly clarified.
- there was a church building before the current building at the same place, which was bombed twice in the war and completely destroyed. Old photographs of that building still exist - any interest from your side to get copies done?
- will there be any financial implications by being included in that list?
- would there be any other restrictions/implications of what we haven't thought about (due to a lack of knowing much of planning issues and dealing with listed buildings)

Second response: One thing however puzzles me - the consultation has now closed. My original email was sent on the 10th December 2019, 2 weeks before the actual deadline. that would have given us 2 weeks to react to any implications your are pointing out (especially your first point).

This is certainly something which would have been a major point in our consideration, if or if not to be included in this list.

We certainly are disappointed that the reply comes more than 3 weeks after the consultation closed (taking a week for Christmas closing out).

The Grove Park Community Group would like to add The Ringway Centre, 268 Baring Road, Grove Park, SE12 0DS to the local listing nominations as it meets the criteria required. It is unique to the borough due to:

It's intangible heritage, historic social and cultural interest

It occupies part of the former home of world-renowned children's author Edith Nesbit (The Railway Children, Five Children and It)

Edith Nesbit and her husband Hubert Bland were founder members of the Fabian Society and Nesbit was friends with HG Wells and George Bernard Shaw (a frequent visitor to the site) and the broad literary circle of her day.

The Ringway Centre came about and is named after the famous community battles against the Ringway 2 motorway plans of the 60s/70s which would have put an 6 lane motorway through the borough, most of Grove Park and Whitefoot wards as part of the planned "inner city M25"

The Ringway Centre has been the seat of social activism in Grove Park since then and the battles have included the prevention of the loss of what is now the Grove Park Nature Reserve and rare habitats adjoining as well as the successful prevention of the historic Grade 2 listed Baring Hall Hotel Public House and the creation of the Grove Park Neighbourhood Plan

proposed inclusion of the church on the Lewisham Local List. However it is important that the significance of the church building is fully understood and that the church is included on the Lewisham Local List for the right reasons. Lewisham Council is therefore requested to note the points below and to amend the proposed listing description as follows: "Of historic, and architectural and social interest. The church was dedicated in 1878 and (save for the later addition of the south chapel) probably built in 1877 to 1879. Then architect is registered on the Diocese of Southwark's website as H. Elliot. A generally well preserved and good example of a late Victorian suburban church, in the Gothic revival style of assured architectural quality with unusual and striking elements such as its small east bell turret. The church sits back from the major South Circular road in a very visible location. It dominates the plot through the substantial nave massing. The architecturally more elaborate apsidal chancel provides interest. to the local street scene, and is By way of its prominent north and west elevations the church is considered to be a landmarker within in the local townscape. The use of stone for the church adds a sense of quality and architectural status to the building, and provides an interesting and deliberate visual contrast and clear functional and architectural distinction between the church and neighbouring residential properties. An impressive Three small C20 stained glass windows by Wilhelmina Geddes installed in the chapel apse after World War 2 bomb damage is are also well preserved internally. While the church has some architectural and historical significance, well-documented local opinion clearly attributes much greater importance to the social significance of the church building, particularly in its extensive community service function." The Council's consultation invites interested local residents and groups to submit further information to contribute to the understanding of how the relevant building is "historically, architecturally or socially significant". The architectural and historic significance of the building is acknowledged, but the greater significance of the building is social. This should not be overlooked. St Mildred's Church is listed on the website of the Diocese of Southwark as "typical of its

Catford Police Station has for some time been identified on MPS's list of disposal sites, and is scheduled to be marketed for sale in 2020 / 2021. In most instances, the MPS disposals deliver residential development, including affordable housing, in accordance with the aims of the London Plan. The London Plan seeks to maximise the delivery of housing and affordable housing. This is also a key aim of the Mayor for London. The receipts from MPS disposals will be used to support operational policing in London. As such, the receipts from the disposals are important to service delivery. Our client consider the proposed Local Listing to be unhelpful, as it may frustrate potential interest in and delivery of development at the site. We therefore request that the property is removed from the list of potential sites to be included.

Thompson Close is a separate (Crest Nicholson) development tagged on in 1989/90 when they were also redeveloping the adjoining hospital. The correct mailing address should in my case be: Sydenham Cottages, Grove Park, London SE12 9PQ. 2. The 'description' refers to a street directory in 1866, I am in possession of a copy of a local OS type plan showing the first two cottages in place and plotted (not drawn) in 1862, the outline of No. 4 is also shown. What is now No.3 was apparently built at a later date (1891?) and was initially intended to be a shop. According to the former tenant of No.1, who was born in my cottage shortly after WW1 and whose family worked at Durham Farm, the original intention was that 4 should be a larger building so that it could double as a chapel for the farm workers. My research at the local library reports that it was home to a local developer by 1877 due to the construction of St Augustines Church, a more appropriate place of worship. The final sentence ends "who worked on the land in Sydenham". As Sydenham is some miles to the west this appears to be totally in error. Also, the description refers to the 'Vernacular architecture of Sydenham', which we are nowhere near. Since the mode of design and construction using 'Bromley' bricks I cannot see why the style should be attributed to Sydenham in particular.

3. . No. 3 was held on an Agricultural tenancy from before WW2 and is now regulated.

No. 1 was recently the subject of a refurbishment by its current owners. The work was closely supervised by your planning department who rejected a proposal to build on the side of the existing building, which have ruined the symmetry, but settled for a large extension to the rear. No.2, 4, 5 & 6 have also been subject to progressive and extensive upgrading by their owners in recent years. 4. The land on the opposite side of the road called Sydenham Cottages passed to the care of Lewisham Council by s106 as part of the Alice Thompson development in 1989. It has remained neglected ever since. The only action taken was largely on the initiative of your Parks & Open Spaces Department who arranged for a hedge to be planted several years ago but interest in this seems to have evaporated with the job half done. The leaf and litter deposits along the road & roadside verge also

The Culverley Green Residents Association are very happy to support the new additions on this list.

We would very much like the bandstand to be locally listed, it is all that remains of the original park from the early 1900s, other than some veteran trees, railings and the Brownhill Road entrance. The bandstand does need some careful conservation/restoration work. The veteran trees and the playing field herringbone drainage system also need more protection. Would it be possible to do some more work on the local listing text below? Our original cafe building was demolished in 1981? We are very interested in the record of the original Victorian buildings, they look very attractive on the postcard images. There may have also been a municipal simple brick building that was also demolished, do you have more information about this?

Historic building/Marker in Area 3 part of the borough:

- 1.) Lewisham Tower clock @ Lewisham Market opposite Police Station
- 2.) Boone's Chapel (Blackheath SE13).
- 3.) The Deptford High Street Anchor at Junction of Deptford Broadway.
- 4.) Deptford Town Hall in New Cross Road (between St. James' and Laurie Grove.
- 5.) Brockley Jack Theatre (410 Brockley Road SE4).

Please find below and attached GPNF list of additions, which meet the councils criteria for local listing.

St Augustine's Church

106 Regiment Royal Artillery Territorial Army Centre -Napier House, Baring Rd, Grove Park, London SE12 0BH

Grove Park Youth Club

Grove Park Railway Station and Prince of Wales footbridge

Burnt Ash Methodist Church

Anglican and Dissenters Chapels in Hither Green Cemetery

Trinity Presbyterian Church (South Lee Christian Centre)

Railway (utility) Building on Pullman Mews

Ringway Centre Office, House at 268 Baring Road

for reference : pg 59 of the GPNP

https://grovepark.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/01_GrovePark_NDP_2019-07-02_Submission_FINAL_LR.pdf

It would be helpful if you include the additional details of Box Number, Type and Marker in the details of your listing (see attached). None of the three are in any way rare/heritage rich boxes on a national level but appreciate you may take a different view on a local level. All three are shown as category D (Least rare) boxes by the Letter Box Study Group who are the eminent experts in all things postboxes

We have no objection per say in the proposal to list but would question the inclusion of the modern era Elizabeth 2nd box which is neither old, rare or unusual in any way

Along with many of the residents of Segal Close, we understand, recognise, and value the history and importance of these houses. However we feel any attempt at listing them should be approached very carefully.

While most listings seek to preserve the built fabric of the buildings, the importance of these buildings lies in the process of their construction and the empowerment of residents in designing the layout and the flexibility to make changes themselves.

We believe there should be a further sentence in the listing description acknowledging “residents should have the ability to adapt the buildings to the needs of their lifestyles over time, whilst not inhibiting the ability of future residents to adapt the buildings, and not detracting from the overall character”. Perhaps there could also be “a requirement that residents considering major adaptations should extensively document the buildings, to ensure changes are captured over time.”

I would also like to suggest similar listings of some of the other Segal method self-build housing in Lewisham. For example Greenstreet Hill off Drakefell Road; Nubia Way in Downham; Fusions Jameen on Lowther Hill, etc. These are owned by housing associations, and are at greater risk of redevelopment by conventional methods, as the buildings age. I would also suggest these self-build houses need not be so rare. The NPPF and legislation from 2016 requires LAs to make provision for self-build and people who want to build their own homes. Planning policy could identify small sites specifically for self-build or community-led housing through site specific allocations.

Council Response

ACTION

Responded to questions raised as part of the consultation. No objections have been provided to disagree with special local interest identified in the description of the building.

Seek response from Church Group to description

Noted

Consider this nomination in the second round of update to the Local list. Address and nomination saved and recorded for future consideration

Noted, and revisions to local list description will be taken on board and revised. However final recommended sentence will not be included: *"While the church has some architectural and historical significance, well-documented local opinion clearly attributes much greater importance to the social significance of the church building, particularly in its extensive community service function."*

This is because it is not necessary to weigh up the relative importance of the difference significances, and have not done this for other entries. It is sufficient to say these significances exist and to set them out clearly.

Revise text in line with recommendations from Church.

Objection noted and will be included as a consideration in report for M&C to determine. Building however will still be included in recommendations to be adopted by M&C as the reasons for objection refer only to development potential, and the Local list acts as summary of buildings that are of historic, architectural or are particularly rare to the LBL. It is still considered that this building is of historic and architectural interest to the LBL, and no information has been provided to disagree with this position. The development potential of the building has not been considered for these reasons

Support noted

None

1, 2, 4 are all already Statutorily listed. 5 is already locally listed. 3 could be considered for local listing in future

Consider the nomination for 3 in the second round of update to the Local list. Address and nomination saved and recorded for future consideration

Noted

Consider these nominations in the second round of update to the Local list. Addresses and nominations saved and recorded for future consideration

Noted

Remove modern post box from recommendation for local listing. Revise text to include additional details such as Box number, type and marker in description of local listing.

Concerns noted. Revise text to include discussion regarding ability to adapt buildings to needs of lifestyles. However cannot revise to include any information that refers to how buildings should be adapted etc, as the Local list is a tool that identifies its special interest

Revise text to include discussion regarding ability to adapt buildings to needs of evolving lifestyles