

Item No. 6.3	Classification: Open	Date: 12 May 2011	Meeting Name: Camberwell Community Council
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-0688 for: Full Planning Permission Address: LAND REAR OF 101 GROVE LANE, LONDON, SE5 8BG Proposal: Erection of a detached two bedroom dwelling with integral garage and single storey rear projection on land rear of 101 Grove Lane		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	South Camberwell		
From:	Wing Lau		
Application Start Date 18/03/2011		Application Expiry Date 13/05/2011	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission with conditions
- 2 This application is referred to Camberwell Community Council owing to the number of objections received.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 3 The application site refers to four garages to the rear of 101 Grove Lane. No. 101 is an end of terrace three storey building with a sizeable corner plot, located on the northern side of Grove Lane.
- 4 The site is adjacent to a park area located over a railway tunnel. On the other side of the park is a four storey block of flats - Hull Court that is approximately 25m from the boundary with 101 Grove Lane. In the park close to the boundary is a mature hedge of trees and bushes that screens most of the site from the park area and Hull court.
- 5 To the rear of 101 Grove Lane is Canning Cross that serves the back of the properties on Grove Lane and Camberwell Grove including access to garages, mews houses and workshops.
- 6 The site is within the Urban Density Zone and Camberwell Grove Conservation Area as identified in the adopted Southwark Plan (July 2007). However, the proposal site is not listed but 103 to 113 Grove Lane are Grade II listed.

Details of proposal

- 7 The proposal is essentially an amendment to a recently approved scheme under ref 10-AP-0972, dated 12th August 2010 (and associated Conservation Area Consent 10-AP-0973). This proposal is for an amendment to the approved scheme and therefore a new application has been submitted.

- 8 This application proposes wider footprint and makes fenestration changes. It is to demolish the 4 existing garages and build a part one/part two storey detached 2 bedroom house with integral garage; space for a second car and gardens. The new house is on two floors with gable roof, sloping down to the existing rear garden of the main house and down to Canning Cross.
- 9 The dwelling size is similar to that of the approved scheme. This measures 20.8m deep and 11m wide maximum (the site boundaries are splayed). The proposed house is designed with a single storey flat roof rear extension element. With a regular shaped footprint, the two storey element of the detached house measures 7.5m wide and 7.55m deep. The single storey rear element measures 3.5m deep. This current proposal is wider than the consented scheme, which was originally 6.38m. In effect, the revision is to widen the footprint of the house.
- 10 Proposed with two front and two rear dormer windows, the maximum height of the house is 6.75m to the ridge and 4.4m to the eaves. The dormer windows are set down approximately 1.1m from the roof ridge and is proposed with gabled end design.
- 11 The main access to the house would be from Canning Cross, through a timber gate and into the garden.
- 12 The plot is separated from the main property No. 101 by a 1.2m high timber fence with 600mm trellis above. The existing 2m high wall between No. 101 and 103 will be retained. The existing 2m high timber fence adjoining open space to the north will be replaced with new timber fencing at the same height.
- 13 The current application also proposes changes to the fenestration arrangements to the ground floor rear elevation (swapping the positions of the French doors and a window) and also to the north elevation towards Hull Court (adding a set of French doors).
- An integral garage is proposed with access from Canning Cross. A forecourt area is also proposed (to be stone paved) for a second parking space.
- 14

Planning history

- 15 00-AP-1596 (Full) - Planning permission granted in June 2002 for "Demolition of existing garages and erection of single storey building to be used for garage, workshop and storage space".

00-AP-1597 (CAC) - Conservation Area Consent (CAC) granted in June 2002 for "Demolition of garages".

09-AP-1562 (Full) - Planning permission refused in October 2009 for "Construction of a part one/two storey detached 3 bedroom house with integral garage on land r/o 101 Grove Lane".

This was refused on the following grounds:

The proposed development by reason of its height, scale and massing, and detailed design would be out of character with the surrounding built form, resulting in an incongruous and obtrusive development which fails to contextualise with the adjoining dwellings by being over dominant, as such the development would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area and would harm the setting of neighbouring listed buildings, thereby contrary to policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.12 'Quality in Design', 3.13 'Urban Design', 3.15 - 'Conservation of the historic environment', 3.16 - 'Conservation Areas' and 3.18 - 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites' of The

Southwark Plan [UDP] July 2007.

09-AP-1563 (CAC) - CAC refused to "Demolish 4 No garages (to enable the development of a proposed 3 bedroom house) on land to the rear of 101 Grove Lane".

This was refused on the following grounds:

Whilst the existing building does not contribute positively to the character or appearance of the conservation area, there is no acceptable proposed replacement scheme, and in the absence of such a scheme if the building were to be demolished a potentially unsightly vacant space would remain, with a gap in the Conservation Area, which would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area. In this regard the demolition would be contrary to policies 3.15 Conservation of the historic environment, 3.16 Conservation areas, and 3.18 Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites of the Southwark Plan 2007.

Following the refusal of 09-AP-1562 and 09-AP-1563, the applicant had made a number of changes to the plot size, design, mass and bulk. This was then approved under permission 10-AP-0972 and associated CAC 10-AP-0973. This permission has not yet been implemented and the current application is essentially amending the approved scheme to create a wider footprint and fenestration changes.

10-AP-0972 (Full) Permission granted in Nov 2010 under delegated powers for "Demolish four garages and construct a detached two bedroom dwelling with integral garage on land rear of 101 Grove Lane".

10-AP-0973 (CAC) granted in Nov 2010 for "Demolish existing four garages".

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 16 There is no relevant planning history on adjoining sites.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 17 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.
 - b) Impact of proposed development on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
 - c) Impact of proposed development on character and appearance of the area and Conservation Area
 - d) Impact of proposed development on the setting of adjoining Listed Buildings
 - e) Traffic and highway issues

Planning policy

- 18 Saved Policies of The Southwark Plan 2007 (July)
- 3.2 - 'Protection of Amenity'
 - 3.7 - 'Waste Reduction'
 - 3.11 - 'Efficient Use of Land'
 - 3.12 - 'Quality in Design'
 - 3.13 - 'Urban Design'

- 3.15 - 'Conservation of the historic environment'
- 3.16 - 'Conservation Areas'
- 3.18 - 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites'
- 4.1 - 'Density of Residential Development'
- 4.2 - 'Quality of Residential Accommodation'
- 4.3 - 'Mix of Dwellings'
- 5.2 - 'Transport Impacts'
- 5.3 - 'Walking and Cycling'
- 5.6 - 'Car Parking'

SPD: Residential Design Standards adopted September 2008
Camberwell Grove Conservation Area Appraisal

London Plan 2008 consolidated with alterations since 2004

- 19 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites
- 3A.6 Quality of new housing provision
- 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
- 4B.8 Respect local context and communities
- 4B.11 London's built heritage
- 4B.12 Heritage conservation

Core Strategy April 2011

- 20 Strategic Policy 1 Sustainable Development
- Strategic Policy 2 Sustainable Transport
- Strategic Policy 5 Providing New Homes
- Strategic Policy 7 Family homes
- Strategic Policy 11 Open spaces and wildlife
- Strategic Policy 12 Design and conservation
- Strategic Policy 13 High environmental standards

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

- 21 PPS 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPS 5 - Planning and the Historic Environment

Principle of development

- 22 In principle there are no objections to redeveloping brown field land to provide residential accommodation within areas characterised by this use. It is considered that there will be no conflict of use and redevelopment would comply with the wider regeneration and housing objectives of the borough.
- 23 The density of the scheme equates to 145 Habitable rooms/per hectare (HR/HA). Whilst this is below the standard range as set out in the Core Strategy of 200-700 HR/HA for an Urban Density zone, this low density development is in keeping with the surrounding family dwellings. Furthermore it is a mews/coach-house type development along a rear lane and the low density would be more suitable in this location.
- 24 An objection has been raised from a local resident relating to the principle of building within Conservation Areas. The objection highlights current central government guidance on garden 'backland' development, but this does not preclude any form of development. There are no planning policies that restrict any development within Conservation Areas. Saved Policy 3.15 'Conservation of the Historic Environment' and 3.16 'Conservation Areas' stipulate that planning permission will be granted for new development within conservation areas if it will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area and respect the context of the area (this is discussed in more detail below). Furthermore, the proposal involves only an addition of 30sqm of built form with the demolition of the existing garages.

- 25 This is however subject to there being no adverse impact on the amenity of residents, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and no adverse traffic issues, which is discussed below.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

- 26 The height, scale and massing of this proposal has been reduced following the refused scheme 09-AP-1562 and remains similar to that approved under permission 10-AP-0972. The main impact of the proposed building would be on the occupiers at 101 and 103 Grove Lane. The overall height at 6.7metres (m) is to the roof ridge. This is reduced to 4.4m at the eaves. The depth of the building (two storey element) is 7.55m. The two storey element of the building is situated at least 16.5m from the nearest window at No. 101 and 12m from No. 103.
- 27 The Council's Residential Design Standards SPD requires a minimum distance of 12m at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts onto a highway, and a minimum distance of 1m at the rear of the property. The separation distance between the building at 101 Grove Lane and the proposed development at first floor at 16.5m would be less than the 1m, but this is not a significant shortfall given the context of the surrounding buildings. This distance was also approved under the consented scheme. There are a number of two storey mews and detached buildings on Canning Cross and Stories Mews, which back onto the residential buildings on Grove Lane (and some seen on the Camberwell Grove side) which have similar separation distances. For example, some of the mews houses to the rear of 113-119 Grove Lane have between 12-18m separation distance. There is approximately 16m from the rear of No. 156 Camberwell Grove to No. 7 Canning Cross. In the circumstances, taking into account the prevailing backland development along Canning Cross and privacy measures outlined below, the separation distance is considered sufficient in this instance.
- 28 An objection has been received from an occupier at the main property No. 101 regarding loss of privacy. The distance is considered adequate to prevent significant loss of privacy into the neighbouring habitable rooms. Furthermore, the first floor rear windows serve a bathroom and stairwell and as such are not habitable rooms and are obscure glazed in any event (the bottom half is fixed closed at 1700mm height). The objection from the neighbour also referred to the potential loss of privacy from the rear gardens and the rear French doors. There is a proposed 1.2m high boundary fence with 600mm trellis above between the rear garden of the new property and the garden of No. 101. This would limit any loss of privacy and therefore it is not considered necessary to have a solid fence up to 1.8m high. A condition was imposed in the consented scheme that required any windows on the rear elevation to have obscured glazing up to 1.8m. The Applicant has submitted a section drawing (BW-725-08) demonstrating that overlooking of the flats in 101 Grove Lane is not possible from ground floor level. The neighbours most affected are those living in the basement and raised ground floor of 101 Grove Lane. Officers consider that the boundary fence would prevent overlooking and therefore accept that a condition requiring obscured glazing up to 1.8m is not required.
- 29 The occupier at No. 101 has raised concerns regarding potential overlooking to and from No. 103 Grove Lane. As the position of the development is to the north, this will only be at an oblique angle.
- 30 There is at least 25m between Hull Court (to the north) and the new building. This distance is sufficient to mitigate any impacts.
- 31 The height of the building is considered acceptable and would not be overbearing on

the adjoining occupiers, especially given the separation distances.

- 32 The configuration of the building located to the east of adjoining properties on Grove Lane would not lead to significant loss of daylight. The increase in the width of the building does not add significant bulk. There may be some effect on daylight in the morning to occupiers at No. 101 and 103, but this would not be significant and adequate daylight would be available for the rest of the day.
- 33 The occupier at 101 Grove Lane has raised objection to the proposed size of the garden. Whilst it may be larger than the garden for the existing dwellings at No. 101, this would not impact on the neighbours' amenity and does not warrant a reason for refusal. It has also been argued that there would be a loss of garden area for the occupiers at 101 Grove Lane. The remaining garden area would be at least 70sqm and this is considered sufficient for the existing occupants in the main building (4 No. flats) as required in the SPD.
- 34 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its effect on residential amenity and therefore complies with saved policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan and SP13 of the Core Strategy.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

- 35 The proposed development is residential and as such conforms with the residential nature of the locality. It is therefore considered that there will be no conflict of use detrimental to the amenity of future occupiers.
- 36 The room sizes all comply with the Residential Design Standard SPD for a two bedroom house. Dual aspect would be provided and it is considered that adequate living accommodation has been provided.

Traffic issues

- 37 The site has a PTAL of 4. The loss of the 4 garages allows for replacement parking for 2 vehicles. Comments from Transport Planning Team have been taken from the previous approved scheme 10-AP-0972. The Transport Planning Team has not objected to the loss of these spaces.
- 38 Transport Planning had raised concerns that a car using the garage may have some difficulty exiting. However, this is of similar arrangement to the other garages along Canning Cross. Furthermore, this is a minor road and it is at the end of the street and as such there would not be detrimental highway safety issues. In any case, Transport Planning have confirmed that this is not a reason for refusal in itself.
- 39 The site is within a CPZ and this application would normally require a S106 agreement to amend the Traffic Management Order to exempt occupiers from obtaining a parking permit. Transport Planning have confirmed however, that as it is only for one dwelling, this is not necessary.
- 40 An objection has been received from a neighbour regarding the volume of traffic along Canning Cross as there are already existing garages. Officers acknowledge the existing garages along this fairly narrow lane. Nevertheless, the use of this mews lane is for domestic purposes and the addition of one dwelling on this site would not significantly increase the number of trips. Some of the mews are being used for workshops, but these are incidental to the main residential properties. Further, the proposal would reduce the potential of trips as it replaces the existing 4 garages with a dwelling with only 2 parking spaces. This provides the same number of spaces as the approved scheme.

41 The objector also raises concerns that construction vehicles would disrupt the use of Canning Cross and causing noise and disturbance. Officers would point out that any construction work would only be temporary and other environmental controls are in place to restrict undue noise and disturbance.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

42 The height, scale and massing of this proposal has been amended by widening the overall footprint of the building by 1.1m, which is not significant when compared to the approved scheme. The appearance of the building is wider, but is still in proportion and does not significantly dominate the overall plot size.

43 The urban grain of the locality is generally one of garages onto a rear-lane, serving large houses facing onto the main streets beyond; in Canning Cross and Stories Mews there is a developing pattern of small mews/coach-house type developments replacing the garages. The most important factors relating to these structures is that they remain small in scale, and subservient to the main house, and it is considered that the proposal meets this criteria.

44 The local townscape character as noted above is a development of coach/mews-houses which face onto the lane, behind larger-scale Georgian terraces; the character of the proposal should be consistent with the scale and design of the mews lane as it has developed.

45 The footprint of the proposed house equalises the garden length to both the proposed and existing buildings. The design is similar to the consented scheme with window alterations and an increase in the width, but these are acceptable.

46 In terms of materials, the stock bricks to match and timber-sash windows and doors are acceptable. It is recommended that the flat-roof to the ground-level extension be a sedum-roof, as this is largely over-looked by surrounding properties. Materials should be conditioned for approval in writing.

47 A neighbour has commented that the re-landscaping of the current garden would lead to a significant loss of character within this Conservation Area. The Applicant has however, proposed suitable soft landscaping within the rear garden. The neighbour has raised that the proposed timber fence dividing the garden should be constructed of a material in keeping with the area (such as brick to match the garden wall between No. 101 and 103). Nevertheless the use of timber for fencing in the garden is a common material and does not justify a ground for refusal in itself. This was also proposed in the approved scheme.

48 An objector has made the comment that the flat roof rear element is not appropriate design solution. However, this would lower the overall height at the rear and limit the impact on the neighbouring Listed Buildings and outlook.

Conservation Area

49 The loss of the existing garages is not problematic in itself, provided that there is an approved replacement development that will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

50 The Camberwell Grove Conservation Area Appraisal notes in section 5.2.11:
"It is a characteristic of properties in Camberwell Grove and Grove Lane in particular that rear gardens are long and have a good cover of mature trees. Post-war development between the two streets, at Glebelands Close for example, has infilled some of this space. Loss of garden space and trees should be resisted, as they provide an important green backdrop visible between and above groups of houses. At the same time, areas like Canning Cross illustrate the historic use of such space as

mews for coach houses and stabling, and it is important that the informal quality of such elements is not compromised by the introduction of poor garage courts and yards.”

- 51 The development potential of this site cannot therefore be ruled-out, but any proposal must have a sensitivity of scale relative to its sensitive context, as well as a quality of design (be it pastiche or contemporary) that positively enhances or preserves the conservation area’s character or appearance. Officers consider the proposal to be of an adequate quality to achieve this.

Setting of Listed Buildings

- 52 This proposal will directly impact upon the rear setting of the listed group 103-109 (odds) Grove Lane, Grade II dating from 1820-40; No.s 111+113 are also Grade II listed.
- 53 Saved Policy 3.18 states that permission will not be granted for developments that would not preserve or enhance the immediate or wider setting of a listed building. The increase in the width of the building would not be any closer to the Listed Buildings. It is considered that the proposal has reached an adequate level of architectural design, which would preserve the setting of the adjacent listed buildings and preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Impact on trees

- 54 No trees will be affected by the proposal. A relatively moderate sized garden area is incorporated into the scheme (approximately 60sqm at the rear).

Other matters

Waste

- 55 Adequate waste storage has been provided within the site. This is likely to be transported out onto the intersection of Grove Lane and Cannings Cross like the other houses along this lane.

Ambiguity in Planning documents

- 56 A neighbour has raised concerns over the ambiguity of the submitted documents. These plans are to scale and the timber fencing is shown clearly on the plans.

Ownership

- 57 The objector at No. 101 has raised the issue that Notice has not been served to leaseholders of the site. Whilst the main property No. 101 comprises a number of flats, the application site relates to the rear garden only (outlined in red). The Applicant has confirmed that the whole of the existing rear garden, the garages and the forecourt onto Canning Cross is in the ownership of the applicant. In the absence of information contrary to this, the application is considered to be valid.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 58 The current application is considered acceptable. This is an amendment to a previously approved scheme. There will be limited adverse impact on neighbour's amenities. The footprint, height and bulk is consistent with the neighbouring mews/coach-house type developments. It preserves the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining Listed Buildings. Impacts on the local highway network is not detrimental. It is therefore recommended for approval.

Community impact statement

- 59 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the

application process.

a) The impact on local people is set out above.

b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as: No issues.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

Consultations

60 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

61 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

Summary of consultation responses

62 One letter received from the Ivanhoe Residents and Tenants Association raising the concern that developments in the area have reached saturation point; will destroy the conservation area and the Coalition Government suggests refusing backland developments.

One letter received from 25/27 Canning Cross raising the following concerns: Canning Cross is already 'choked' with cars; there is no room for cars along Canning Cross which already has a high volume of traffic and difficulty with access; potential noise and disturbance from the construction work and using of Canning Cross for access; no benefits to those already living in the area.

One letter from the owner of one of the flats at 101 Grove Lane objecting on the following grounds: proposed fencing at 1.8m would impact on the daylight available to occupiers at 101 Grove Lane; proposed French doors would lead to loss of privacy; proposed fencing not adequate to prevent overlooking; re-landscaping of the current garden would be a loss of character within the Conservation Area; proposed timber fence should match existing materials of existing boundary treatment (brick); the owners of the flats at No. 101 have not been served notice; ambiguity in application documents; loss of daylight available to garden of No. 103; flat roof area of the house is a poor design solution.

Human rights implications

This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.

This application has the legitimate aim of providing residential development. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2135-101 Application file: 11-AP-0688 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5460 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Wing Lau, Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	12 April 2011	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Date final report sent to Community Council Team	27 April 2011	

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 02.04.11

Press notice date: 31.03.11

Case officer site visit date: 02.04.11

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 29.03.11

Internal services consulted:

Design and Conservation Team

Transport Planning

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Thames Water

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

107 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
109 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
111 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
115 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
117 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
25 CANNING CROSS LONDON SE5 8BH
103B GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
138 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
113A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
117A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
138B CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
115A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR REAR 113A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
FLAT 3 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 5 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 2 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 11 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 13 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 15 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 10 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 12 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 6 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 8 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 14 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 3 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 5 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 7 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
SECOND FLOOR REAR 117 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
103A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
105 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
113 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
138A CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
102 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
106 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
112 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
116 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
120 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
124 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
130 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
134 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
FLAT 10 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 12 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 14 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 16 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 4 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 7 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 9 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
FLAT 1 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG

117B GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
117C GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
117D GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
100 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
104 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
108 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
110 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
114 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
118 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
122 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
126 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
128 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
132 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
136 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RQ
FLAT 11 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 13 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 2 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 4 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 6 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 8 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 9 GROVE COURT CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RG
FLAT 1 101 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
FLAT 3 101 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
FLAT 4 101 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 117 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
SECOND FLOOR FRONT 117 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8BG
FLAT 1 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL
11 de Crespigny Park Camberwell London SE5 8AB
7 Finsen Road Camberwell London SE5 9AX
54 Shipwright Road
54 Shipwright Road London SE16 6QA
48 Somerford Way Rotherhithe London SE16 6QW
48 Somerford Way Rotherhithe London SE16 6QW
6 Ivanhoe Road London SE5 8DH

Re-consultation:

None

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Design and Conservation Team (Surgery) - No objections.

Transport Planning - No objections. Comments have been used from the previous applications.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Thames Water - in respect of surface water it is recommended that the Applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval required from Thames Water Developer Services. No objections with regard to sewerage infrastructure or water infrastructure.

Neighbours and local groups

One letter received from the Ivanhoe Residents and Tenants Association raising the concern that developments in the area have reached saturation point; will destroy the conservation area and the Coalition Government suggests refusing backland developments.

One letter received from 25/27 Canning Cross raising the following concerns: Canning Cross is already 'choked' with cars; there is no room for cars along Canning Cross which already has a high volume of traffic and difficulty with access; potential noise and disturbance from the construction work and using of Canning Cross for access; no benefits to those already living in the area.

One letter from the owner of one of the flats at 101 Grove Lane objecting on the following grounds: proposed fencing at 1.8m would impact on the daylight available to occupiers at 101 Grove Lane; proposed French doors would lead to loss of privacy; proposed fencing not adequate to prevent overlooking; re-landscaping of the current garden would be a loss of character within the Conservation Area; proposed timber fence should match existing materials of existing boundary treatment (brick); the owners of the flats at No. 101 have not been served notice; ambiguity in application documents; loss of daylight available to garden of No. 103; flat roof area of the house is a poor design solution.