Item No.	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:			
6.1	Open	12 May 2011	Camberwell Community Council			
Report title:	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-0225 for: Full Planning Permission					
	<ul> <li>Address: 18 GROVE PARK, LONDON SE5 8LH</li> <li>Proposal: Conversion of existing building from hostel (Sui Generis) into 4 No. self- contained flats (2x3 bedroom and 2x2 bedroom), extension of basement with lightwells to front and rear, erection of a single storey rear extension, loft extension, replacement of timber sash windows and installation of new windows to rear elevation.</li> </ul>					
	extension of basem	room single family dwelling house mber windows, installation of and installation of 6 No. rooflights.				
	Erection of front boundary wall and provision of 3 No. car parking spaces at the front.					
Ward(s) or groups affected:	South Camberwell					
From:	Wing Lau					
Application St	Application Start Date 11/03/2011 Application Expiry Date 06/05/2011					

# RECOMMENDATION

1 Grant planning permission with conditions

The application is referred to Camberwell Community Council owing to the number of objections received.

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

## Site location and description

- 2 The application site relates to two existing buildings on this site known as No.18 Grove Park. The existing detached building fronting the road was formerly a house, which has been converted into 4 self-contained units and then was used by Social Services to house distressed families (Sui Generis).
- 3 To the rear of this main building is a former chapel, which is connected to the main building via a vestibule. The chapel has never been consecrated and has not been used for religious purposes since late 1970's. This was also used by Social Services. Both buildings have been vacant since June 2007.
- 4 The site slopes down towards the rear garden, which has a maximum depth of 45metres (m), but this is broken up by the existing chapel occupying the central area

of the site.

- 5 There are a number of trees along the side boundaries and larger mature trees to the rear.
- 6 The surrounding area is all residential characterised by larger family dwellings and some flats opposite.
- 7 The site is within the following designations as specified in the Local Development Framework 2010 (LDF); Urban Density Zone, Air Quality Management Area and the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area.

#### Details of proposal

- 8 The application has two main elements:
- 9 Main building

It is proposed to convert the existing main building into 4 No. self-contained flats (2x3 bedroom on the lower ground and ground floors and 2x2 bedroom units on the first and second floors). The existing basement will be extended to provide additional accommodation and lightwells are proposed to the front and rear ranging between 1.5-2m in depth. The lightwells at the front are separated into two and the lightwells to the rear are almagamated for the two units.

- 10 The existing rear conservatory will be demolished and it is proposed to erect a two storey rear extension at ground and first floor levels. This extension measures a maximum of 3m deep and 10.7m wide, which has the effect of making the building footprint more regular. Part of the rear elevation of this extension would comprise timber cladding.
- 11 It is also proposed to convert the loft to provide accommodation at second floor level. Other minor alterations are proposed comprising replacing the timber sash windows and installation of new windows to the rear elevation. A new slate roof will be provided with 2 No. rooflights on the flat section of the roof.
- 12 Chapel

It is proposed to demolish the existing vestibule, which links the house to the chapel. The existing extension to the flank wall of the chapel is also to be removed. This results in a simple detached building with a more rectangular footprint. It is proposed to convert the existing chapel into a 4 bedroom self-contained house. The basement will be enlarged by 0.7m in width and 2 No. new windows are proposed to the rear elevation with 4 No. new French doors proposed to the north east elevation at lower ground (basement) level. The existing timber windows will be replaced.

- 13 A new slate roof and 6 No. rooflights are proposed. Living accommodation is also proposed within the roof level.
- 14 Other works

The existing boundary fence will be replaced with a lower 1.2m high timber boundary fence to the front. Associated cycle and bin storage are proposed within the front garden area.

- 15 The front and rear garden areas would be provided with soft and hard landscaping. A total of 3 No. car parking spaces (including 1 No. disabled parking bay) are proposed at the front to the eastern boundary.
- 16 The associated Conservation Area Consent application under ref 11-AP-0226 is also to be considered at this meeting.

## Planning history

17 There is no relevant planning history on this site.

### Planning history of adjoining sites

18 <u>17 Grove Park</u>

Planning permission was granted in 1991 for the change of use from children's home (C2) to a hostel for homeless families (C3).

Planning permission was granted 17th Sept 2010 (ref 10-AP-1130) for: Conversion of existing hostel (Sui Generis) into four dwelling houses involving; partial demolition of the existing building and removal of fire escape, erection of three storey rear extension, external and internal modifications and alterations, replacement timber sash windows, new slate roof, new hard and soft landscaped areas, car parking provision at the front, new front boundary wall, cycle and bin storage. Removal of link bridge and infill flank wall to No. 18 Grove Park.

Associated Conservation Area consent for the above permission was also granted 17th Sept 2010 (ref 10-AP-1285) for: Partial demolition of the existing building and removal of fire escape. Removal of link bridge to No. 18 Grove Park.

Since the original permission was granted 26th Jan 2011 under 10-AP-1130, the Applicant had submitted a planning application for minor amendment (ref 10-AP-3533). The variation of Condition No. 2 (approved plans) was to: increase the basement area by adding lightwells to the front and rear of the property and amendments to the location of one of the parking bays.

- 19 There is some planning history for a number of the dwellings directly opposite the site (41-45 Grove Park) relating to alterations to the building and conversion into flats. These are however, at least 19 years old and therefore not directly relevant to this scheme.
- 20 The most relevant and recent is at <u>42 Grove Park</u> planning permission was granted in 2004 (ref 04-CO-0042) for the conversion of 3 storey house into 1x1 bed ground floor flat and 1 x 4 bed maisonette on 1st and 2nd floors, including the demolition and rebuilding of the front bay and porch for underpinning works and demolition of single storey rear addition.
- 21 There have been a number of planning approvals for adjoining properties to the south (Ivanhoe and Grove Hill Road) for extensions and flat conversions, but these are not directly relevant to this application.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### Summary of main issues

22 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 the character and appearance of the host building, the surrounding area and the Conservation Area

d) Highway and traffic issues

## **Planning policy**

Saved policies of The Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

- 23 3.2 Protection of Amenity
  - 3.7 Waste Reduction
  - 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
  - 3.12 Quality of Design
  - 3.13 Urban Design
  - 3.15 Conservation and the Historic Environment
  - 3.16 Conservation Areas
  - 3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites
  - 3.28 Biodiversity
  - 4.1 Density of Residential Development
  - 4.2 Quality of Residential Development
  - 5.2 Transport Impacts
  - 5.3 Walking and Cycling
  - 5.6 Car Parking

Residential Design Standards 2008 SPD Camberwell Grove Conservation Area Appraisal 2003

London Plan 2008 consolidated with alterations since 2004

- 3A.1 Increasing London's supply of housing
- 3A.2 Borough housing targets
- 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites
- 3A.6 Quality of new housing provision
- 4B.12 Heritage Conservation

## Core Strategy

24

25 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)

26 PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' PPS 5 'Planning and the Historic Environment'

# Principle of development

- 27 The principle of the change of use from the vacant hostel (sui generis use class) to residential is considered acceptable in terms of land use, for the following reasons. The existing use is not one which is protected under the saved Southwark Plan policies or Core Strategy policies. The site is not within any designated zone that would restrict residential use. The site is within a residential area, characterised by large single family dwellings, with some residential flats further along Grove Park. Therefore the change of use to residential houses would be compatible with the character of the area. There is therefore no objection to the conversion of the building for single family dwellings.
- 28 The conversion of the chapel is considered acceptable as it has not been in D1 use (place of worship/community use) since the 1970's. The condition of the building is relatively poor and the re-use of the building to provide much-needed family housing is encouraged. The house and flats appear to be of a suitable scale. The introduction of five family homes is considered to be in keeping with the established character of the area which includes large family units along this part of Grove Park.

- Objections from local residents refer to the principle of building within Conservation Areas. The objections highlight current central government guidance on garden 'backland' development, but this does not preclude any form of development. It is also noted that the proposal is for the conversion of existing buildings. 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 demolition and creation of additional floorspace by a small rear extension and basement and does not significantly add to the footprint within the application site. In effect, the overall external volume (excluding the basement) of all buildings would be reduced and would not significantly encroach into the Conservation Area.
- 30 The scheme has a density of approximately 200 Habitable rooms/Hectare (HR/Ha). The site is within an Urban Zone, which allows a density range of 200-700HR/Ha. The scheme is therefore acceptable in terms of its density.
- 31 Whilst the principle of the change of use is acceptable, the acceptability of the proposal is subject to there being no adverse impact on residential amenity, and consideration of transport impacts and impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. These matters are discussed below.

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

- 32 The main impacts on amenity as a result of the proposed development would be as a result of the proposed rear extension to the main building.
- 33 The proposed rear extension measures 2m minimum to 3m deep maximum and across the whole width of the house. The extension does not go beyond the existing rear conservatory. Southwark's Residential Design Standards SPD states that two storey rear extensions would not normally be desirable. Nevertheless, it should always be assessed on its merits and the proposal is for extension to the basement and ground levels. The proposed extension would be reduced in depth from the existing single storey conservatory. The main building is set off from the boundary adjoining No. 17 by 3m and does not protrude beyond the rear building line of No. 17. The extension also comes in line with the rear building line of No. 19 to the east. As such, the proposed extension at basement and ground floor levels is unlikely to lead to detrimental impacts on the neighbours in terms of light or outlook.
- 34 The other works proposed involving demolition would not affect the neighbour's amenity in terms of light and outlook.
- 35 The enlargement of the basements to both the main building and the chapel is acceptable as this would not be readily visible from the neighbours. The provision of additional windows, 'French' doors and rooflights are unlikely to result in significant overlooking as this is within the existing building envelope.
- 36 The proposal would not significantly affect the residents' amenity and complies with saved policies 3.2 and 3.11 of The Southwark Plan 2007 and SP13 of the Core Strategy.

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

37 Standard of accommodation

This scheme provides  $2x \ 3$  bedroom and  $2x \ 2$  dwellings within the main building and one 4 bedroom dwelling within the chapel building. These units are proposed with dual aspect and with room sizes that exceed the Council's minimum room standards as set out in the SPD 2008.

- 38 Units 1 and 2 within the lower ground and ground floor levels rely on the lightwells for natural light. As these serve bedrooms and the lightwells are at least 1.5-2m deep and at full floor to ceiling height, these are acceptable. The ground floor comprises the main kitchen and lounge area and as such is acceptable.
- 39 Officers note that one of the bedrooms on the second floor relies mainly on a rooflight for natural light and outlook. Whilst this is generally discouraged, this bedroom is technically on a mezzanine level and overlooks the main lounge area and would therefore still have some outlook. It is not substantial enough to warrant a reason for refusal in itself.
- 40 Private amenity space is provided for Units 1 and 2 (ground floor) within the lightwells. This totals at least 15sqm. The site is divided between the main building and rear chapel. Communal amenity space is provided at the rear of the main building and separated by a dwarf wall and timber fence totalling 2m in height. The remainder of the site will be private amenity space for the single family dwelling house (392sqm). It would be ideal for the 2 bedroom maisonettes to have private amenity space, but it is not a ground to warrant a refusal of the application in itself given all other aspects of living accommodation are satisfactory.
- 41 Overall, a satisfactory quality of accommodation will be provided.
- 42 Impact on nearby uses

The application site is within a residential area. The change of use from the hostel to five self-contained dwellings would be more in keeping with the character of the surrounding area which is characterised mainly by large family dwellings and flats in converted houses. It is not considered that the proposed conversion would have an adverse impact on the nearby residential uses.

# Design issues and impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

- 43 The main building of importance is the 19th century house itself which is an important element in the townscape of the conservation area and makes a positive contribution to its status as a heritage asset. Any work which would undermine this contribution should be resisted, but there does not appear to be any significant threat in this case. However, to ensure that this is the case conditions should be added to ensure that the windows are maintained in their current state ( at the front). It is recommended that the existing windows be retained and the glazing should remain single or possibly with very lightweight double glazing that is no more than 12mm.
- 44 The proposed extension is not significant in scale and would not dominate the host building. The extension has been designed to be in keeping with the character of the building.
- 45 This application has been reviewed by the Conservation Area Advisory Group (CAAG) and they were concerned about the quality of the landscaping at the front. It is important that the historic character of the street frontage be maintained along this part of Grove Park with boundary and planting proposals appropriate to this Victorian and Edwardian suburban character, and not be dominated by hard standing parking areas and bin stores. The garden has bin stores and bicycle stores to the front and it was recommended that these should be placed around the side of the house to free up space. Whilst the preferred location is to the side, for the ease of collection, these

storage areas remain within the front area. The Applicant has since amended the plans and have pushed the stores further away from the front boundary. The height of the store at 1.35m will only be slightly higher than the 1.2m front boundary fence. The soft landscaping would also partially screen these stores and this is now considered acceptable. In addition, 3 No. car spaces already exist on site.

- 46 The Chapel to the rear is mid 20th century and of only minor historic interest. Its character as a chapel and the quality of internal space has some merit but this has been taken into account in the proposal. It is also unlisted so there can be no objection to the interior alterations. The Design Officer advised that the chapel is not even locally listable.
- 47 The link building is of even less interest and appears to be a later addition, (possibly 1960's or 70's). Officers consider that the building has no significance as a heritage asset nor does it contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area. There is no objection to its demolition.
- 48 The existing 1.7m high boundary fence will be replaced with a new timber fence at 1.2m high. This would allow visibility into the house and would improve the streetscape. Further, this would be enhanced with hedgerow planting to the boundary.
- 49 There are no Listed Buildings close to the site which will be affected.
- 50 The scheme overall preserves the character and appearance of the Grove Park Conservation Area subject to conditions relating to landscaping, material samples and the retention of the timber windows.

#### Traffic issues

- 51 The proposal is not expected to generate a volume of trips which would create a significantly harmful impact on the local transport network, comprising as it does of five dwellings and with a density that is in accordance with the Council's Strategic Policy 5.
- 52 Notwithstanding proximity to bus routes and Denmark Hill train station, the application site is located in an area with a low public transport accessibility (PTAL) rating (2), reflecting the area's generally low level of access to all forms of public transport. Developments in areas with this PTAL rating are normally required to provide on-site parking in order to minimise overspill parking on the road network.
- 53 The applicant has proposed to retain the three existing off street parking spaces. The Transport Group do not object to this proposal, given that the site is located within a low PTAL (2) and is not located within a CPZ. The Transport Group consider that this would mitigate against any overspill parking that may occur as a result of this development.
- 54 Cycle and refuse storage are proposed within the front area and this has been relocated following CAAG's comments. These are secure and weatherproof.
- 55 It is considered that a balance should be attained between the need for parking and the impacts of car parking on the character of the Conservation Area, in particular landscape qualities. It is considered that adequate space would be proposed around the parking and vehicle manoeuvring areas, such that the appearance of the front garden would be high quality and would contribute positively to the streetscene, subject to a condition in relation to details of landscaping to be provided.
- 56 A new cross-over and vehicular access are proposed. Tracking diagrams have been

submitted to ensure that the parking layout is practicable and vehicles can enter and exit in a forward gear. These have been reviewed by Transport Planning and are acceptable.

57 The provision of 8 secure cycle parking spaces for five dwellings is encouraged and these are secure and weatherproof.

Waste

- 58 The refuse store for the single family dwelling house is located within the front yard and is hidden from the street. The communal bin storage area is proposed to be contained within a timber enclosure (to accommodate 1 No. 660ltr wheeled waste bins and 1 No. 360ltr wheeled recycling bin), which is adequate for the number of units proposed.
- 59 The refuse storage for the flats is located within the front garden area (labelled 11 and 12). Although this is located to the front and have the potential to compromise the appearance of the Conservation Area, it is appreciated that this is set back slightly from front boundary. The soft landscaping proposed helps to screen most part of this 1.35m high refuse store. Condition requiring landscaping scheme to be submitted prior to occupation is recommended.

#### Impact on trees

60 No trees are proposed to be felled and would be protected in accordance with British Standard 5837. There are no changes to the proposal that would affect trees. These matters can be secured by way of conditions. As highlighted above, soft and hard landscaping is proposed, which would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

#### Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

61 The proposal would convert the building into 5 No. residential units, which is below the threshold (of 10 units) to trigger any standard S106 financial contribution requirements having had regard to saved Policy 2.5 'Planning Obligations'. There are no site specific contributions that are considered to be required in this instance.

#### Other matters

#### 62 <u>Access</u>

The proposal would move the existing central pedestrian access to the side with new crossover and vehicular path provided. This will provide level access.

#### 63 Archaeology

The site is not within the Archaeological Priority Zone (APZ), but it is noted from a recently consented scheme at adjoining No. 17 that there is the presence of human remains at a burial site. The Council's Archaeology Officer advised at the time of the application for No. 17 that this does not preclude development, however a number of legal issues must be confirmed before works can commence. The provision of lightwells have been confirmed by the Archaeology Officer to be acceptable.

64 Officers still do not consider that the matters raised in relation to burials provide for grounds to refuse the scheme or to defer determination pending further information, but rather that there is a duty on the applicant to comply with all other regulations that pertain to development of the site, including the Disused Burial Grounds Act 1884 and the Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981. This is a separate matter for the applicant to address and not a material planning consideration.

#### Conclusion on planning issues

65 The proposed development is considered acceptable overall and would provide much needed family houses. The development does not significantly increase the footprint

within this Conservation Area and the rear extension would be of an appropriate scale. The demolition of the vestibule is acceptable and the fenestration changes to the chapel would preserve the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area.

66 The proposed development would not significantly harm neighbours' residential amenity and it would also not result in harm to the local highway network. It is therefore recommended for approval.

#### Community impact statement

67 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

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

#### **Consultation replies**

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

Summary of consultation responses

70 Four letters received from <u>The Ivanhoe Residents' and Tenants Association</u> -Development does not enhance the Conservation Area; it would be a gradual destruction of this Conservation Area; Local Authorities are under no pressure to grant planning permission to back garden developments according to the Chief Planner in the Coalition government; it will set a precedent for other developers to build in the large back gardens of Grove Park.

Two letters from <u>11 Blenheim Grove</u> - Object to proposal as this is in a Conservation Area; 'Garden grabbing' must stop; will destroy the historic chapel; will destroy hostel of 'special interest'.

Two letters from <u>8 Ivanhoe Road</u> - The development would not enhance the Conservation Area.

One letter from <u>71 Grove Hill Road</u> - The development will result in the loss of a green site and destroy a historic chapel.

One letter from <u>19 Grove Park</u> - Welcome the fact that No. 18, currently a subsiding eyesore, will be restored and again inhabited; the designs will be well executed; consider it too much to squeeze five dwellings and car spaces; whole garden will be for car parking; ideally would like to see No. 18 turned back into a single family house; see no historical or architectural merit in keeping the chapel; ideally chapel should be demolished and replaced by a well-designed garden for the house.

## Human rights implications

71 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/2154-17	Regeneration and	Planning enquiries telephone:
	Neighbourhoods	020 7525 5403
Application file: 11-AP-0225	Department	Planning enquiries email:
	160 Tooley Street	planning.enquiries@southwark.gov
Southwark Local Development	London	<u>.uk</u>
Framework and Development	SE1 2TZ	Case officer telephone:
Plan Documents		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 May 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 Neighbourhoods	Regeneration and	No	No			
Strategic Director of Housing	Environment and	No	No			
Date final report sent to Community Council Team27 April 2011			27 April 2011			

## **APPENDIX 1**

#### **Consultation undertaken**

Site notice date: 19.03.11

Press notice date: 17.03.11

Case officer site visit date: 19.03.11

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 15.03.11

Internal services consulted:

Design and Conservation Team Transport Planning

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Conservation Area Advisory Group (CAAG) Thames Water

#### Neighbours and local groups consulted:

41B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 41C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 37 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 40B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 40C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 41A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 43 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG FLAT 2 83 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF 19 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH 44 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 17-18 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH 40A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 4 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH 6 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH 8 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH FLAT 1 83 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF FLAT 3 83 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF 2 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH 42 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG FLAT A 39 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG FLAT B 39 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG FLAT C 39 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG 20 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH 81 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF 204 Camberwell Grove London SE5 8RJ 6 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH

**Re-consultation:** 

None

## Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

<u>Design and Conservation</u> - comments incorporated into the main body of the report. <u>Transport Planning</u> - No objections subject to conditions.

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

<u>CAAG</u> - No significant objections. The main concerns for the buildings were the treatment of the garden to the front of the building. The garden has bin stores and bike stores to the front these should be placed around the side of the house to free up space.

<u>Thames Water</u> - The Applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services to discuss options available at this site in regards to development close to public sewers. No objections with regards to water infrastructure.

#### Neighbours and local groups

Four letters received from <u>The Ivanhoe Residents' and Tenants Association</u> -Development does not enhance the Conservation Area; it would be a gradual destruction of this Conservation Area; Local Authorities are under no pressure to grant planning permission to back garden developments according to the Chief Planner in the Coalition government; it will set a precedent for other developers to building in the large back gardens of Grove Park.

Two letters from <u>11 Blenheim Grove</u> - Object to proposal as this is in a Conservation Area; 'Garden grabbing' must stop; will destroy the historic chapel; will destroy hostel of 'special interest'.

Two letters from <u>8 Ivanhoe Road</u> - The development would not enhance the Conservation Area.

One letter from <u>71 Grove Hill Road</u> - The development will result in the loss of a green site and destroy a historic chapel.

One letter from <u>19 Grove Park</u> - Welcome the fact that No. 18, currently a subsiding eyesore, will be restored and again inhabited; the designs will be well executed; consider it too much to squeeze five dwellings and car spaces; whole garden will be for car parking; ideally would like to see No. 18 be turned back into a single family house; see no historical or architectural merit in keeping the chapel; ideally chapel should be demolished and replaced by a well-designed garden for the house.