

<b>Item No.</b> 6.3	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 21 July 2011	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Camberwell Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-1562 for: Conservation Area Consent  <b>Address:</b> CAMBERWELL GREEN UNITED REFORM CHURCH, 64 GROVE LANE, LONDON, SE5 8SN  <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing 1960s brick / concrete church and perimeter hardstanding and steel fence, to facilitate redevelopment as proposed under application ref. 11AP1561		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Brunswick Park		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 13 June 2011		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 8 August 2011	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant Conservation Area Consent.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site Location and description

- 2 The application site comprises a church building that is located towards the northern end of Grove Lane at its junction with Love Walk. The church building stands at approximately 4 storeys in height when compared to the adjacent listed terrace of properties it adjoins. The building is of brown brick construction with a flat bituminous felt roof. The exterior consists of a small concrete paved parking area and a large exterior ramp that provides wheelchair access to the church.
- 3 The site is in a predominantly residential area that comprises a number of Listed Georgian houses which abut the application site to the north. This terrace, 18-60 Grove Lane is grade II listed and illustrates excellently the character of the late 18th Century elements of the conservation area, which is defined by the interrelationship of well ordered and continuous building facades and strong front garden planting and street boundaries, complimented by street trees. It is also the oldest terrace on Grove Lane built in the late 1700s.
- 4 The application site falls within the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area and is also within a high PTAL area (6a=) and is within the Urban Density Zone.

### Details of proposal

- 5 Conservation Area Consent is sought for demolition of the existing church building including the perimeter hard standing and steel fence. The proposal to demolish the existing building is supported by a conservation area design statement which seeks to justify the removal of the building, having regard to PPS 5 'Planning for the historic environment'.

- 6 The proposed replacement development for the site is the erection of 8 x three bedroom dwellings in a four storey block along Grove Lane and a four bedroom, three storey property at the end of the terrace on the corner of Grove Lane and Love Walk. A replacement 2 storey church and community hall building would be erected on Love Walk. This is detailed under the report for planning application reference 11-AP-1561.

### **Planning history**

7 08-AP-3019

Planning permission was refused on 27 April 2009 for demolition of existing church building, hard standing and steel fence and erection of a four storey terrace block comprising 8 three bedroom split level maisonettes with a three storey 3 bedroom house at the southern end, all facing Grove Lane, and erection of 2 storey church and community hall building (Class D1) at rear facing Love Walk.(08-AP-3019)

The application was refused for the following reason:

*The proposed development by reason of its detailed design, elevational treatment, and use of materials, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area and would fail to preserve the setting of neighbouring listed buildings, and would not respond adequately to this important corner site in urban design terms, thereby harmful to visual amenities. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.12 'Quality in Design', 3.13 'Urban Design', 3.16 'Conservation Areas' and 3.18 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites' of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.*

8 08-AP-3020

Conservation Area consent was also refused on 27 April 2009 for demolition of the existing church building.

Conservation area consent was refused for the following reason;

*In the absence of an acceptable scheme of development for the site, the demolition of the existing buildings would be premature and would result in an unsightly vacant site at this prominent position within the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area, harmful to visual amenities, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of neighbouring listed buildings; thereby contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.16 'Conservation Areas' and 3.18 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites' of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.*

9 09-AP-2368

Planning permission was refused on 11 November 2009 for the demolition of existing church building including perimeter hard standing and steel fence. Erection of 8 x four bedroom dwellings in a four storey block along Grove Lane, with roof terraces above, and a four bedroom three storey property at the end of this terrace on the corner of Grove Lane and Love Walk together with the erection of a replacement 2 storey church and community hall building on Love Walk.

Planning permission was refused for the following reasons;

*1) The proposed development by reason of its detailed design - including the form of the roof, elevational treatment, and use of materials, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area and would fail to preserve the setting of neighbouring listed buildings, and would not respond*

*adequately to this important corner site in urban design terms, thereby harmful to visual amenities. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.12 'Quality in Design', 3.13 'Urban Design', 3.16 'Conservation Areas' and 3.18 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites' of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.*

*2) The proposed roof terraces, due to their height and the degree to which they are unenclosed, will result in the potential for an unacceptable degree of noise breakout at this elevated level and as such would result in loss of amenity for nearby residents by reason of noise and disturbance. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.*

10 09-AP-2369

Conservation area consent for demolition of the existing building was also refused for the following reason:

*In the absence of an acceptable scheme of development for the site, the demolition of the existing buildings would be premature and would result in an unsightly vacant site at this prominent position within the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area, harmful to visual amenities, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of neighbouring listed buildings; thereby contrary to Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.16 'Conservation Areas' and 3.18 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites' of the Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.*

11 An appeal against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission was lodged on 22 April 2010 and was subsequently dismissed.

12 In dismissing the appeal the Inspector considered the main issues to be:

- Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area;
- The effect of the proposal on the setting of nearby listed buildings; and
- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the adjacent occupiers.

13 The Inspector concluded by stating as follows, *'I have had regard to all other matters raised, including the impact on privacy and outlook. I do not find that the living conditions of existing adjacent occupiers, whose gardens are already overlooked to some extent by adjacent dwellings, would be unacceptably worsened by the proposal. There would be no increased overlooking of the private areas close to the houses. Nor do I consider that their outlook would be compromised unreasonably, to the extent that the UDP policy would be breached. However, the harmful impact of the scheme on the historic significance of the listed terrace and the character and appearance of the conservation area and the detrimental effect on the living conditions in terms of noise and disturbance (from the roof terrace), are compelling.'*

#### **Planning history of adjoining sites**

14 None of relevance

#### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

##### **Summary of main issues**

15 The main issue to be considered in respect of this application is:

a] impact on the character and appearance of this part of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area.

### **Planning policy**

#### Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

16 Saved Policies

Policy 3.15 - Conservation of the historic environment

Policy 3.16 - Conservation Areas

Policy 3.18 - Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites

17 London Plan 2008 consolidated with alterations since 2004

4B.1 - Design principles for a compact city

4B.8 - Respect local context and communities

18 Core Strategy

Strategic Policy 12 - Design and Conservation

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

PPS 5 - Planning for the Historic Environment

### **Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area**

- 20 Conservation area consent is sought for the demolition of the existing church building on the site. The applicant has submitted sound and robust justification for the demolition of the existing building in line with PPS 5.
- 21 The existing building is not of an architectural quality that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Indeed, paragraph 3.2.19 of the Conservation Area Appraisal describes it as '*an unsympathetic modern building made worse by the dominance of its wheelchair access ramps*'. It is also noted that the Inspector acknowledged that it does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area in his assessment of the earlier appeal. Its removal is therefore considered to be justified in this instance given its poor quality.
- 22 However, one of the tests of PPS 5 where demolition of an existing building is proposed is that the replacement building must be of sufficient quality in terms of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. Officers considers that the replacement building, as detailed in the associated planning application report, would be an acceptable replacement which would enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, therefore no objections are raised in this regard.
- 23 As stated, the site is within close proximity to many listed terraces in the area, particularly nos. 18-60 Grove Lane and as such saved policy 3.18 'Setting of Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and World Heritage Sites' applies. These listed buildings contribute to a consistently high quality of Georgian terraced development in the area.
- 24 Policy HE7.7 of PPS 5 states that "*Where loss of significance is justified on the merits of new development, local planning authorities should not permit the new development without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred by imposing appropriate planning conditions or securing obligations by agreement.*" To that end, in the event that conservation area consent is

granted, officers recommend a condition requiring a contract for the redevelopment of the site to be submitted for approval. This would ensure that there would be no harmful 'gap' site which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings.

- 25 PPS5 states that *“When considering applications for development that affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities should treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset. When considering applications that do not do this, local planning authorities should weigh any such harm against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval.”* The impact of the replacement development on the setting of the listed terrace is considered in full in the associated planning application report (reference 11-AP-1562) and is found to be acceptable.
- 26 Overall, there are no objections to the loss of the existing building given its poor quality and because there is an acceptable scheme for redevelopment.

### **Conclusion**

- 27 The demolition of the existing church building is considered to be acceptable having regard to the tests in PPS5. It detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the adjacent listed buildings, and the replacement scheme is considered to be of an acceptable quality. It is therefore recommended that conservation area consent be granted, subject to conditions.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2135-66  Application file: 11-AP-1562  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: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a> Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5428 Council website: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk">www.southwark.gov.uk</a>

## APPENDICES

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

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Donald Hanciles, Senior Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	30 June 2011	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Community Council Team</b>	21 July 2011	

**Consultation undertaken**

28 **Site notice date:** 3 June 2011

**Press notice date:** 2 June 2011

**Case officer site visit date:** 3 June 2011

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 03.06.2011

**Internal services consulted:**

Conservation and Design

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

English Heritage

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:** Consultation carried out under associated planning application reference 11-AP-1561.

**Re-consultation:**

Not required

**Consultation responses received**

29 **Internal services**

Conservation and Design - comments incorporated into body of report.

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations**

30 English Heritage

The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

**Neighbours and local groups**

31 URC Local Amenity Societies Working Party - although raised a number of concerns with regards to loss of privacy, noise pollution, parking, design, generally there is support, subject to conditions, for the present plans as they consider the proposal would add to the character and enhance the surrounding conservation area and respect the historic significance of the Grade II Listed Terrace to which it is adjoined.

32 8 Love Walk - welcomes the proposal to replace the current building, but raised concerns on design grounds and the fact that the proposed development should be houses with gardens instead of flats. Also comment that the proposed church building should be a landmark feature and that the design of the tower should be given further consideration as the design presently lacks imagination. Also comment that the height of the church building should be reduced. Raised concerns about refuse and arrangement for collection. Comment that the proposed ramp to the front is unnecessary and raised concern about the end house being an afterthought notwithstanding its prominent corner location. Comment that the quantum of development for the site is excessive and in that regard have strong reservations about the proposal as a whole.

33 9 Love Walk - Comment that although the proposal to replace the existing church building is welcomed, raised objections to the proposed development on the grounds of overdevelopment, the height of the proposed scheme, the introduction of flats as opposed to family houses, inappropriate design as the planned arrangement is not in keeping with any of the local architecture, lack of off street car parking provision and traffic generation, safety, overlooking and loss of privacy, the size of the new church being too large.

34 44 Grove Lane - supports the views expressed by the Working Party. Considers that the existing building is no longer fit for purpose. Also comment that if the Council were to be satisfied about the Working Party's concerns over invasion of privacy, noise pollution and parking with appropriate conditions, the proposed scheme would be improved further and provide the right solution for this very important corner in the Conservation area.

35 51 Grove Lane - raised questions as to whether the existing lime trees will be affected by the proposed development, the permitted hours allowed for building work, provision for wheelie bins to be kept out of public view, use of communal front gardens for social activities. Also comment that if future residents are entitled to parking permits, it should be no more than one permit per household.

36 46 Grove Lane - comment that the ramp to the front is unsightly and should be omitted



- and there should be continuous gardens. Also comment that particular attention need to be paid to the design details as detailed in the Working Party's conditions. Also comment that the flat roof to the end house should not be used as a roof terrace in order to avoid noise nuisance. Also concerned about noise from the balconies and inappropriate use of the balconies that would be detrimental to the character of the area. Comment about adequate security to the church building and the use of appropriate materials. Supports the current scheme on the basis that the conditions suggested by the Working Party being applied separately.
- 37 56 Grove Lane - Endorses the position taken by the Local Amenity Societies' Working Party and should the Council be minded to grant planning permission, it should include all the Working Party's suggested conditions.  
Suggested two conditions in relation to the facade;  
a) The front doors throughout the existing terrace are paired and on a level with each other. Suggested the terrace should be completed sympathetically with the inherent symmetry of the original 18thc design and noted that this suggestion would solve the problem of the doors not being paired or on a level.  
b) The ramp is considered a jarring element in the general design and in relation to the facade, and its removal would allow the front garden area to be a continuous garden space as the rest of the terrace. Comment that the suggested changes would strengthen the proposed design and add elegance to the terrace and respect its historical significance.
- 38 50 Grove Lane - raised objection to the proposal but add that only if the conditions set out by the Working Party of the Camberwell Society should the application be approved.
- 39 87 Grove Lane - concerned that the design of the facade is still not harmonious, the pairs of front doors are not level with each other unlike the rest of the doors throughout the rest of the adjoining Grade II Listed Terrace. The ramp being an unduly intrusive feature and sits awkwardly in relation to the facade. Also concerned about loss of privacy for no.9 Love Walk, particularly at first floor level because of the closeness of the proposed end house which is directly opposite. Also comment about the location of the refuse bins on a narrow road. Also concerned about lack of car parking provision. Recommend that the Council planning committee support the present application subject to the conditions proposed by the Working Party.
- 40 30 Grove Lane - comment that the present application is an improvement on the previous plans and supports the position adopted by the Local Amenity Societies' Working Party with suggested conditions. Comment that particular importance should be given to the Grove Lane facade. The ramp is unnecessary and an ugly attachment to the frontage and it is important for the doors to be aligned correctly. Also comment that the materials to be used are listed in detail. Also comment that all details of what is permissible on site should be secured at this application stage to ensure a high quality development is achieved should in case the site is sold on in the future.
- 41 28 Grove Lane - supports the application proposal and comment that the development will enhance that part of the conservation area. Welcomes retention of the church, albeit smaller than the present church and comment that the proposed block of flats and single house will provide a reasonably harmonious extension to the listed terrace. Also comment that if possible for the conditions suggested by the Working Party to be imposed, would be welcomed.
- 42 Comment received with no address; comment that the Council insist that the Developers will meet the recommendations of the URC Local Amenities Societies' Working Party