

<b>Item No.</b> 6.1	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 11 April 2012	<b>Meeting name:</b> Camberwell Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-3208 for: S.73 Vary/remove conds/minor alterations  <b>Address:</b> 18 GROVE PARK, LONDON, SE5 8LH  <b>Proposal:</b> Variation of Condition No. 2 of planning permission 11-AP-0225 dated 17.06.2011 (for 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; conversion of existing chapel into 4 bedroom single family dwelling house with extension of basement, replacement of timber windows, installation of windows and French doors to basement and installation of 6 No. rooflights; erection of front boundary wall and provision of 3 No. car parking spaces at the front) comprising:  Demolition of existing chapel and rebuild chapel within the same envelope to provide single family dwelling house, increase the chapel lightwell; alterations to chapel window configuration; alterations to the front garden area; delineation of private amenity space for the maisonettes and erection of new brick front garden wall		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	South Camberwell		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 4 November 2011		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 30 December 2011	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Agree Material Minor Amendment

## 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 was once 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 45 metres (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, in particular a cherry tree located in the garden of 19 Grove Park.
- 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 Core Strategy 2011; Urban Density Zone, Air Quality Management Area and the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area.

### **Details of proposal**

- 8 The original permission to which the current application relates has two main elements:

#### Main building

- 9 Conversion of 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). Existing basement to be extended to provide additional accommodation and provision of lightwells to the front and rear ranging between 1.5-2m in depth.
- 10 Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a two storey rear extension at ground and first floor levels, to measure a maximum of 3m deep and 10.7m wide.
- 11 Provision of a lots conversion at second floor level. Other minor alterations were also proposed, comprising replacement of the timber sash windows and installation of new windows to the rear elevation and provision of a new slate roof with 2 rooflights on the flat section of the roof.
- 12 **Proposed Amendment:** The only change proposed to the apartment building is that the previously communal rear garden would become two private rear gardens relating to the ground and lower ground two maisonettes. The refuse and cycle storage would be positioned slightly closer to the house, but would have the same capacity as previously consented.

- 13 Chapel

Demolition of the existing vestibule, which links the house to the chapel, as well as existing extension to the flank wall of the chapel to result in a simple detached building with a more rectangular footprint. Conversion of existing chapel into a 4 bedroom self-contained house spread over basement ground and first floors. Enlargement of basement by 0.7m in width and insertion of 2 new windows to the rear elevation with 4 new French doors proposed to the north east elevation at lower ground (basement) level. The existing timber windows would be replaced, and 6 new rooflights to be inserted into a new slate roof.

- 14 **Amendment:** Full demolition of the chapel building is now proposed, and a new building would be constructed within its envelope. The layout would be the same as the consented scheme 11-AP-0225 granted 17/6/2011. The windows would be larger than in the consented scheme, which proposed the retention of the chapel with its narrow arched windows. The new building would be constructed from brick to match existing. There would be a new slate, apex roof and the existing chimney would be repaired and reinstated.

- 15 The basement would remain the same size as approved and on the same footprint of the existing chapel building, but the external lightwell garden proposed to the east of the chapel would be extended further to the east. In the consented scheme the lightwell measured 3317mm at basement level, leaving 2652mm at ground level between the garden wall and lightwell. The proposed scheme would expand the lightwell at basement level to 5710mm with a stepped retaining wall along the boundary to accommodate tree roots from the cherry tree in the garden of 19 Grove Park.

### **Planning history**

- 16 11-AP-0225: Planning permission was granted on 17/06/11, for the 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.
- 17 Conversion of existing chapel into 4 bedroom single family dwelling house extension of basement, replacement of timber windows, installation of windows and French doors to basement and installation of 6 No. rooflights.
- 18 Erection of front boundary wall and provision of 3 No. car parking spaces at the front.
- 19 11-AP-0226: Conservation Area Consent was granted on 17/06/11, for the partial demolition of rear wall and removal of existing UPVC conservatory to No. 18, demolition of chapel vestibule, single storey extensions to north and east elevations, and removal of chapel external brick piers.
- 20 11-AP-3590: Accompanying application for Conservation Area Consent.
- 21 11-AP-3136: Approval was granted on 17/11/11 for approval of a landscaping scheme in respect of condition 8 of planning permission dated 17.06.2011 (LBS Reg No:11-AP-0225). This included the removal of 4 trees along the boundary with number 19 Grove Park, retention of 4 trees in the garden of 18 Grove Park and the planting of 12 new trees.

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

- 22 17 Grove Park  
Planning permission was granted in 1991 for the change of use from children's home (C2) to a hostel for homeless families (C3).
- 23 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.
- 24 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.
- 25 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.

- 26 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.
- 27 The most relevant and recent is at 42 Grove Park - 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.
- 27 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**

- 28 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) design
  - c) character and appearance of the conservation area
  - d) amenity
  - e) impacts on trees
  - f) transport impacts

### **Planning policy**

#### Core Strategy 2011

- 29 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

#### Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 30 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 SPD 2011  
 Camberwell Grove Conservation Area Appraisal 2003

London Plan 2011

- 31 Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm

- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands

- 32 NPPF 27 March 2012  
 Section 12, Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.  
 On 27 March 2012, the DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework with immediate effect. The NPPF replaces previous government guidance including all PPGs and PPSs. Full weight should be given to the NPPF as a material consideration in taking planning decisions.

1. the policies in the NPPF apply from the day of publication and are a material planning consideration;
  2. for the purpose of decision-taking, the policies in the Core Strategy, DPDs and SPDs should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF;
- for 12 months from the date of publication, decision-takers can continue to give weight to relevant local planning policies such as LDDs adopted in accordance with the PCPA 2004 and those in the London Plan. It should be noted that the weight accorded to saved policies of the Southwark Plan (UDP) should be given according to their degree of consistency with policies in the NPPF.

**Principle of development**

- 34 The Government Department for Communities and Local Government released guidance (Greater Flexibility for Planning Permissions) in 2009 to assist Local Planning Authorities (LPA) in the determination of applications. The Guidance has resulted in, amongst other measures, a mechanism being available by way of using s73 of the Town and Country Planning Act, which allows for planning conditions to be varied or deleted, to permit applicants to apply make minor changes from consented schemes, with the aim of helping make for a more streamlined planning process.
- 35 The DCLG Guidance states at Para 62 that,  
 'We agree with the definition by WYG 'A minor material amendment is one whose

scale and nature results in a development which is not substantially different from the one which was approved'. The Guidance notes that this is not a statutory definition. Officers are guided by the definition however as it appears to be a reasonable definition and is the only definition available to Local Planning Authorities.

36 This application therefore falls to be considered as a material minor amendment, the mechanism for the application being a variation to Condition 2 or the previous permission, to allow for changes from the approved plan numbers, the effect being in summary the demolition of the existing chapel and its replacement by a new building in the same location and of the same size, same general external appearance and the same proposed use as a house and with the same internal layout.

37 Sec.73 of the 1990 Act gives power for applications to be made to remove or modify conditions previously applied to a permission. In so doing a local authority may only consider the question of the conditions i.e. it may not enquire into the permission itself.

The local authority may decide whether to grant permission subject to differing conditions, remove the conditions altogether or refuse to alter conditions. Thus it is possible to apply for conditions to be struck out, or for their modification or relaxation. However, in terms of decision making a sec.73 application should be treated just like any other application, and due regard paid to the development plan and other material considerations.

39 Circular 11/95 para. 4 states that the original planning permission will continue to subsist whatever the outcome of a S73 application. Permission with modified or removed conditions is not legally a new permission, and thus any agreements or other restrictions related to the original grant of planning permission are still valid.

40 In this case, condition 2, listing the approved plans, was imposed in accordance with Government good practice guidance, 'Greater flexibility for planning permissions', to enable material minor amendments to be made to the scheme if necessary. The condition required that the scheme be carried out in accordance with the plans that were submitted with the previous scheme. This scheme to amend that condition would result in amendments being made and if granted, the scheme could be built out in accordance with either the originally consented scheme, or the revised scheme.

41 Officers consider that the main matters that the Council may concern itself with are whether the scheme as amended would result in a development which is substantially different from the one which was approved, impacts of the demolition of the building on the character and appearance of the conservation area, impacts of the proposed new building on the character and appearance of the conservation area, impacts on trees, transport impacts and impacts on residential amenities. These matters are addressed below.

42 The principle of developing the site for four flats and a house has already been established by virtue of planning permission reference 11-AP-0225. The London Plan 2011 has been adopted since the original permission was granted, but this does not raise any new material planning considerations that were not taken into account when the previous scheme was assessed.

43 The proposal now before Members for a 'minor material amendment' to the approved scheme, to allow the amendments set out in paragraphs 12 and 14.

44 The proposal is considered by officers to be minor, and to satisfy the test that the scheme as amended would not result in a development which is substantially different from the one which was approved, because;

- there are no substantial changes to the amount or quality of accommodation provided on site;
- whilst the volume of the permitted scheme is increased, the number of habitable rooms and accordingly the density of the building is to remain as previously approved;
- the alterations to the scheme are primarily to the rear of the site and the scheme is substantially the same in its effect and impacts as the consented scheme.
- the location, layout and scale of buildings on the site under the amended scheme would be the same as under the consented scheme. The detailed appearance of the replacement building would differ from the appearance of the chapel, but officers do not consider that it could be said to be 'substantially different' such that this scheme would be more than a minor amendment.

- 45 Objections have been received raising concerns about the justification for the demolition, and querying whether, if the chapel is demolished, the scheme should be re-visited with regard to the appropriateness of locating a house in that location at all. The assessment of acceptability of the proposed demolition of the building falls appropriately to be addressed in the accompanying application for conservation area consent, LBS Ref 11AP3590. The view of the objectors appears to be that the scheme as consented provided for a house too close to the rear of the main building at the front of the house, but that this was justified as the scheme was for re-use of an existing building. If the building is removed then that justification falls away.
- 46 Officers consider that there are two matters to consider here. Firstly, the guidance 'Greater flexibility for planning permissions' does not require justification for amendments to be provided and assessed. The test is whether the development that results from the scheme as amended would be substantially different. To this officers consider the response is that the development would not be substantially different.
- 47 Secondly, and in any event, officers were satisfied in relation to the originally consented scheme that there would be no harm to residential amenities as a result of the scheme., The dwellings at the front of the site, for example, would receive adequate outlook, light and sunlight/daylight despite the location of the chapel building. There would be no loss of privacy as the chapel building would not have windows facing the rear of the front houses. The scheme as amended retains a building in the same location and so again no harm to residential amenity would arise.
- 48 If permission is granted, it would have the effect of being a new planning permission, and conditions may be imposed. It would however have the same time expiry as the original permission. The original planning permission would also remain in place and could still be implemented. Officers consider that conditions should be imposed that reflect the originally imposed conditions except where considered necessary to amend or vary them as set out elsewhere in this report.
- 49 On the question of principal, for the reasons set out above, officers are satisfied that the scheme is acceptable, subject to detailed assessment below.

### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 50 None required due to the nature and size of the scheme which does not fall within Schedule 1 and is below the relevant thresholds for Schedule 2 development, being less than 0.5ha in area and as it is not within a sensitive area and would not generate significant environmental impacts in this urbanised location.

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

### Standard of accommodation

- 51 This scheme provides 2x 3 bedroom and 2x 2 bedroom dwellings within the main building and one 4 bedroom dwelling within the chapel building. There is no change proposed to the unit sizes, which were found to comply with the Council's adopted Residential Design Standards 2008, and also comply with the revised Residential Design Standards 2011, as well as the Unit size standards in the London Plan 2011.
- 52 The revisions to the chapel building would allow more natural light into the ground floor of the four bedroom house, as the new building would incorporate larger windows. This is acceptable as it would reduce reliance on artificial light, without introducing adverse amenity issues internally, as the windows are proposed to the same positions. A larger outdoor amenity space would also be provided to the eastern facade of the chapel.

### Impact on neighbouring occupiers.

- 53 An issue raised in consultation is that the enlarged windows coupled with the removal of trees on the eastern boundary of the site would lead to increased overlooking towards 19 Grove Park. Officers have taken account that the scheme would result in clearer views from the east facing bedrooms in the chapel, however the chapel bedroom windows are to be located 14m obliquely away from those of 19 Grove Park, therefore views of the rear of 19 Grove Park would not be direct. The SPD requires that rear facing windows be separated by a minimum of 21m, but this applies to those directly opposite each other. It is not therefore considered that significantly detrimental overlooking would result from the proposal.
- 54 The amendments are therefore in accordance with saved policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Core Strategy 2011 SP13 High Environmental Standards.

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

- 55 None envisaged.

### **Traffic issues**

- 56 The cycle and refuse storage would be moved back towards the main building by 1m, however the capacity would not change. There is therefore no harm arising in relation to transport impacts as a result of the proposed amendments.

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

- 57 The chapel building is not listed or locally listed, and though it is within the conservation area it is not visible from the street.
- 58 The building has some material character as a brick chapel, but the brickwork is not of high quality and by the standard of the 19th Century buildings around it, and this 1920's chapel is quite crudely constructed. It may not be considered a heritage asset of any significance as defined in PPS 5.
- 59 A Heritage Asset is defined within Annex 2 of PPS5, as follows:



- A building, monument, site, place or landscape, positively defined as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage Assets are the valued components of the historic environment. They include designated heritage assets and assets defined by the local planning authority during the process of decision making or through the plan making process (including local listing).

- 60 The proposed building is of identical massing, height and footprint to the existing chapel. Therefore, there would be no changes in the scale of buildings that would result from the development as amended.
- 61 Conditions should ensure that the proposed brickwork is of at least the same quality with sample bricks and panels of brickwork approved on site before work commences. Timber windows should also be approved as a condition. The suggestion that hardwood is used must not mean that natural finish dark tropical hardwood is used. Painted finished wood is probably preferable.
- 62 The previous consent included a condition which required an alternative front boundary treatment as that shown on the submitted plan was a timber fence which was considered by Members not to be of sufficient quality for the conservation area. The revisions to this scheme now include details of a wall with timber fence on top, which have been submitted as part of the current application and is considered by officers to be acceptable. There is now no requirement for a condition on this matter.
- 63 Officers have been on site to measure the dimensions of the existing chapel. The dimensions measured are in accordance with the dimensions that are scaled and noted on the submitted plans. A condition is recommended to ensure that the dimensions of the resulting new building, as shown on the plans, are adhered to in implementation.
- 64 The proposal is in accordance with saved policy 3.16 Conservation Areas of the Southwark Plan 2007, and SP12 Design and Conservation of the Core Strategy 2011.

### **Impact on Trees**

- 65 The implications of the wider lightwell in terms of trees are as follows:
- The expanded lightwell would affect the root area of the cherry tree in the garden of 19 Grove Park.  
The applicant has provided a report dated 12 February 2012 stating that, despite some roots having decayed the roots of the cherry tree actually grow back on themselves, towards the boundary. The design of the lightwell retaining wall is therefore amended to accommodate the healthy roots and this is shown in drawing 026-341 F.
- 66 A condition should be imposed to require the findings of the report to be adhered to.
- 67 The implementation of the previously approved landscaping plan subject of application 11-AP-3136 would no longer be possible due to the increased size of the lightwell. A fresh condition should therefore be imposed to state "notwithstanding the approved scheme 11-AP-3136, details of landscaping showing the planting of 12 new trees shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA".
- 68 A root protection diagram has been submitted. This is considered to be acceptable therefore there is no requirement to impose the previous condition on root protection details.

### **Other matters.**

- 69 An objection questions why, since the building is now to be demolished, the applicant did not propose the flats in the chapel building on another part of the site. In response officer note that it is not a requirement when considering an application for material minor amendments to re-visit the scheme in its entirety or to enquire into the justification for the amendment or whether the scheme could be improved in any other way. It is simply to determine whether the effect of the scheme as amended would be substantially different. This matter has been addressed above where officers conclude that the effect would not be substantially different.

### **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 70 It is considered that the scheme may be considered as a minor material amendment for the reason that the scale and nature of the development as amended would not be substantially different from the one which was approved. In particular, the amendments that arise would result in the replacement of the existing building with a building of identical footprint, height and massing, and of the same use as previously consented and same internal layout, and similar external design in relation to detailing such as windows and doors. The scheme is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

### **Community impact statement**

- 71 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.

### **Consultations**

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

### **Consultation replies**

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

### **Summary of consultation responses**

- 74 There were six objections received raising concerns about the following matters:
- scheme would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area
  - concern that the original scheme retained the existing chapel and the conversion of the chapel to residential use, in such close proximity to the existing front building, was acceptable in this context but that if the existing chapel is to be demolished, no justification of re-use of an existing building exists to justify a new house so close to the existing building which is to be converted to four houses
  - impacts on trees
  - existing building should be treated with more care and retained

### **Human rights implications**

- 75 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.
- 76 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.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

#### **Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance**

- 77 N/A.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2154-17 Application file: 11-AP-3208 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 5405 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>	Susannah Pettit, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	26 March 2012	
<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
Director of Planning	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	29 March 2012	

**Consultation undertaken**

- 80 **Site notice date:** 11/11/11
- 81 **Press notice date:** 10/11/11
- 82 **Case officer site visit date:** 11/11/11
- 83 **Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 15/11/11

**Internal services consulted:**

- 84 Design and Conservation team. Urban Forester.

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

- 85 English Heritage

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

- 86 19 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
44 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 2 83 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF  
17-18 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
45C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
45B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
37 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
43 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
38 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 1 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 8 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 7 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 3 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 2 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 4 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 6 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 5 16 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
45A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
42 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
8 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH  
20 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
79 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF  
77 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF  
FLAT 3 83 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF  
FLAT 1 83 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF  
2 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH  
THE IVANHOE RESIDENTS AND TENANTS ASSOCIATION 6 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH  
4 IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH  
81 GROVE HILL ROAD LONDON SE5 8DF  
40C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
40B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
41A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
41C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
41B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT A 39 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT B 39 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
40A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT C 39 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
71 Grove Hill Road SE5  
11 Blenheim Grove SE15  
19 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH

**Re-consultation:**

- 73 N/A

## Consultation responses received

### Internal services

- 87 Design and Conservation Team: Comments incorporated into report.  
88 Urban Forester: Comments incorporated in the report.

### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

- 89 LAMAS: Although the chapel appears rather featureless and is an undesignated heritage asset, its conversion may be appropriate. Its replacement however requires proper justification without which this committee would object because of the potential impact on the setting of other buildings and upon the character and appearance of the area.

### Neighbours and local groups

- 90 Ivanhoe Residents Association: Objection

I strongly object to the continual erosion of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area. The character of this site will not be enhanced. The developments will conflict with policies 3.12, 3.13, 3.15, 3.16 and 3.18 of the Unitary Development Plan 2007. It will not enhance the special interest or historic character or appearance of areas of historical or architectural interest and conserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets. It will conflict with policy PPS5 which seeks to sustain and enhance heritage assets.

71 Grove Hill Road: Objection

I object to the development - loss of wildlife, trees etc, and loss of heritage assets. This application will not enhance the Camberwell grove Conservation Area.

11 Blenheim Grove: Objection

The proposal will not enhance the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area and would conflict with policies 3.12, 3.13, 3.15, 3.16 and 3.18 of the Southwark Unitary Plan 2007. Therefore please refuse both applications as the Planning Inspectorate certainly would.

79 Grove Hill Road: Objection

When the initial planning application for this site went through, my main concern was for the future of the area of garden immediately behind the development, which appeared to be worryingly unaccounted for, and the fact that the short gardens offered with the accommodation in the main building were certainly not in keeping with the conservation area. I welcomed the fact that a new and productive use was being found for the fine historic buildings which were rapidly becoming derelict. The proposal to demolish the other walls of the chapel and replace them with a nondescript and unattractive alternative (presumably to squeeze more living space into the envelope) feels like the last straw.

No doubt repeated re-applications and amendments are perfectly within the law, but as a consultee I feel a victim of deception. The applicants are very experienced in forcing through changes mid-work, but most people don't have the time or the training to wade through complex drawings and descriptions online and work out the impact of 'minor changes' to the original proposals. I think it is quite wrong to try to sneak through something as major as the demolition of a 19th Century chapel as a minor amendment. I feel that this proposal is extremely dishonest and architecturally, quite out of keeping with the conservation area.

### 81 Grove Hill Road: Objection

A historic building in a conservation area should be handled much more carefully than the current developers are doing. They seem to have decided to wear down, step by step, application by application, any resistance to their decision to squeeze maximum profit out of this project. They seem to be paying no attention to the essential nature of this conservation area and have ignored its main glory: the vastness and beauty of its gardens. Seemingly unimportant changes of plans obscure the systematic dismantling of anything left of the original building.

### 19 Grove Park: Objection

At the time application 11-AP-0225 was being considered, we had indicated a preference to the developers to demolish the chapel on site and turn the main house back into a family house with a garden. However the developers informed us that the Council had indicated a preference at the time for the building to be retained. It now seems obvious that 11-AP-0225 was little more than a sham. The developers are proposing a clever shuffle, taking advantage of the existence of a building on site in order to demolish it and build something entirely different. It was a way of squeezing five dwellings into 18 Grove Park when very likely, they would have struggled to get permission for such a density or for building a second house in the garden of the main one.

The developers told us that they were only developing five dwellings *because* they had to work with the chapel; so if the chapel can or should now be demolished, there is no longer any justification for five dwellings. The developers should be obliged to work within the envelope that they themselves created with application 11-AP-0225.

- 19 Grove Park has always been overlooked by the chapel at 18 Grove Park. nevertheless there is a great difference between being overlooked by a chapel that is only used occasionally, and a permanently occupied house.
- It is one thing to convert an existing building into a house, but quite another thing to demolish an existing building and build a house. If a chapel had not been on site, would permission have been given at all to build a house just metres behind the main one? We think almost certainly not.
- The application makes much of building a new house within the existing envelope of the chapel. If a new dwelling can be justified at all, why can it not be built in a different part of the site, further back from the main house and at a reasonable distance from other surrounding houses.
- If the Council will not give permission for a better-situated house on the site, what can be the justification for approving a poorly situated one? There may at one time have been good reasons for building the chapel where it is (allowing nuns to get too and from services without getting wet etc), but it makes no sense to put a house in that location.
- The chapel has church-like Gothic-arch windows to the main elevation which overlooks our garden. They are discreet in size and quite deeply rebated so that looking out of them, one does not get a great vista over our garden. The original application proposed the restoration of these windows in their current size, shape and configuration, so as to preserve our privacy; they even told us they would fit frosted glass. They are now proposing to enlarge these windows. The occupants of the house would therefore have a view over our garden.
- The chapel has a basement which the developers wish to extend to the full footprint of the garden. Why is this essential? It is possible to underpin a building without doing this. The further excavation will destroy the roots of more trees on site.
- If there must be a basement, why not put the lightwell at the southern end of the chapel, where it would get plenty of natural light?
- The developers make much of creating a 'sunken-garden' at basement level between the chapel and the boundary wall. In reality, the 'sunken garden' would be a narrow, gloomy hole in the ground, 4.3m deep on the side of the boundary wall, and even deeper on the chapel side.

- Four fruit trees have already been destroyed near the chapel. These trees were an important shield between the chapel and our garden and without them we are now dominated by the whole mass of building.