

<b>Item No.</b> 7.3	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 11 June 2013	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 13/AP/0583 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 26 GROVE PARK, LONDON SE5  <b>Proposal:</b> Retention of a new 5 storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear. (Amendment to previously consented scheme reference 07-AP-0144, to include altered depth and height of building, alteration to accommodation mix, and alteration to materials).		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	South Camberwell		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 26/03/2013		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 21/05/2013	
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b> 12/05/2013			

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

- 2 The application relates to a recently constructed building which is nearing completion, for a five storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear, on land which was previously used as a garage. Number 26 is listed in Council records as "Highgrove House" with flats 1-8, 26 Grove Park.
- 3 The site is at the end of a row of large Victorian and some Edwardian Houses, and forms part of the Grove Park conservation area. To the east of the site is the south London railway line. The embankment and land adjacent to this is designated Borough Open Land within the Core Strategy Proposals Map 2012. The site also lies within the Urban Density Zone. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 2, indicating a relatively low access to public transport.

### Details of proposal

- 4 The applicant is seeking planning permission to regularise the scheme which is nearing completion, described above, for which several discrepancies have arisen between the original approved scheme and the 'as-built' scheme.
- 5 The differences are outlined below:
  - The original approved scheme did not take account of accessibility and circulation

around the building, and therefore would have contravened a number British Standards and Building Regulations. Lobbying, ventilation and fire protection of the stair core has therefore had to be incorporated which has affected the building envelope.

- The approved drawings do not take account of accessibility - the main entrance was not appropriate for wheelchair use. The revised entrance has eliminated the corner.
- Within the units, fire protection and means of escape was not taken into account and the incorporation of these measures as well as a lift core has resulted in alterations to the dwelling sizes and mix.
- The dwelling mix is 3 x 3 bed flats, and 5 x 2 bed flats. The approved scheme contained 2 x 4 bed flats, 4 x 3 bed flats and 2 x 2 bed flats. The unit sizes are set out in the amenity section of this report.
- A lift has been added, which has resulted in an increase in overall height of the building by 2.3m.
- These internal alterations have resulted in an increase of the building depth by 992mm from north to south, when compared with the consented scheme. The balconies on the rear elevation remain as being inset, and not projecting from the building line.
- Window position has been altered on the east elevation - the windows, which relate to habitable rooms (dining rooms, kitchens, bedrooms and studies) have been re-aligned to be more central and positioned more towards the rear.
- The layout of the basement has been altered to accommodate the lift core.
- Materials have been altered, and these are given in the design section of this report.
- Cycle parking layout has been amended.

## Planning history

- 6 **07-AP-0144** (Registered as "land adjacent to 25 Grove Park")  
Planning permission was granted on 23/11/07 for the erection of a five storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear on vacant land previously used as a garage.
- 7 Conditions  
  
The following conditions have been discharged:  
  
08-AP-2356 - Shutter details  
08-AP-2357 - Loggia details  
08-AP-2358 - Window reveal details  
08-AP-2359 - Railing details  
08-AP-2347 - Contaminated Land Assessment.
- 8 **08/AP/2606** - Details of a tree protection plan from a qualified Arboriculturalist as required by Condition 14 of planning permission dated 23/11/07 - LBS Registration No 07-AP-0144 for erection of a new 5 storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear on vacant land previously used as a garage. This application has also remained undetermined as further information was required as the removal of 11 trees and proposed tree protection measures were not considered acceptable.
- 9 **08/AP/2608** - Details of an Arboricultural method statement as required by Condition 15 of planning permission dated 23/11/07 - LBS Registration No 07-AP-0144 for erection of a new 5 storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear on vacant land previously used as a garage. This application has also remained undetermined

as further information was required as the removal of 11 trees was not considered acceptable.

**09-AP-1368**

- 10 Minor Material amendment was granted on 03/11/09, for the removal of condition 16 from the above planning permission (which required that the proposed development shall incorporate renewable energy technology and design to achieve a carbon dioxide neutral building). The revised condition required the development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes 3, and required, prior to occupation, a post construction review to be carried out, submitted to and approved by the LPA.

**11-AP-2897**

- 11 Material Minor amendment was granted on 16/11/11 for omission of conditions 14 in relation to tree protection and condition 15 in relation to the arboricultural method statement pursuant to planning permission 07-AP-0144 for the "Erection of a new 5 storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear on vacant land previously used as a garage". The tree works have already been undertaken and the trees are proposed to be re-instated by way of a Tree Replacement Notice subject to an agreed replanting scheme.

**12-AP-1797**

- 12 Non-Material Minor Amendment to add condition 16 (drawing numbers) to the parent scheme (07-AP-0144) was granted on 18/06/12.

**12-AP-1726**

- 13 An application for a Minor Material Amendment (s.73 application) with the following description was withdrawn on 16/04/13:

Variation to condition 16 (drawing numbers) of planning permission 11-AP-2897 dated 16/11/2011) [which permitted "Omission of conditions 14 in relation to tree protection and condition 15 in relation to the arboricultural method statement pursuant to planning permission 07-AP-0144 (for the "Erection of a new 5 storey building comprising eight residential units with basement car park for eight cars, sixteen bicycles and landscaping to front and rear on vacant land previously used as a garage") to regularise the following minor amendments:

- Revised floor to ceiling heights
- Revised depth of building
- Revised room size and accommodation schedule
- Revised elevational design

**10/EN/0447** - An enforcement investigation was opened in relation to the removal of 15no. trees within the site without consent. A Tree Replacement Notice was served on 07/12/11, and took effect on 19/01/12. The requirements of the notice were as follows:

"You are required to implement the replanting scheme as outlined in plan (attached to TRN) reference 205.10.2A. The planting works will result in the introduction of 14 new trees in total that will consist of three no. Gleditsia Triacanthos with a size of 20-25cm girth within a 150 litre pot, four no. Parrotia Persica multistem at a height of 2.25m within a 150 litre pot, three no. Prunus Padus "Albertii" with a size of 20-25cm and a 40 litre pot, and four no. Tilia Cordata 25-30cm girth within a 350 litre pot. Any trees that fail within a 5 year period shall subsequently be replaced".

The Tree Replacement Notice is covered further in paragraph 41 of this report.

**12/EN/0158-** An enforcement complaint was received on 16/03/12, alleging the possible departure from approved planning permission 07AP0144 rear boundary wall line not in accordance with approved plans. The investigation is still open, pending the outcome of this application.

## **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 14 25 Grove Park. Planning permission was granted in 1977 for the partial rebuilding and conversion of the property into self contained flats together with the erection of a rear extension to accommodate an access staircase.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 15 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) Land use issues
  - b) Enforcement issues
  - c) Amenity issues
  - d) Design and Heritage issues
  - e) Sustainability

### **Planning policy**

#### Core Strategy 2011

- 16 Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation  
Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

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

- 17 The Council's cabinet on 19th March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the Council satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 18 3.2 Protection of Amenity  
3.13 Urban Design  
3.12 Quality in Design  
3.15 Conservation of the Historic Environment  
3.16 Conservation Areas  
3.28 Biodiversity  
4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation  
4.3 Mix of Dwellings

#### London Plan 2011

- 19 Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply  
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments  
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 6.9 Cycling  
Policy 6.10 Walking

- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
- Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
- Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands

#### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 20 The following sections are particularly important:
- Section 4: 'Promoting sustainable transport'
  - Section 6: 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes'
  - Section 7: 'Requiring good design'
  - Section 11: 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment'
  - Section 12: 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'

#### **Principle of development**

- 21 The principle of development has already been established by recent and past decisions on this site. Residential has been found to be an acceptable land use and would accord with the area. The scheme has been assessed previously in relation design, amenity and transport. The scheme before Councillors now is for the further assessment of the elevation changes and their effect on the amenity of nearby residents, the character and appearance of the conservation area, quality of accommodation provided and its impact on the future residents, and the acceptability of the amended parking layout in the basement. These are all discussed below.

#### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 22 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**

##### Daylight and Sunlight

- 23 The projecting element of the rear stair core of 25 Grove Park already blocks the 45° line drawn westwards from the window of the habitable rooms, which are in the main elevation to the rear of 25 (and as a result, those of 24 also). The proposal site does not project any further from this element and is not therefore causing any loss of daylight or sunlight from neighbouring windows. In terms of the closest windows to the application site, these are at raised ground and first floor in 25 Grove Park. There is no lower ground floor window. The ground floor glazed door here relates to a communal entrance hall and leads onto a small balcony. The first floor window relates to a bathroom. It is not considered that the additional rearward projection at the application site would lead to a significant loss of light from these windows, for the following reasons: The additional projection is only 992mm, and in addition the buildings are separated by a 1.8m gap. The 45° BRE test has been applied to the plan, and whilst the additional depth would block the line drawn from the centre of the windows, these windows are not habitable rooms, therefore no significant harm would arise.

## Dwelling Mix, and Room and Unit Sizes

- 24 The dwelling mix has been altered, and due to the reasons outlined in the applicant's cover letter, which states that a lift had to be installed, as well as additional fire proofing, three of the larger units have had to be converted to smaller ones, resulting in 5 x 2 bedroom flats and 3 x 3 bedroom flats, in place of the previously consented 2 x 4 bed, 4 x 3 bed and 2 x 2 bed. This revised mix still meets saved policy 4.3 Dwelling Mix of the Southwark Plan, as an adequate mix of unit sizes would be provided, and the majority of units would have two or more bedrooms.

The unit sizes are as follows:

FLAT	07-AP-0144	13-AP-0583
A	113sqm (2 bed)	80.1sqm (2 bed)
B	108.9sqm (3 bed)	127.4sqm (3 bed)
C	71.5sqm (2 bed)	71.8sqm (2 bed)
D	78sqm (3 bed)	81.6sqm (3 bed)
E	71.5sqm (2 bed)	71.8sqm (2 bed)
F	78sqm (3 bed)	81.6sqm (3 bed)
G	139.3sqm (3-4 bed)	136.2sqm (3 bed)
H	156.3sqm (4 bed)	151.2sqm (3 bed)

- 25 The room and unit sizes all generously comply with the Residential Design Standards, and in all cases exceed the required floor areas. With the exception of one bedroom for flat B (Ground floor) located beneath the living room for flat D (First floor) (both two bedroom flats), stacking arrangements are all acceptable. On balance it is not considered that the living room above the bedroom of another flat would harm the residents' amenity, in view of the fact that a condition on sound insulation is to be attached to the recommendation, which would ensure sound levels in the flats remain below a specified level.

### Overlooking

- 26 It is not considered that the increased depth of the building by 992mm would result in significant additional overlooking to neighbouring properties. The balconies do not project from the rear elevation but are inset. This is the same arrangement as in the previous approval, as such same view would be afforded from the external balconies to the rear as on the approved scheme. An oblique view of gardens to the east could be had by leaning over the balustrade of the balcony, but this would be an indirect oblique view, and not worsened by this application.
- 27 It is considered that the proposal complies with saved policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan 2007 and SP13 High Environmental Standards of the Core Strategy 2011.

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

- 28 The imposition of conditions regarding sound insulation for the new properties shall ensure the protection of the future residents from noise from the railway adjacent to the site.

### **Transport issues**

- 29 The approved scheme provided 8 car parking spaces in the basement. The current scheme also proposes 8 car parking spaces, to include 2 wheelchair parking spaces

which is welcomed. This meets the current standard in the Southwark Plan 2007 for the Urban Density Zone, which recommends a maximum of one space per unit. Due to the site's relatively low PTAL of 2, this provision is considered acceptable and would discourage cars from being parked on the street. The increased width of the basement allows the parking to be accommodated more comfortably, in a row rather than positioned in ad hoc spaces as with the 07-AP-0144 scheme.

16 Sheffield cycle parking spaces are provided in the basement. This is the same number as provided in the previous scheme which exceeds the requirement in the Southwark Plan for one space per unit plus one visitor cycle parking space be provided. The spaces are also secure, convenient and weatherproof in accordance with policy 5.3 Walking and Cycling.

- 30 The scheme complies with saved policies 5.3 Walking and Cycling, 5.6 Car Parking and 5.7 Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired of the Southwark Plan 2007, and SP2 Sustainable Transport of the Core Strategy 2011.

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

- 31 The NPPF states at paragraph 58 "developments should respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation".
- 32 Saved Policy 3.12 Quality in Design of the Southwark Plan 2007 states 'new buildings and alterations to existing buildings should embody a creative and high quality appropriate design solution, specific to their site's shape, size, location and development opportunities and where applicable, preserving and enhancing the historic environment.'
- 33 The consented scheme (07-AP-0144) received a positive response from the Design Review Panel and the Design and Conservation Team. Due to the strong design and reference to key architectural styles in the area, the development was deemed to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and it was deemed a good quality design. The scheme also sought to maintain established heights on the street and maintain front and building heights.
- 34 It would appear from the submitted documentation that there were errors with the original site survey and application drawings. The application to regularise 'as built' scheme is as a result of having to align with the front of neighbouring buildings. The rear building line of the 'as built' scheme is 992mm further back in order to accommodate fire protection lobbies, wheelchair refuge, smoke shaft and service risers left out of the previously consented scheme. To accommodate this; and due to the constraints of the site and without compromising flat layouts, it is only possible to increase the size of the core, and this has resulted in the depth of the building being increased by just under one metre.
- 35 The basement has also been lowered by 500 mm as a result of the need to comply with Part E and the London Housing Design Guide and the constraint of the new building having to be no higher than the highest part of the neighbouring building.
- 36 There have been other elevational changes; in part due to discrepancies in the consented scheme drawings. This includes a larger set back on the upper floor (northern elevation).
- 37 Whilst the increase in height is not ideal, the building does still comply with the condition attached to the previous scheme as it does not exceed the highest part of the neighbouring building (the chimney). It is not considered that this results in

significant harm to the streetscene or to the character or appearance of the conservation area, as the building line along the street is largely maintained. The front building line has not been altered, and this is demonstrated on the applicant's overlay drawings.

- 38 With regards materials, changes have also been made from the consented scheme. The developer has been unable to source the 'iron oxide impregnated brickwork.' A 'Funton Old Chelsea' London Stock has been used as a facing material, to reflect the neighbouring properties. Other material changes identified include a change in cladding; top floor western elevation and for the loggia balconies an aluminium mesh in lieu of oxidised copper. At ground level a self coloured render instead of reconstituted stone. With the exception of the render at ground floor level, these materials are all considered acceptable and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 39 The shutters have been omitted on the northern elevation. Notwithstanding that they would serve no purpose on this elevation there were sourcing issues.
- 40 In summary the previously consented scheme proposed a building that was considered to preserve and enhance the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area. Whilst the need to comply with current Building Regulations, inaccuracies in the original survey and the problems this then caused are accepted, some of the changes to materials, such as: the render are regrettable. However, the render is only to the ground floor, and on balance it is considered that the impact of these modifications overall, are not sufficient to refuse this application to regularise the 'as built' development, and the application complies with NPPF, the Core Strategy 2011 and the saved policies of the Southwark Plan 2007.

#### **Impact on trees**

- 41 Drawing number 205.10.2A was submitted by the applicant in response to the Tree Replacement Notice served in early 2012. This showed a landscaping layout showing proposed positions of trees, and the tree species and girths were agreed in planning application 11-AP-2897. A condition shall be carried forward onto the recommendation for this scheme, to reinforce that the scheme shown on drawing 205.10.2A shall be implemented. In brief, this requires that the species, size and location of the new trees are to be agreed with the LPA's Urban Forester and planted prior to occupation of the scheme, and the replacement of diseased or dying trees in the first available season.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

- 42 The development was required to meet with Code for Sustainable Homes 3, in a condition added in 2009. Current policy would require the developer to meet with Code for Sustainable Homes 4. Code for Sustainable Homes is assessed according to scores, which rate the development in various categories (Energy, Water, Materials, Surface Water, Waste management, Heating and insulation, Construction management, and Ecology). A score of 57 credits is required to meet Code 3, and 68 is required to meet code 4. The developer has submitted a summary document setting out how the current development can be upgraded to score 64.48 (from the previous score of 57.05). The document sets out a response to each of the categories, and how measures have been incorporated to achieve the highest possible score. The document also sets out where the development is unable to be upgraded to achieve more credits in the categories. The development has achieved Code for Sustainable Homes 3 but has been upgraded to incorporate the following measures which have gained additional credits:



- Installation of 11 additional PV panels alongside the existing 17.
- Improvement 5db over Building Regulations Part E requirement of 3db in terms of insulation.
- Ecological value of the site has been increased to 'minor positive change' from 'neutral change'.

43 Areas where the development remains unchanged are as follows:

- The building fabric and materials remain as built.
- There is no possibility of installing white goods in each flat.
- There is no more room to install PV panels on the roof.

44 The developer has sought to improve the existing score as much as possible, and the only way that Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 might be achieved, is if the development were to be demolished and rebuilt as new, however the score of 64.48 is very close to the 68 required for Code 4. The reason why the development may not meet CSH4 is not as a result of the changes to the scheme as part of this application, but simply as a result of it not being constructed from the most up to date materials and specifications, which is mainly due to when it was granted planning permission. It is not considered that to withhold planning permission for this reason could be upheld.

### **Other matters**

45 S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL as a material "local financial consideration" in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail. The development would trigger CIL - proposed new floorspace is 802sqm and at a charge of £35 per square metre this equates to a CIL payment of £28,070.

### **Conclusion on planning issues**

46 It is considered that the scheme on balance is acceptable. Whilst there have been changes to the original consent during the course of construction, the changes do not introduce significant adverse amenity or design implications. Planning permission is therefore recommended.

### **Community impact statement**

47 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.

The impact on local people is set out above.

### **Consultations**

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

## Consultation replies

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

### Summary of consultation responses

50 Concerns about lack of enforcement, outlook, privacy issues, and concerns regarding how the building looks in the context of the conservation area.

## Human rights implications

51 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.

52 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a five storey building containing 8 flats. 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/2154-25 Application file: 13/AP/0583 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief executive's department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5405 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

## 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>	23 May 2013	
<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 Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	30 May 2013	

**Consultation undertaken**

**Site notice date:** 19/04/2013

**Press notice date:** 11/04/13

**Case officer site visit date:** 19/04/2013

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 02/04/13

**Internal services consulted:**

Environmental Protection Team  
Design and Conservation Team  
Transport officer

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

The Camberwell Society

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

FLAT 3 33 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 4 36 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 3 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 2 33 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 3 36 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 4 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 5 33 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 6 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 5 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 4 33 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 5 36 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
27C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 21 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
27B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT E 25 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
27A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 22 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 2 36 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 2 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 1 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 24 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 1 36 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 6 33 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
1-8 (consec) COPLESTON MEWS COPLESTON ROAD LONDON SE15 4PR  
BASEMENT FLAT 24 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 21 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
BASEMENT FLAT 22 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 7 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT 8 23 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 22 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
SECOND FLOOR FLAT 24 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
THIRD FLOOR FLAT 24 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
SECOND FLOOR FLAT 22 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 24 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
SECOND FLOOR FLAT 21 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT D 25 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT A 30 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT B 30 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
1A IVANHOE ROAD LONDON SE5 8DH  
155 CHADWICK ROAD LONDON SE15 4PY

20 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT C 30 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT C 25 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
31 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT B 25 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
FLAT D 30 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT A 25 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
GARDEN FLAT 21 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
35A GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
FLAT 1 33 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
35B GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
35C GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
1 COPLESTON ROAD LONDON SE15 4AN  
2 COPLESTON ROAD LONDON SE15 4AD  
32 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
1-11 (consec) LINWOOD CLOSE LONDON SE5 8UT  
34 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
28 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
29 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LG  
19 GROVE PARK LONDON SE5 8LH  
An Skyber Paul Penzance TR19 6UQ  
20 Luxor Street London SE5 9QN

**Re-consultation:**

N/A

**Consultation responses received**

**Internal services**

Environmental Protection Team - request conditions on vibration and sound insulation between units.

Design and Conservation Team (comments incorporated into the report)

Transport comments are incorporated into the report.

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations**

**The Camberwell Society**

The substantial variations to the scheme should have triggered a strong enforcement response from the Council. Despite the variations in the scheme, it remains very similar to the original proposal, in that it is a contemporary approach, using modern materials.

**Neighbours and local groups**

Objections received from:

Basement Flat, Ground Floor Flat, First floor flat, 24 Grove Park

28 Grove Park

Support received from a potential buyer

Frustrations that the developer had not gone back to the planning department on realising that the approved John Smart scheme was inaccurate and could not be built. Residents feel ignored because the building works have continued despite them having reported their concerns over a year ago.

Overlooking and privacy issues, but with goodwill from the developer these could be addressed.

The building is too tall and too large for the site.

The building line is much further back than its neighbours and this will result in the gardens at 24 and 25 feeling overlooked. The originally approved building used the neighbouring projecting staircore as a shield. Now that the building line has been extended, something needs to be done to mitigate the issue of overlooking such as screening on the balconies.

The front building line is too far forward, and with the overhang, it is not in keeping with the street.

The building now has balconies and a facade which protrude from the wall. This dominates the area.