

<b>Item No.</b> 7.1	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 24 January 2017	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 16/AP/2259 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> CABRINI HOUSE, 2 HONOR OAK RISE, LONDON SE23  <b>Proposal:</b> Conversion of existing vacant basement storage area to 3 residential units involving the creation of a new lightwells.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Peckham Rye		
<b>From:</b>	Director of Planning		
<b>Application Start Date</b>	01/08/2016	<b>Application Expiry Date</b>	14/10/2016
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b> 04/09/2016			

## RECOMMENDATION

1. Members to grant planning permission subject to conditions and informatives.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The application was deferred at the Planning Sub-Committee meeting of 28 November 2016 so that officers can supply the committee with information about the planning history of the site in relation to the assessment for affordable housing contributions.

### Site location and description

3. Cabrini House is a three-storey, locally listed Georgian building in use as 12 flats. The building is located on the corner of Honor Oak Rise (where the vehicular entrance is located) and Forest Hill Road. A three-storey coach house (extension) is attached to the main building and has permission to be used as 2 flats. There is a large forecourt between the building and Forest Hill Road where off-street car parking and a number of mature trees are located. The building located is within the Honor Oak Rise Conservation Area.

### Details of proposal

4. It is proposed to convert the basement of Cabrini House into three flats. This area is currently used as storage space by occupiers of the flats within Cabrini House.
5. The proposal was amended following concerns by officers that the second bedroom of flat 2 would not have adequate outlook. Flat 2 now only has one bedroom with two windows providing adequate outlook.
6. The design and access statement indicates that the headroom in the basement varies between 2.4m and 2.47m.
7. Four new lightwells are proposed to the south west elevation, two lightwells to the north western elevation and two lightwells to the south eastern elevation. The

lightwells would be 0.5m from the facade and would be enclosed by 1.1m high glass screens / panels. All new windows would be timber.

8. Flat 1 (69m<sup>2</sup>) would comprise two bedrooms (of which one would have an en-suite), hallway, bathroom, kitchen and an open plan living / dining area.
9. Flat 2 (68m<sup>2</sup>) would comprise one bedroom, bathroom and an open plan kitchen / living / dining area.
10. Flat 3 (131m<sup>2</sup>) would comprise two en-suite bedrooms, living room, open plan kitchen and dining room, hallway and storage area.
11. Flats 2 and 3 would have white timber bi-fold doors (to match existing windows above) opening onto an existing terrace to the north eastern elevation.
12. Access to the three flats would be from existing staircases located on the western and eastern sides of the building. Two of the three flats would also be accessible from the terrace along the north elevation.
13. The existing terrace to the south elevation would be separated by a screen and would be accessed from the respective living areas of Flats 2 and 3. The remainder of the existing communal areas would be available to future occupiers of the proposed development.
14. Six new cycle spaces would be provided, an additional refuse bin added to the existing refuse storage area and 1 new off-street car parking space provided.
15. **Planning history**

<p>03/AP/2209 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Erection of a 3 storey extension to the side of the main building, and part one storey/part two storey extensions above the existing ground floor at the rear of the building, and the conversion of the enlarged building to form 19 self-contained flats, with the creation of 18 off-street parking spaces at the front of the building. Decision date 01/03/2005 Decision: Granted with 'Grampian' Condition (GWGC)</p>
<p>05/AP/0722 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Erection of a three storey extension to the side and a two storey extension above the existing ground floor to rear of the main building and the demolition of a two storey building and replacement with a new two storey building to the rear of the site; conversion of enlarged modified buildings from bedsit accommodation and one self contained maisonnette into 12 x two bed and 2 x three bedroom flats with associated parking. Decision date 10/08/2005 Decision: Refuse (REF) Appeal decision date: 15/05/2006 Appeal decision: Planning appeal allowed (ALL). Reason(s) for refusal:</p>
<p>05/AP/2462 Application type: Conservation Area Consent (CAC) Demolition of two storey rear building and one storey lean-to building and removal of existing fire escape to the rear elevation. Decision date 01/08/2006 Decision: Granted (GRA)</p>
<p>08/EN/0513 Enforcement type: Non compliance with approved plans (NAP) Development not in accordance with approved plans in terms of basement under construction. Sign-off date 11/12/2009 Sign-off reason: Final closure - miscellaneous reason (FCM)</p>

10/AP/2688 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL)  
Retrospective application to vary the approved scheme appeal ref.  
App/A5840/05/1189974 (LBS ref. no. 05-AP-0722) to: create a 3 bedroom residential unit over the lower ground and upper ground levels of the coach house and change the height, design, massing and width of the coach house; retain the existing basement and use this space and the additional basement structure / space to the new three storey extension to Cabrini House as storage space; retaining wall to the north and east of the coach house and to the east of the new three storey extension to Cabrini House and revised hard and soft landscaping (including car parking spaces), refuse storage facilities, cycle parking and means of enclosure.  
Decision date 18/04/2012 Decision: Granted (GRA)

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

16. None

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

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

17. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) the detailed design of the alterations and the impact on the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area;
  - b) amenity issues for future occupiers of the units in the basement and adjoining properties;
  - c) car parking and transport impacts.

#### **Planning policy**

18. National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)
- 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
  - 7 Requiring good design
  - 12 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
19. The London Plan 2016
- 7.6: Architecture
20. Core Strategy 2011
- Strategic Policy 2 Sustainable Development
  - Strategic Policy 12 Design and Conservation
  - Strategic Policy 13 High Environmental Standards
- Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies
21. The council's cabinet on 19 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.

- 3.2 Protection of Amenity
- 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
- 3.12 Quality in Design
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 3.15 Conservation of the Historic Environment
- 3.16 Development in Conservation Areas
- 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
- 5.3 Walking and cycling
- 5.6 Car Parking
- 5.7 Parking Standards for Disabled People

Supplementary Planning Document

- 22. 2015 Technical update to the Residential Design Standards

**Principle of development**

- 23. The number of flats on the site would increase from 14 to 17, which is in line with the commitment of The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to support sustainable economic growth. The conversion of the basement into three flats is sustainable and there is no objection to the loss of additional storage space of existing flats to create much needed new homes.
- 24. The density of the site would increase from 270 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) to 325hrh, which is within the density range for the suburban density zone that is 200hrh to 350hrh.

**Environmental impact assessment**

- 25. The proposed development lies outside the scope of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999 and as such will not require the submission of an environmental impact assessment. It is not considered that significant environmental effects would arise.

- 26. **Summary of consultation responses**

Total number of representations:	19				
In favour:	3	Against:	13	Neutral:	3
Petitions in favour:	0		Petitions against:	0	

**Details of Responses**

- 27. Against
  - Loss of storage space.
  - Impact on appearance and character of (locally) listed building.
  - Loss of amenity as a result of reduction in communal space.
  - Inappropriate development creating poor quality living
  - Loss of visitor and disabled parking:
  - Insufficient waste storage for an additional three flats.

28. Non-planning matters cited

- There is a history of inadequate building control and serious defects - *Building Control completion certificate issued on 04/12/2013.*
- Incorrect and misleading information submitted in relation to drawing ref. 16/004 dated 23.05.2016. - *Drawing subsequently revised. Lightwell removed and number of bedrooms reduced from 2 to 1.*
- Health and safety construction concerns - *Separate Building Control approval required for the works covered by this proposal.*
- The basement under flats 1-6 have flooded on various occasions (as far back as at least 2012). Our understanding is that the existing sewage and draining system is not sufficient to support the existing flats. Building a further three flats would cause additional pressures on an already failing system and we have no doubt that this would lead to further flooding. The basement under flats 7-12 have flooded on numerous occasions. One of the flats in the Coach House has also flooded throughout 2015 and 2016, which has led to numerous insurance claims.- *Thames Water have no objections to the proposal with regards to water infrastructure capacity and have recommended an informative to be added to any planning permission granted.*
- A previous application was made to develop the basement of Cabrini House and that application was rejected. Despite this rejection, the basement was partitioned into flats and begin the necessary work to make this space habitable including cutting out window space and attaching drainage and pipes for waste removal - *the basement in question was regularised by retrospective planning permission 10/AP/2688 following enforcement investigation.*

In support

29. There used to be windows and residents living in the existing basement under the existing Cabrini House over 120 years old.

Thames Water

30. No objection but recommended that an informative in relation to water pressure be attached to the planning permission.

Transport Planning

31. No objection subject to provision of 1 disabled off-street parking space on the site as per the previously approved application.

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

32. The layout of flat 2 has been altered by reducing the bedrooms from two to one. The bedroom of flat 2 would have two new windows.
33. The daylight / sunlight report assessed the original scheme with flat 2 having two bedrooms.

Daylight

34. The daylight / sunlight report concludes that in terms of daylight all habitable rooms of the 3 flats would achieve or receive in excess of the minimum average daylight factor values prescribed for the associated room uses by the BRE Guidelines and the British Standards. All habitable rooms within the proposed development will therefore achieve very good levels of natural daylight.

#### Sunlight

35. The daylight / sunlight report concludes that in terms of sunlight at least one room within two of the three flats will receive very good levels of direct sunlight throughout the year.
36. Flat 2 would receive the least sunlight but it is considered that the revised layout with one larger bedroom with two windows would improve the level of daylight.
37. It is also acknowledged that despite the low level of sunlight to future occupiers of flat 2 they would benefit from large north facing bi-folding doors to the open plan living/dining/kitchen opening into an existing terrace. Future occupiers of Flat 2 would also benefit from the relatively open aspect to the north towards a stepped communal garden which is approximately 0.5m above the terrace along the north elevation.
38. The design and access statement states that the headroom in the basement varies between 2.4m and 2.47m. This height provides acceptable headroom for the scheme.
39. Internally, all 3 flats would have individual rooms and an overall unit size above the standards of the Supplementary Planning Document: 2015 Technical update to the Residential Design Standards.
40. The terrace to the rear of the north elevation currently forms part of the communal amenity area. It is considered that the proposal to divide this terrace to provide private amenity space for flats 1 and 3 is acceptable.
41. Whilst this would lead to a loss of communal amenity space it is considered that the raised communal area to the north would provide adequate amenity space for all 17 flats.

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

42. The future occupiers of flats 2 and 3 could suffer from a loss of privacy through overlooking from the raised communal amenity area to the north, especially when the bi-folding doors to the north elevation are open. However, the level of overlooking of these areas are no different from that experienced by occupiers of the flat at the lower level of the Coach House located to the north west.
43. The properties in the immediate vicinity, bar the school and the nursery to the south east, are in residential use. Cabrini House has been occupied for at least eight years without any known detrimental impact on occupiers from nearby uses. There is no reason to believe that nearby uses would have a detrimental impact on the occupiers and users of the flats.

#### **Transport issues**

44. The site is not within a CPZ and there no other on-street parking restrictions.
45. Historically, a total of 19 off-street car parking spaces have been approved of which 3 should be reserved for visitors and 1 for disabled parking. This includes a turning area

for vehicles to the east of parking spaces 18 and 19.

46. The submitted (surveyed) site layout plan shows 20 car parking spaces - this area is already tarmac and in practice can already be utilised as a car parking space. Policy does not require any more off street car parking spaces but given that the proposed car parking space already exist no concerns are raised in this regard. The proposed plan does show 1 disabled space which is acceptable.
47. The provision of 6 new off-street cycle spaces are acceptable.

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

48. Cabrini House is an undesignated heritage asset of local interest because of its location within the Honor Oak Conservation Area. Applications for listed building consent are only required for statutory listed buildings.
49. The appearance of the new lightwells and associated glass screens and new bi-folding doors to the north elevation are minor additions to this 3 storey building and would not detract from its character and appearance as an undesignated heritage asset nor the appearance or character of the wider conservation area.

#### **Impact on trees**

50. None identified.

#### **Other matters**

##### Affordable housing:

51. In 2005 planning permission was granted for planning application reference number 03/AP/2209 for the 'Erection of a three storey extension to the side of the main building, and part one storey/part two storey extensions above the existing ground floor at the rear of the building, and the conversion of the enlarged building to form 19 self-contained flats, with the creation of 18 off-street parking spaces at the front of the building'.
52. The permission was subject to the completion of a legal agreement which was concluded on the 1 March 2005. The agreement was entered into by the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart as the Sacred Heart Convent were the applicants for planning permission. The agreement provided for affordable housing in that 5 of the one bed units in the new development were to be 'provided on a rental/shared ownership basis under the control of a Registered Social Landlord'.
53. A month later, in April 2005, Gillcrest Homes Limited, the new owners of the site, had submitted a fresh application for 'Erection of a three storey extension to the side and a two storey extension above the existing ground floor to rear of the main building and the demolition of a two storey building and replacement with a new two storey building to the rear of the site; conversion of enlarged modified buildings from bedsit accommodation and one self-contained maisonette into 12 x two bed and 2 x three bedroom flats with associated parking' This application was refused but Gillcrest Homes Ltd appealed and the appeal was allowed on 15 May 2006.
54. One of the principal issues in the appeal centred on whether the scheme was deficient in terms of its failure to provide a measure of affordable housing. The appellants argued that the development permitted in March 2005 for 19 self contained flats was not viable. The council argued that the extant planning permission for 19

units was a clear indication that the site was capable of accommodating more than the (then) threshold figure of 15 units for the provision of affordable housing.

55. The Inspector examined all the policy support for affordable housing which existed at the time and all of which has now been replaced. He considered whether there were any cogent reasons for departing from the policy requirement and considered that there were and these included the following;

a) The wording of the council's policy H.1.4 in the Unitary Development Plan at the time allowed for the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing having regard to all the circumstances and any compelling reasons for not providing affordable housing. The Inspector found that the wording of the policy therefore allowed for flexibility in its application.

b) A topic paper dated April to July 2005 submitted by the council in the appeal reflected guidance in a Circular in operation at the time (6/98) which recognised the need in individual cases to decide whether there are any particular costs associated with site development and whether the provision of affordable housing would prejudice any other planning objectives of importance in the local area. The circular also emphasised the need to secure an appropriate housing development, including a mix of housing suitable for families and smaller households.

c) The Inspector favoured the arguments put forward by the appellant on the basis that Cabrini House was in a run down and neglected condition and 'the costs associated with its conversion are likely to have a material impact upon the viability of the scheme'. He also considered that the redevelopment of the site would bring about considerable benefits to the appearance of the conservation area and would provide a wider mix of housing types (more in line with council policy) than the March 2005 development.

d) With regard to the 14 unit scheme, the Inspector did not accept that the individual units had been artificially increased in size in order to reduce the number of units below the affordable housing threshold.

e) The appellant had provided evidence on viability of the March 2005 development which the Inspector noted was not challenged by Southwark as the local planning authority and which related to amongst other factors, the costs of conversion, the loss of the five units to be transferred to a Registered Social Landlord and the poor layout of the individual units. He accepted that the earlier scheme for 19 units 'may well prove unviable'.

f) The Inspector noted that no detailed viability study had been undertaken of the proposals for 14 units but concluded that 'it seems to me that the changes to the layout of the units and the larger element of new build are likely to increase the chances of this scheme proceeding on the basis that no element of affordable housing is provided'.

56. Although the original 19 unit scheme brought forward by the Sacred Heart Convent in 2005 provided for 5 of the units to be affordable housing, this permission was not implemented and Gillcrest Homes Ltd as new owners of the site, brought forward a revised scheme for fewer units - 12 x two bed and 2 x three bedroom flats. The council refused this application and considered that the proposal should support affordable housing but the Inspector did not agree and allowed the appeal, granting permission for the development in 2006. Having considered the policy framework which existed at the time, the Inspector accepted Gillcrest's argument that the original scheme was not viable. He also concluded that the affordable housing policies allowed for sufficient flexibility in their application to allow considerations such as the

costs associated with site development along with the importance of planning objectives such as the need to enhance the appearance of the conservation area and the provision of a better housing mix, which suited the needs of families and smaller households, to outweigh the provision of affordable housing, despite the undoubted need for such housing in the locality.

57. An issue of contention at committee on 28 November was that the consented scheme from 2006 was not built out in compliance with approved plans in terms of the basement under construction and was subject to enforcement action. Retrospective permission was granted in April 2012 to vary the approved scheme.

58. The current policy framework includes the Affordable Housing SPD from 2008 and the draft Affordable Housing SPD from April 2011. Both SPDs contain guidance on cases where there may be underdevelopment, partial development, additional and phased development including proposals that are deliberately designed to avoid the affordable housing threshold, which is now 10 units. Cabrini House already has permission dating from 2006 for 14 units which was adjudged on appeal not to attract affordable housing requirements. Even if the local planning authority were minded to consider the application of the guidance in the draft Affordable Housing SPD in relation to 'sites that are partially developed' the policy states as follows;

"We will look at whether an application is an extension to a building which has an existing planning permission (this may be completed, under construction or yet to begin construction) to see whether it should be more properly considered to be part of a single development. We will take into account:

- The timing between the previous planning permission and the new planning application and the extent to which the previous permission has been implemented
- Whether the fresh application is linked to the previous application. This may include ownership, shared access or shared buildings, level of occupation and other relevant considerations."

59. It is clear that, as a decade has now elapsed since the 2006 scheme was consented on appeal, it is not open to the local planning authority to conclude that the 14 unit scheme and the three unit basement conversion can be properly considered to be part of a single development for the purposes of assessment for affordable housing. In addition, and for the sake of completeness, with regard to the second limb of the test and the link to previous applications, the planning agent, Gillcrest Group, has pointed out that the applicants in the present case are Malonne Ltd and the owners of the site are Cabrini London Ltd.

60. This advice is supported by the decision of the Planning Inspectorate at another site from October 2014. Here, the appeal considered whether two adjoining sites, the larger one of which had been developed and completed before the other, smaller appeal site could be considered together for the purposes of affordable housing. The Inspector concluded that the sites could not be considered as linked although they would effectively be developed by the same company. The Inspector noted that the larger site had been granted consent three years earlier in 2011 and that it was now completed and the dwellings sold. She concluded that, even if there were an appropriate retrospective requirement which could be accurately identified, this would not be practical as the cumulative contribution relating to the earlier site would have a disproportionate impact on the viability of the latter.

#### Refuse storage

61. The refuse store to the south of the vehicular entrance is currently used to store large wheelie bins and it is considered that there is adequate space within it for an

additional large wheelie bin.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy

62. None payable as the existing basement provides ancillary storage to the existing flats on site.

#### **Conclusion on planning issues**

63. The flats would provide a good standard of accommodation and would not impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. For the reasons set out above, the application is recommended for approval.

#### **Community impact statement**

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

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

b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as: none.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above. Specific actions to ameliorate these implications are: none.

#### **Consultations**

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

#### **Consultation replies**

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

#### **Human rights implications**

67. 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.

68. This application has the legitimate aim of providing 3 new 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/2341-G Application file: 16/AP/2259 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 5457 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>	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
<b>Report Author</b>	Andre Verster, Team Leader	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	10 November 2016	
<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 Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		11 January 2017

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

**Site notice date:** 12/08/2016

**Press notice date:** 14/07/2016

**Case officer site visit date:** 12/08/2016

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 07/07/2016

**Internal services consulted:**

n/a

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

Thames Water - Development Planning

**Neighbour and local groups consulted:**

Flat 10 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	Flat 7 Cabrini House SE23 3QY
Flat 11 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	Flat 4 Cabrini House SE23 3QY
Flat 8 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	Flat 5 Cabrini House SE23 3QY
Flat 9 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	40 Barry Road London SE22 4HU
Flat 12 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	Bakery Cottage Eastcombe GL6 7ED
1 Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3QY	Bywood 30 Brackendale Close GU15 1HP
3 Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3QY	38 Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3RA
161 Forest Hill Road London SE23 3QU	Alpha House Laser Quay Business Park ME2 4HU
163 Forest Hill Road London SE23 3QU	16a Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3QY
Flat 1 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	30 Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3RA
Flat 2 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	Flat 8 Cabrini House SE23 3QY
Flat 1 Coach House SE23 3QY	13 Honor Oak Rise London Se233qy
Flat 2 Coach House SE23 3QY	5 Honor Oak Rise London SE233QY
Flat 3 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	School House Honor Oak Rise SE23 0HU
Flat 6 Cabrini House SE23 3QY	

**Re-consultation:** n/a

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

None

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Thames Water - Development Planning

#### Neighbours and local groups

Alpha House Laser Quay Business Park ME2 4HU  
Bakery Cottage Eastcombe GL6 7ED  
Bywood 30 Brackendale Close GU15 1HP  
Flat 1 Cabrini House SE23 3QY  
Flat 1 Coach House SE23 3QY  
Flat 10 Cabrini House SE23 3QY  
Flat 2 Coach House SE23 3QY  
Flat 5 Cabrini House SE23 3QY  
Flat 8 Cabrini House SE23 3QY  
Flat 9 Cabrini House SE23 3QY  
School House Honor Oak Rise SE23 0HU  
13 Honor Oak Rise London Se233qy  
16a Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3QY  
30 Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3RA  
38 Honor Oak Rise London SE23 3RA  
40 Barry Road London SE22 4HU  
40 Barry Road London SE22 4HU  
5 Honor Oak Rise London SE233QY