

FAO Alfie Williams  
The Planning Information Office  
3rd Floor Laurence House  
1 Catford Road  
Catford  
SE6 4RU  
UK  
[planning@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:planning@lewisham.gov.uk)  
[alfie.williams@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:alfie.williams@lewisham.gov.uk)

Provision of Comments regarding **the construction of an additional storey at roof level to provide 1 two bedroom self-contained flat at 88 Grove Street SE8 (former Princess of Wales PH) reference no. DC/20/119575**

**Dear Mr. Williams**

This letter is written to you on behalf of a number of impacted parties in response to your letter dated 12 January 2021 to provide comments in relation to the above planning application.

These parties (who have each reviewed and signed this letter) are leaseholders at 88 Grove Street, residents at 88 Grove Street, and neighbouring residents adjacent to the property on Grove Street and Barnes Terrace. This letter represents our shared concerns over the proposed development.

We would like to raise a number of points for consideration by the planning officers in making a decision regarding the application. These points represent objections to the appropriateness of the proposed development, on a number of grounds.

Change in circumstances since granting of previous planning application in May 2017 (application ref: DC/17/100234)

The planning statement submitted with the application seeks to re-secure consent for the previously granted planning application on the grounds that there are no changes in local circumstances, material considerations, and that the local authority planning documents remain the same as they were at the time of the granted application (namely the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011 ("CS") and the Development Management Plan 2014 ("DMP")).

We would contend that, actually, there are changes in both material considerations and local circumstances. The impact and relevance of these changes are referred to within the points raised in this letter.

- There has been an additional piece of relevant local authority planning guidance issued since the previously granted application (the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary planning document issued in April 2019 ("Alterations & Extensions")). s1.4.2 of this document specifically indicates the principles set out should be read by the council 'in determining planning applications and in upholding decisions at planning appeals', so this guidance would look to be relevant to this application.
- Planning permission has recently been granted, on 5 August 2020, for a three-storey extension to the side of the building at 88 Grove Street - application reference DC/19/112117 with subsequent amendments DC/20/118814 and DC/20/119571. Whilst this is a separate planning application, the fact that it relates to the same property and will have an impact on the property and its residents and neighbours means that the combined impact of this development and the proposed development should be considered when assessing this application.
- The property is very close to other proposed developments, most significantly at Convoys Wharf - further detail has become available since 2017 on how the immediately surrounding and wider neighbourhood will change as a result, and so they also represent relevant factors in considering this application.

- The increase in 'home working' as a result of the COVID pandemic (expected to continue into the future) and the consequent increase in the amount of time existing residents at the property will be spending at home and using the shared areas of the property during working hours.

Therefore, whilst the planning statement rightly indicates that 'consistency in decision-making' must be upheld, there are sufficient differences with regard to local authority guidance and current circumstances that this present application should be considered on its own merits, rather than on the basis of the previous application of approximately four years ago.

Our objections to the proposed development are set out as follows, numbered 1 to 5:

### **1. Damage to non-designated heritage asset (the host building at 88 Grove Street), and non-compliance with urban design and local planning guidance**

The building at 88 Grove Street is a strikingly attractive late-Victorian public house building, and is regarded as a non-designated heritage asset - 'a building of townscape merit identified by the Council for its contribution to the borough's local character and distinctiveness'. Records confirm that the public house is even older, with landlord records dating back to 1823. It is also situated in a historically significant location, and an Area of Archaeological Priority (The Strand, Sayes Court and The Royal Naval Dockyard), and is the subject of frequent tourism circuits through the neighbourhood as a heritage resource. It occupies a prominent street position on the corner of Grove Street and Barnes Terrace, with a high gable of the former 'Princess of Wales' public house and a clear line of sight down the street in both directions, and contributes to the borough's distinctness and character as the only building of its kind in the immediately surrounding area.

A number of specific planning policies must be considered when assessing any proposed developments to modify such assets, and these accordingly need to be considered in relation to the property at 88 Grove Street:

- The **Alterations & Extensions** guidance (which we understand to be providing direction in ensuring adherence to the DMP and CSO policies) contains a section specifically on roof extensions. **S5.14** sets out the options available for the construction of an additional storey - the proposed approach appears to be the first approach, that of a lightweight subservient extension set back from all sides. The guidance requires that the style must 'complement the appearance of the existing building'. **S2.4** requires that proposals relating to heritage assets must be 'in keeping with the scale, mass and detailing of the area, including the use of sympathetic materials'.
- **DM37** of the DMP applies to such buildings, and 'seeks to ensure the value of the borough's non-designated assets are protected so they may continue to contribute to the richness of the borough's historic environment'.
- **DM30** of the DMP on Urban Design and Local Character requires proposed designed to give adequate consideration to its aims to 'create / preserve urban forms which contribute to local distinctiveness', including 'building features and uses, and roofscapes' and 'how the scheme relates to the scale and alignment of the existing street including its building frontages'. This policy also requires developments to reflect the context of the existing development and their 'degree of ornamentation', specifically by using 'high quality matching or complementary materials'.
- **DM31** of the DMP specifies that, where the rooflines of buildings are exposed to long views from public spaces, 'a roof extension in any form that would have an obtrusive impact on that view will not be permitted'. As a prominent building in a corner location with clear views from the public right of way in both directions and from the western side of Sayes Court Park, this consideration would look to apply to the building.
- **CSO10** and **CSO15** of the CS requires that new alterations are 'sensitive and appropriate to their context', and must 'conserve or enhance the borough's heritage assets and the significance of their settings'.

The proposed development is not in accordance with these policies for several reasons:

- **DM37** - the development does not sustain or enhance the significance of the building or its historical environment (general principle 1), and there has been no real consideration of the heritage of the building provided in the application, and no heritage statement submitted with the application (principle 2).

- **DM30** - the development would detract from the architectural detailing and embellished 'ornamentation' on the building frontage which gives the building its character - the proposal does not include any detail on how such stylings are to be included on an additional storey and in any case it would be very difficult to replicate in an authentic manner. The materials specified in the application are such that they would not match the external appearance of the original Victorian building.
- **Alterations & Extensions** - an additional storey would also not be in keeping with the 'mass and scale' and the alignment of the existing building since the application plans show it to be a different in-storey height from the existing storeys in the property and the proposed aspects do not align with the window placement and spacings at the front of the property. For these reasons and those in the point above, the development cannot be said to complement the existing building appearance.
- **DM31** - the development would have an 'obtrusive' impact on views of the existing original building since an additional storey would be very clearly visible and noticeable directly above the existing striking frontage and gable with the old public house name - this is one of the main features which gives the building its distinctiveness. This would be the case for people approaching the building from either direction on Grove Street, and the view from the western side of Sayes Court Park to the south.
- **CSO10 and CSO15** - similarly as for DM37, the adding of an additional does not conserve or enhance the significance or setting of the building. The setting of the building on a street corner makes it particularly prominent as a reminder of the type of public house that was typical of historic Deptford, and an additional storey of a different architectural style would be out of character with this heritage.

We therefore believe that this development would amount to 'harming the physical significance and local distinctiveness of the building' (DMP s2.290) and go against the overall instruction in the Alterations & Extensions guidance that 'the architectural integrity of a building must not be harmed' (**S5.1.4**).

A number of previous planning applications made in relation to the building (decision notice refs DC/16/097961 and DC/17/100229) were refused on the basis that the proposed developments were in breach of the same guidelines in **DM37, DM30, DM31** and **CSO15**. The reasons for the refusal were that the proposed development was 'completely out of character with the design of the host building' and would represent an 'overdominant and visually obtrusive feature in the street scene'. Whilst these were separate applications for an extension on the side (rather than on the roof) of the building, they were specifically made in relation to the proposed roof of the extension in the relevant applications, and we believe that these previous objections are similar to some of our objections to this planning application.

## 2. Issues with the specific extensions proposed

- **Height - s5.1.4** of the alterations & extensions guidance stipulates several 'fundamental principles which must be followed in all cases'. One of these is that 'it will generally not be acceptable for the extension to be higher than the existing ridge height'. The proposed development has a roof height of 15.8m, per 'Topo Proposed 952415'. While this is the same height as the existing roof entry hatch at the far rear of the roof, it is significantly higher than the existing ridge wall of 14.7m (and maximum height of 15.1m at the raised gable) encircling the front and both sides - the street facing sides - of the property. **DM31** of the DMP makes this same point, that extensions will 'generally not be permitted where any part is higher than the height of the ridge on the main roof'.

**Structural Integrity** - The host building 88 Grove Street is very old, and its internal plumbing / utilities systems, which are shared by all six existing flats in the building, were built for less pressure and use than for the six households utilising them now, and have had many years of continuous use. **S15.5** of the Alterations & Extensions requires that modern service equipment, ducts/pipes and any ventilation equipment should ideally be 'accommodated internally' so as to not detract from the building's appearance - this would presumably mean the proposed additional flat would need to share the existing building infrastructure. An additional flat making use of the shared water, energy and drainage systems would undoubtedly put more pressure on these systems, which were not designed with an additional household in mind.

There have been a number of specific issues noted by residents in relation to the building's structural strength.

- There have been periodic flooding and water/waste system problems over the last few years, in the basement level of the property in Flats A and B, and this is in part due to blockages and issues with the piping arising from the increased use of these systems since the building was converted into flats in 2006.
- The ceiling / roof directly above Flats D and F (on the third storey of the property) is uneven due to the fact that the roof level is stepped down from front to rear. This is also the case at ground level, with an uneven floor below Flat B. The construction of an additional flat above may cause weight distribution problems, therefore putting additional pressure on the already uneven existing ceilings and building structure.

**Practical Concerns** - the existing six flats in the building use electricity and gas meters, with one meter box per household. Whilst the gas meters are in the shared communal courtyard and there is space for another, the electricity meters are located in the basement of the property within a very small space in cramped conditions. It is at best doubtful whether an additional electricity meter could be accommodated in the same way.

### 3. Issues over quality of the proposed additional flat

- **Inaccessibility** - The submitted sustainability monitoring form indicates the additional flat will be a wheelchair-accessible unit (Q2). The proposed development will be accessed 'via the existing common staircase' within the property, and by ascending three flights of stairs - there is no lift or ramp in the property at present, and the structure of the building and size of the stairwell is such that it would be impossible for either a lift or ramp to be installed. Furthermore, the staircase is narrow and the part of the staircase leading to the roof is even narrower. It is difficult to see how this flat could possibly be wheelchair-accessible. The flat could not meet the 'functional requirements' of such future residents, as required by **DM32** of the DMP or the 'accessibility and inclusiveness' aim of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2026 (**s4.9** of the CS).
- **Height - DM32** of the DMP requires a minimum floor height of 2.5m between finished floor level and finished ceiling level for all habitable rooms to comply with residential quality and amenity standards. This requirement is not met for any of the internal space in the new development. Per plan 'TOPO Proposed 952415', the existing roof height is at 13.6/13.7m and the roof of the proposed development at its highest point is 15.8m, so the room height provided is only 2.1m/2.2m across the whole flat. Given the alterations & extensions guidance referred to previously effectively restricts the height of any additional storey to 15.8m (at most), it would not appear to be possible for any storey to be constructed on the roof which would comply with the minimum floor height requirement. Additionally, the fact that the proposed floor plan provides only marginally above the minimum required sqm (63 sqm for a 2b3p household against a minimum of 61 sqm per **DM32** of the DMP) would result overall in a rather confined environment for the residents.
- **Aspect - DM32** of the DMP requires provision of a 'satisfactory level of outlook and natural lighting' with the main habitable rooms receiving daylight and sunlight. The aspect of the rooms in the proposed development would look directly into the back of the ridge wall surrounding the current property roof, which rises 1.0m/1.4m from the existing roof level up to two thirds of the proposed room height. Whilst the rooms do receive direct sunlight, this hardly constitutes a 'satisfactory' outlook.
- **Private outdoor space - DM31** of the DMP indicates that residential extensions should retain 'an accessible and usable private garden'. **DM33** of the DMP goes further and requires that new developments 'be provided with a readily accessible, secure, private and usable external space and include space suitable for children's play.' In this case, there is no possibility of private outdoor space - there is a courtyard at ground level, but this would be shared with the other six households in the building, so is not private. This courtyard is also four storeys down from the roof level and so it is difficult to describe as 'accessible'. The lack of usable outdoor space would therefore seriously detract from the quality of accommodation.
- **Waste Facilities** - the sustainability monitoring form (Q12) indicates that a waste and recycling waste store is to be constructed in an external space, which the 'Topo Proposed 952415' plan indicates is in a refuse

/ recycling bin store situated on Grove Street to the front of the property. Since the residents in the additional flat would access the flat via the existing staircase to the rear of the property, they would then need to go through the existing shared courtyard at the side and all the way around and past the front of the property to access this facility - such an arrangement is highly impractical for the residents. (NB it is noted that the previously approved application for a three-storey extension adjacent to the property includes plans for waste facilities for those flats to be accommodated in/just outside the shared outdoor courtyard, and it is possible that the details of the two applications have been muddled, given they were submitted by the same party. If this is the case, there are also issues arising from use of the courtyard for waste facilities for the proposed additional flat - these are covered in the section below).

#### **4. Impact on current residents of 88 Grove Street (also considering combined impact with planned three-storey extension to the side of the property)**

- **Extended Disruption and Home Working** - one of the impacts of the COVID pandemic on the current residents at the property is that a large proportion of the residents are currently working from home from the property full-time. Whilst it is uncertain when working arrangements will change, this is expected to be the case for a significant amount of time still, and, for many of the residents the pattern of home working is expected to continue after the pandemic. This is specifically the case for the residents of Flat B, Flat D, Flat E and Flat F. Any development work would be particularly disruptive for Flats D and F, which are located on the third storey of the property, immediately beneath where developments would occur for the proposed additional storey.  
The submitted application form indicates the proposed timeline Dec 2022 - January 2024 (section 10) for undertaking the development work - even assuming that there are no unexpected overruns, this represents a sustained period of disruption and noise pollution directly overhead, which will make it very difficult for existing residents to effectively work from home and enjoy their rights of residence free from undue interference. Additionally, whilst a timeline is not specified for the commencement of works on the already-approved three-storey extension adjacent to the property, this is required to commence by 5 August 2023 (approval notice DC/20/118814) at the latest. Approval for development to construct an additional storey would increase and likely extend the overall period of the disruption, particularly for residents of Flat D, who would possibly have development occurring above and adjacent to them at the same time.
- **Waste Management - CSP13** of the CS indicates that an aim of the borough council is to 'minimise the amount of waste generated'. The six existing flats make use of recycling bins and facilities located outside the communal courtyard. The provision of bins at present is inadequate and as a result the excess rubbish at the kerbside is unsightly to walkway users. The proposed waste facilities plan ('Topo Proposed 792272' document) for the adjacent three-storey development includes the provision of a 'sheltered and secure bin store' within the shared courtyard. This proposal is unlikely to be feasible due to refuse collectors being unable to enter the courtyard to collect the bins - alterations could be made to the surrounding wall to provide access for refuse collectors, or alternatively provision made for a caretaker to ensure the waste facilities are ready for weekly collection. The waste facilities were stored in the courtyard prior to approximately 2015, and the refuse built up to such an extent that rodent infestation occurred, after which residents agreed the best solution was for the waste bins to be stored outside the shared courtyard. In any case, the construction of an additional flat (possibly in addition to the two new flats on the adjacent development) would logically result in additional waste being produced on the site and the need for either additional household(s) using the already over-used facilities or the taking up of scarce outdoor space to accommodate additional waste facilities. This would look to be an unsatisfactory outcome.
- **Proposed Cycle Storage** - the sustainability monitoring form (Q14) indicates that eight cycling spaces are to be provided. The 'Topo Proposed 792272' document (submitted with the application for the adjacent development) shows the intended installation of the cycle rack. The existing cycle rack is fully used by the existing flats, and the installation of a larger cycle rack to accommodate more households would take up a significant amount of space in the shared courtyard - this is the only outdoor space available to the residents of each of the six existing households in the building and the expanded cycle rack would reduce the space available.

**Impact on Amenities of neighbouring properties - S3.5** of the Alterations & Extensions indicates that consideration needs to be given to any impact on the 'general amenities of adjoining properties'. The existing six households in the building at 88 Grove Street, while not resident in adjoining properties, currently share the 'general amenities' of the small back courtyard at 88 Grove Street, and **DM33** of the DMP only allows development where 'there is no loss of amenity to adjacent houses and gardens'. Aside from the points above relating to proposed waste and cycle facilities, an additional flat would mean there would be more households making use of the shared courtyard, increasing the congestion and demands on the space - in an environment in which increased numbers of people are working from home and using the communal space on a daily basis, this impacts enjoyment of the space such that the quality of the shared amenities are reduced for the existing residents.

**Overlooking - S3.39** of the Alterations & Extensions and **DMP31** of the DMP requires that the privacy of neighbours is to be respected, and that this includes both neighbouring properties and gardens. The guidance indicates 'there should not usually be any windows above ground floor on side walls directly facing a neighbour'. The proposed development, per 'Proposed Floor Plans 952416', includes a window looking east from the main kitchen / living area - this would look directly over the back gardens of the neighbouring properties at 1-5 Barnes Terrace and also (to a lesser extent) the private garden of Flat B at 88 Grove Street directly to the east of the building. The development would seem to be in breach of this guideline. Previous applications (again for previously proposed adjacent extensions rather than the construction of an additional storey at roof level) were rejected on the basis they had outlooks overlooking neighbours' residences to the east of the property (decision notice refs DC/16/097961 and DC/17/100229) and were also contrary to **DMP31**.

## 5. Impact on the surrounding area and users of public walkways and facilities

Additionally, there are a number of significant impacts on the users and residents of the area immediately surrounding 88 Grove Street resulting from the increased number of households using and residing at the property when the proposed development (if approved) and the already-approved adjacent development are completed.

- **Parking and Traffic** - The application form (section 13) does not provide for any additional parking spaces for any vehicles kept by the residents of the proposed additional flat. The street immediately outside the property (Grove Street) typically has vehicles parked on both sides of the road in both directions. **CSP14** of the CS indicates that parking should be managed to 'prevent parking demand being displaced from the development onto the street'. There will be additional need for the vehicle parking and road use as a result of the two developments, for which no plan has been proposed to prevent an increase in on-road congestion. Such vehicles and the moderately high level of traffic on the street represents a hazard for pedestrians, cyclists and particularly families with young children. The street is almost entirely residential with a large amount of high-density housing with families with children (specifically the Trinity Estate directly opposite) so this is a serious risk.
- **Public Transport and Public Walkway - CS09** Transport and Accessibility looks to provide for 'a system of walking and cycling routes' across the borough. **Spatial Policy 2** in the CS specifically seeks to 'improve connectivity throughout the area for pedestrians and cyclists' for the Deptford area of the borough. Grove Street is the direct walking route for the Thames Path walkway south of the river, and is also in a Public Transport Accessibility Level 2 area. The additional flats would together exacerbate congestion and vehicle encroachment on the public walkway, making the area less easily navigable for pedestrians and cyclists, so going against the council's stated aims.
- **Expected Population Growth and Developments in Evelyn Ward** - CS **s2.10** outlines the Council's expectation that there will be an increase in households and population specifically within Evelyn Ward, in which the building is situated. There are a number of developments in progress (since this expectation was made in 2011) which will increase the population pressure and usage of facilities in the specific area around Grove Street - the Timberyard development on Oxestalls Road and the enormous Convoys Wharf development are both within site of the building and will significantly increase the number of neighbouring households.

- **Adjacent Convoys Wharf Development and New Bus Routes** - the property is situated directly adjacent to the Convoys Wharf development on the Thames riverside, which will have a major and rejuvenating impact on the area. **S6.68** of the CS indicates that this area is 'safeguarded' and that any development on the site must be designed to 'minimise the potential for conflicts of use and disturbance'. Given its proximity to and the fact that the immediate area will be significantly impacted by the Convoys Wharf development, we would suggest that a similarly measured approach should be taken to any proposed development at 88 Grove Street. Additionally, the Convoys Wharf plans (from the Greater London Authority representation hearing report D&P/0051c/03) indicate a bus route is to be diverted along Grove Street and New King Street, and highway works are to be done on Prince Street and Grove Street to accommodate this. The increased pressure on Grove Street from the proposed developments at 88 Grove Street will make this public transport improvement more difficult to achieve.

### Stewardship of the Property

Whilst this section does not relate directly to this specific planning permission application, we would also like to express some views relating to the current freeholder's stewardship of the property since acquiring the freehold in 2002. We feel this is relevant when considering future development of the property under present ownership. There have been shortcomings in the freeholder fulfilling the duties of maintenance and due care over the property over this period, which have caused inconvenience and discomfort to various of the residents and neighbouring parties. As of 2019, the leaseholders of the property have set up a Right to Manage Company to direct and carry out any required maintenance on the property building itself.

Specific examples include:

- **Hazardous Outdoor Space** - The land adjacent to the property (on which site the three-storey extension is to be built) has been derelict over this period, and is part of the same freehold and therefore the same duty of care attaches as which applies to the building. This land has previously been occupied by rough travellers and has increasingly become a dumping ground for waste. The area is highly unsightly and represents visual pollution for the adjacent back gardens of 90 / 92 Grove Street and the private garden of Flat B to the rear of the property. The site also became, and is presently, occupied by rodents and urban foxes. This problem was particularly serious in previous years, and the freeholder only acted to address the rodent infestation problems after repeated requests from the residents of 92 Grove Street, who had suffered these creatures entering their private outdoor spaces directly from the derelict site, and also after this issue had spread to the internal building structure.
- **Adjoining Walls** - The adjoining wall between the derelict site and, respectively, the rear private outdoor space attached to Flat B and the open space to the front of the property, has been poorly maintained. Both walls have collapsed on multiple occasions, and the rear wall remained damaged and supported by wooden blocks for a significant period of time before being fully repaired. The front wall has been replaced with a number of wooden panels, which are vulnerable to high winds and have since collapsed on at least three occasions. This current structure represents poor workmanship and, besides being visually unappealing, poses a danger to residents since the front windows of Flat B are immediately adjacent to the structure and are therefore at risk if the structure collapses.
- **Basement Water Issues** - The flooding experienced by Flats A and B at basement level has previously been referred to. This was in part caused by deficient repairs carried out on damaged water pipes, which were patched up with rags / loose rubble materials and taped over - this kind of repair is entirely inappropriate for such an issue. There has additionally been a failure to install effective tanking in the basement level of the property, which has resulted in significant damp issues and damage for the residents of these two flats.

Additionally, the building at 88 Grove Street, since 2016, has been the subject of a constant series of planning permission applications (8 in total) followed by long periods of inactivity even after the approval of such applications.

Whilst the points above are not related specifically to this application, the combined impact of these instances has been to contribute to an unsettling and uncertain living environment for both the residents and leaseholders of the property. Further approval for development plans where there is no guarantee over whether, when, or with what degree of quality, these will be carried out will exacerbate this situation.

## **Conclusion**

We are of the shared view that, for all the reasons outlined above, the construction of an additional storey at 88 Grove Street would be inappropriate, and we respectfully suggest that the planning application be refused by the planning officers on all/some of these grounds.

We have invested not insignificant time and effort in collating the above information and comments, and we only ask that you take these into consideration in your deliberations.

Thank you for your time in considering this letter, and for providing the opportunity to provide comments on the current application.

Yours sincerely

The signatories (please find names and addresses below).

## **Signatories**

### ***Leaseholders at 88 Grove Street***

David Gape, Flat A and Flat D  
Zac Buchan, Flat B  
James Carr, Flat F

### ***Residents at 88 Grove Street***

Luke Ossai, Flat A  
Andrew Ossai, Flat A  
Marta Zdzieblo, Flat B  
Benjamin Smith, Flat B  
Tyler Parker, Flat D  
Ben Ngondo-Cooke, Flat E  
Tina Ngondo, Flat E  
Joseph Oastler, Flat E

### ***Neighbouring and other interested parties***

Chris Pool, 86 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
Neil Mulholland, 3 Barnes Terrace (SE83BD)  
Lisa Seymour, 90 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
Donna Millar, 92 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
J. Millar, 92 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
Naznin Islam, 94 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
Nadeem Islam, 94 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
Sadia Islan, 94 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
Bilal Mohamed, 96 Grove Street (SE83AA)  
K. Osman, 98 Grove Street (SE83AA)

Whilst the points above are not related specifically to this application, the combined impact of these instances has been to contribute to an unsettling and uncertain living environment for both the residents and leaseholders of the property. Further approval for development plans where there is no guarantee over whether, when, or with what degree of quality, these will be carried out will exacerbate this situation.

**Conclusion**

We are of the shared view that, for all the reasons outlined above, the construction of an additional storey at 88 Grove Street would be inappropriate, and we respectfully suggest that the planning application be refused by the planning officers on all/some of these grounds.

We have invested not insignificant time and effort in collating the above information and comments, and we only ask that you take these into consideration in your deliberations.

Thank you for your time in considering this letter, and for providing the opportunity to provide comments on the current application.

Yours sincerely

The signatories (please find names and addresses below).

**Signatories**

**Leaseholders at 88 Grove Street**

James Carr, Flat F *[Signature]*

David Gape, Flat A and Flat D

Zac Buchan *[Signature]*

**Residents at 88 Grove Street**

<i>Tyler Parker</i> Flat D	TINA NGONDO	<i>[Signature]</i> HAETH ZDZIEBLO
<i>IAYGONKO</i> FLAT E	BEN V. NGONDO-COOK	FLAT B
<i>[Signature]</i> FLAT E	JOSEPH T. CASTLER	<i>[Signature]</i> BENJAMIN SMITH
<i>[Signature]</i> FLAT E		FLAT B
<i>[Signature]</i> Flat 88A	LUKE HERR O'SCAI	<i>[Signature]</i> LUKE HERR O'SCAI
<i>[Signature]</i> Flat 88A	ANDREW O'SCAI	

**Neighbouring and other interested parties**

<i>[Signature]</i>	3 RIVERS TERRACE SE8 3BE	<i>[Signature]</i> NIGEL M. HOLLANDS
<i>[Signature]</i>	90 GROVE STREET, SE8 3AA	<i>[Signature]</i> C. SA SYMOND
<i>[Signature]</i>	92 GROVE ST SE8 3AA	
<i>[Signature]</i>	92 GROVE ST SE8 3AA	
<i>[Signature]</i>	94 GROVE ST SE8 3AM	- Nadeem Islam
<i>[Signature]</i>	94 GROVE ST SE8 3AA	- Nadeem Islam
<i>[Signature]</i>	94 GROVE ST SE8 3AA	- Sadia Islam
<i>[Signature]</i>	96 GROVE ST SE8 3AA	
<i>[Signature]</i>	98 GROVE ST SE8 1AA	<i>[Signature]</i> BILAL MOHAMMAD
		<i>[Signature]</i> K. OSMAN