

Item No. 7.2	Classification: Open	Date: 24 January 2017	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee A
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 16/AP/3090 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 256-260 WATERLOO ROAD, LONDON SE1 8RF Proposal: Construction of a top floor extension to create residential accommodation (1x one bedroom and 1x two bedroom flats)		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Director of Planning		
Application Start Date 04/08/2016		Application Expiry Date 29/09/2016	
Earliest Decision Date 03/09/2016			

RECOMMENDATION

1. That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

2. The application relates to a five-storey building fronting Waterloo Road with office use at ground (and lower ground) floor and residential accommodation on the upper four floors. The building comprises the original three-storey element that was constructed in the 1920s with a contemporary two-storey extension since added. The building is abutted directly by a six-storey building at 250 Waterloo Road to the west and seven-storey building at 262-264 Waterloo Road to the east. Dodson Street is immediately to the south, with housing including Jurston Court and Guthrie Court further south.
3. The site is located within the Central Activities Zone, Bankside and Borough District Town Centre, Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area and in the council's Air Quality Management Area. The building in question is not located within a conservation area nor is it listed, though Mawdley House (opposite) is Grade II listed.

Details of proposal

4. It is proposed to add a single storey extension to the roof of the existing building to create 2 additional flats: a two-bedroom four-person and a one-bedroom two-person flat. It is also proposed to introduce a colonnade constructed in reconstituted stone and with a feature glass brick detail at third and fourth floor level, sitting in front of the existing duplex flats. It is also proposed to create a communal storage area at 5th floor level, with plans suggesting that this could provide bespoke cycle storage.
5. **Planning history**

15/AP/3412 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Installation of air cooled heat pump condensing units in recessed front lightwell
--

<p>Decision date 29/10/2015 Decision: Granted (GRA)</p>
<p>12/AP/3760 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) A 5th floor roof extension to form a new 2-bedroom flat. Decision date 01/02/2013; Decision: Refused (REF)</p> <p>Reason(s) for refusal:</p> <p><i>The proposed extension would adversely affect the proportions and architectural character of the building, and appear as an incongruous feature which damages the overall character and appearance of the building and visual amenities of the surrounding area. As such, the development is contrary to saved Policies 3.12 'Quality in Design' and 3.13 'Urban Design' of the Southwark Plan (2007), Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation of the Core Strategy (2011) and Sections 7 'Requiring good design and 12 'Conservation of the historic environment' of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).</i></p> <p>Appeal decision date: 07/01/2014; Appeal decision: Planning appeal dismissed (DIS).</p> <p>Summary of decision: Inspector agreed that the additional storey would represent an incongruous addition to the building and dismissed the appeal on this basis. Whilst some impact on the nearby listed building was noted, this was not deemed sufficient to warrant refusal.</p>
<p>08/AP/1056 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Installation of three air conditioning condenser units on an external wall adjacent to a loading bay to the rear of the building. Decision date: 21/08/2008 Decision: Granted (GRA)</p>
<p>03/AP/2450 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Roof level extension to provide additional self-contained flat with roof terrace to the rear Decision date: February 2005; Decision: Refused (REF)</p> <p>Reason(s) for refusal:</p> <p><i>The proposed extension, which would be constructed on top of a previous two storey extension to the original building, would adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building, and appear as an incongruous feature which damages the overall character and appearance of the building. As such, the development is contrary to Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995, and Policies 3.11 'Quality in Design' and 3.13 'Urban Design' of the emerging Southwark Plan (revised draft deposit version) March 2004.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed roof extension would reduce the level of natural light reaching the flats immediately below, particularly Flat 13, adversely affecting the amenities of the residents of these flats, and additionally could compromise the privacy of occupiers of other flats in the block, contrary to Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995, and Policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' of the emerging Southwark Plan (revised draft deposit version) March 2004.</i></p> <p>Appeal decision date: November 2005; Appeal decision: Planning appeal dismissed (DIS)</p> <p>Summary of decision: Inspector found that the additional extension would create an awkward 'top-heavy' appearance that would damage the architectural character of the existing building. A potential loss of daylight/sunlight was acknowledged because of</p>

the impact on rooflights serving the existing top floor flats and whilst not deemed sufficient to warrant refusal in isolation, these impacts added weight to the principal design concerns.

16/EQ/0157 Application type: Pre-Application Enquiry (ENQ)
Erection of a top floor extension to create residential accommodation
Decision date 08/07/2016 Decision: Pre-application enquiry closed (EQC)

15/EQ/0293 Application type: Pre-Application Enquiry (ENQ)
Erection of a top floor extension to create residential accommodation
Decision date 20/01/2016 Decision: Pre-application enquiry closed (EQC)

Planning history of adjoining sites

250 Waterloo Road

6. **12/AP/2940** - Erection of five storey infill extension to rear of building fronting Webber Row and Dodson Street, five-storey extension over existing service yard adjoining 252-260 Waterloo Road, extension to fifth floor and erection of new sixth floor, extension with forward projection at 1st to 4th floors to front elevation with re-modelled elevations, and change of use at 4th and 5th floors from office (Use Class B1) to residential (Use Class C3) to create 8 residential units (5 x two bedroom and 3 x three bedroom) on 4th - 6th floors and additional office space.
Granted – March 2013.
7. **15/AP/1913** - Minor material amendments sought to the above planning permission to amend internal residential layouts and to introduce a small off-street car park beneath a new mezzanine level.
Refused - June 2015; Reason: Insufficient justification for car parking in an area with excellent public transport accessibility
8. **15/AP/2320** - Minor material amendments sought to the above planning permission to amend internal layouts and elevational treatments.
Granted - August 2015

262-264 Waterloo Road

9. **00/AP/0817** - Erection of six-storey building, use of ground floor as offices and provision of 6 car parking spaces and storage facilities ;use of front part of 1st floor for offices and rear part as 1x2bed;and provision of 10x2 bed flats on 2nd to 6th floors
Granted with Legal Agreement, October 2000
10. **01/AP/0876** - Construction of 8th storey to form a two-bedroom flat
Granted, November 2001

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

11. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a. The principle of development and conformity with land use policies;
 - b. Design considerations, including the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings;
 - c. Quality of accommodation provided;
 - d. Impact(s) of the amenity of neighbours and that of the wider area, particularly

- daylight impacts;
- e. Transport and traffic impacts;
- f. Any other material considerations.

Planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

12. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the government's strategy for the delivery of sustainable development. The guidance it contains is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The following is of greatest relevance to this proposal:

Chapter 2 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Chapter 7 - Requiring good design

13. On 19 March 2013, the council's cabinet considered whether Southwark's planning policies were consistent with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), as required by NPPF paragraph 215. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the council satisfied itself that those in use were in general conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Southwark Plan policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres), all local policies would be saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

14. The London Plan 2016

Policy 2.13 - Opportunity areas and intensification areas

Policy 2.15 - Town Centres

Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments

15. Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 5 - New Homes

Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation

16. Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

Policy 3.2 - Protection of amenity

Policy 3.12 - Quality in design

Policy 3.13 - Urban design

Policy 3.18 - Development affecting the setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites

Policy 4.6 - Quality of residential accommodation

Policy 5.2 - Transport impacts

Policy 5.3 - Walking and cycling

Supplementary planning guidance

17. Technical updated to the residential design standards SPD 2015

Summary of objections

18. 14 objections have been submitted in response to this application. The issues raised are that the proposed development would:

- Detract from the architectural integrity of the principal Waterloo Road frontage;
- Represent an incongruous and ill-conceived element in views from the Housing Estate to the south;
- Detract from the daylight and sunlight enjoyed by existing residents in the upper storey duplexes due to the construction of the colonnade and impacts on lightwells;
- Detract from the amenity of existing balconies/terraces due to enclosure and overshadowing;
- Reduce residential outlook from the single aspect upper storey duplexes;
- Increase transfer of noise between the proposed flats and existing;
- Create noise and disturbance during construction;
- A failure to overcome the issues highlighted by previous appeal decisions.

Principle of development

19. The site is located within an Opportunity Area and Town Centre, within which the provision of new residential units is an integral part of the vision for new development. Residential use is established as a lawful use at the application site. For these reasons, the principle of the use is acceptable, though the broader acceptability of the proposal is subject to consideration of the design impacts, impacts on the amenity currently enjoyed by neighbours and any other material considerations. These issues are explored below.

Environmental impact assessment

20. Not required for an application of this scale and nature.

Design issues

21. The application site has been subject to several refused applications and dismissed appeals in recent years and design issues have consistently been cited as the principal reason for the failure to achieve a successful planning permission.
22. Core Strategy policy 12 emphasises that the highest quality of design will be expected for all new development, whilst saved Southwark Plan policies 3.12 'Quality in design' and 3.13 'Urban design' articulate this more clearly with reference to a series of detailed design considerations.
23. The host building was originally a three storey commercial building, constructed in the 1920s with a classical architectural style. The building is red brick with a stone base, stone detailing and distinctive Crittall windows. The brick is articulated to give the impression of piers at regular intervals, providing a rhythm to the Waterloo Road frontage. A contemporary two storey extension comprising three duplex apartments has previously been added and though this element is designed to purposely contrast with the original building, it is recessive and subordinate to it. Previous refusals and appeal decisions have highlighted that further vertical extensions would unbalance the building, detracting from its original character and architectural integrity. The council has stressed through pre-application advice that the prominence of the original building must be retained and that the only opportunity for further units being delivered would be if a coherent, comprehensive and high quality design could be presented

that respected the architectural language of the original building.

24. The proposal would comprise a further storey that shares the alignment of the newer duplex units fronting Waterloo Road, but is set back from Dodson Street to the rear to allow for the creation of private terraces. The scale and massing of the extension is comparable to that of neighbouring buildings and the principal design concern is the impact on the architectural integrity of the host building and the consequent impact on the streetscene.
25. This extension would be clad in a similar material to the previous addition, but in an attempt to overcome past concerns about the perceived dominance of the modern additions, it is proposed to introduce a reconstituted stone colonnade that would sit in front of the existing third and fourth storeys, terminating just below the new extension. To address objections raised by existing residents that the new columns would adversely affect their daylight and outlook, it has been subsequently proposed that the centre of the individual piers within the colonnade will be constructed from a fully glazed brick.
26. Officers consider that from an urban design perspective, this design solution overcomes concerns aired in earlier applications and appeals. By virtue of its rhythm and use of reconstituted stone, officers are satisfied that the colonnade would read more clearly as an extension of the original building. As a result, the order of the building is skewed such that the original element remains of greatest prominence in views along Waterloo Road. Though the introduction of glazed brick is undoubtedly a modern intervention, as opposed to one that reflects the traditional character of the original building, it is nevertheless a high quality and distinctive material. Subject to suitable samples being presented in due course, officers are satisfied that the glazed brick has the ability to make a positive contribution to the overall appearance of a building that marries traditional and contemporary architecture.
27. The rear of the building is of lesser prominence in its immediate setting. From street level, the balustrade around the private terraces would be visible but the extension itself would be set-back from the existing building line. Though the elevated walkways and open spaces associated with the housing estate to the south would allow for longer views of the building, this extension will be read as one of a number of modern interventions along this line of buildings and officers would suggest that the impacts in this sense are afforded less material weight than those along Waterloo Road.

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

28. The Grade II listed Mawdley House is situated 25m north of the building in question. The addition of a single storey element to the host building - partly screened by a new colonnade - would not adversely affect the character or setting of the listed building.

Quality of accommodation

29. The overall size of both units would significantly exceed the nationally described Space Standards and individual room sizes would meet those specified in the council's residential design standards SPD. Both units have dual aspect and access to large private external terraces. The quality of accommodation would be high.

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

Impact on of daylight and sunlight for neighbours

30. A number of objections have focused on the potential impact of the development on levels of daylight received by existing properties, principally occupiers of the existing duplexes at 4th and 5th floor level.

Impacts on daylight received in duplex units at 256-260 Waterloo Road

31. A comprehensive analysis has been undertaken to consider the impacts on the daylight received at the three duplex apartments located in the existing rooftop extension. The vertical sky component (VSC) and No sky line (NSL) tests have both been completed to consider reductions in light falling on the plain of windows and within the affected habitable rooms. This accords with guidance drafted by the Building Research Establishment (BRE). The average daylight factor test has also been completed, but this test is less reliable where precise details concerning internal layout, decorative finish and glazing specification are unknown and so officers have afforded this information less weight.
32. The results of the vertical sky component test are as follows:

Apartment 13

	Current VSC	VSC After Extension	Level reduction	of Meets BRE?
LKD	33.80	27.60	-18.3%	Yes
Bed 1	36.80	29.50	-19.8%	Yes
Bed 2	36.80	27.50	-25.3%	Yes

Apartment 14

	Current VSC	VSC After Extension	Level reduction	of Meets BRE?
LKD	33.80	27.20	-19.5%	Yes
Bed 1	36.80	27.70	-24.7%	Yes
Bed 2	36.80	27.70	-24.7%	Yes

Apartment 15

	Current VSC	VSC After Extension	Level reduction	of Meets BRE?
LKD	33.10	27.10	-18.1%	Yes
Bed 1	36.40	27.70	-23.9%	Yes
Bed 2	34.10	27.10	-20.5%	Yes

33. The values recommended by the BRE are advisory and need to be interpreted carefully in an urban context, but they nevertheless provide the most robust way to assess impacts on daylight. The BRE guidance advises that an adverse impact may occur if a reduction in excess of 20% is experienced and the resulting VSC is less than 27%. In all cases here, the resulting VSC remains in excess of 27%, a level that is very good in an urban context.
34. An updated daylight assessment has been provided that also includes the no sky line/daylight distribution test, which considers the area of a room from which the sky is directly visible. This assessment concludes that the individual piers of the colonnade will lead to small areas of shadow immediately behind each pier, such that there is approximately a 2%-5% reduction in the amount of room from which the sky is visible.

The assessment has assumed that the piers are fully opaque obstructions rather than constructed from glazed brick, so this can be interpreted as a cautious outcome. This outcome is fully in accordance with the BRE recommendations.

35. Some objectors have also referred to the impact that the development would have on light from their rooflights. The lightwells serving the existing duplex units would effectively be extended vertically, becoming much deeper, as a result of the proposed development. These rooflights are secondary sources of light and directly serve a hall/stairway rather than a habitable room. The assessment presented suggests that the proposal would have a negligible impact on the amount of daylight that is delivered to the spaces below.
36. Overall, whilst the proposed extension and the introduction of a colonnade would have an effect on daylight for the dwellings below, the resulting levels of daylight would continue to exceed the levels recommended by the BRE. For a location within the Central Activity Zone, this represents a good level of daylight and officers are satisfied that the development would not unduly affect residential amenity in this regard.

Impact on daylight received by neighbours

37. Section drawings have been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will have a limited impact on the levels of daylight received in properties opposite the application site. Further testing in accordance with the BRE's recommended methodology confirms there would be no noticeable impacts at Mawdley House to the north or at 1-48 Dodson Street.
38. A further sunlight assessment was carried out for Mawdley House, since the proposed extension would be to the south of this building. This demonstrates that the 1st floor and 2nd floor residential units at Mawdley House would continue to achieve the annual and winter sunlight levels recommended by the BRE.

Impacts on outlook from neighbouring and existing properties

39. The residential design standards SPD recommends a separation distance across a highway of 12m as being sufficient to protect against overlooking and a loss of privacy. Buildings on the northern side of Waterloo Road are in excess of 20m away, so there is no concern in this regard. Residents in the existing building have raised concern about overlooking of their existing amenity spaces, but the proposed extension would give rise to a relationship between floors that is common across flatted developments. Officers do not consider that the additional roof terraces associated with the new units would detract from the amenity currently enjoyed by residents to the extent that there would be any material harm.

Noise

40. It is desirable for flats to be stacked in an arrangement to limit possible issues with noise transfer between floors, for example, bedrooms above bedrooms. This has not been possible in this instance because the existing top floor only includes bedrooms. For such cases, it is normally recommended that the sound insulation between the dwellings be installed to exceed the requirements in the Building Regulations; a condition to achieve this has been recommended.

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

41. The relationship with immediate neighbours is such that no adverse impacts are anticipated for occupiers of the proposed units.

Transport issues

42. The site benefits from excellent accessibility to public transport and the additional trip generation presented by two new residential units is considered negligible.
43. The applicant proposes changes to the internal layout and functioning of the bin store, including the introduction of a platform lift and installation of new doors to prevent odour being transferred into communal areas of the building. The mooted changes do not result in any external change (and do not require planning permission) but, should they improve the functioning of this space, can be supported.
44. The site is located within the Borough Controlled Parking Zone and in the interests of promoting sustainable transport a planning condition is proposed to stipulate that residents of the proposed units would be ineligible for residential parking permits.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement) and Community Infrastructure Levy

45. The scale of development is such that no planning obligations are required, but the additional residential floorspace triggers the need to pay both the Mayoral and Southwark Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
46. Mayoral CIL is charged in Southwark at a rate of £35 per square metre, whilst Southwark's CIL is charged at a rate of £200 per square metre for residential development in this location. Both charges are subject to indexation, but the required contributions are estimated as follows:

Mayoral CIL - £11,351
Southwark CIL - £55,635

47. The Localism Act 2011 sets out that any local financial considerations are material to the determination of planning applications, though the material weight to be attached is an issue for the decision taker to determine.

Sustainable development implications

48. None in addition to those referenced above.

Conclusion on planning issues

49. The proposal presents a coherent and well-considered architectural solution, allowing for the creation of the two new high quality residential units whilst maintaining the character and integrity of the original building. Though the introduction of the colonnade will interrupt views from the existing duplex units and lead to a minor loss in daylight received in these units, these impacts are considered to be relatively minor and not so significant that they would unduly reduce the amenity experienced in these residential units. It is considered that the proposal is consistent with development plan policies pertaining to impacts on amenity and urban design and, as such, it is recommended that planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

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

application process.

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

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

52. Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.
53. In addition, comments have been received from the council's design and conservation team and these are incorporated into the above policy assessment.

Human rights implications

54. 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.
55. This application has the legitimate aim of providing details of a proposed roof top extension to provide two residential units and external changes to the appearance of the existing building. 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/1241-A Application file: 16/AP/3090 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 1249 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Pre-application letter
Appendix 4	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
Report Author	Michael Glasgow, Team Leader	
Version	Final	
Dated	10 January 2017	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
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
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		11 January 2017

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 04/08/2016

Press notice date: 11/08/2016

Case officer site visit date: n/a

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 05/08/2016

Internal services consulted:

n/a

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

n/a

Neighbour and local groups consulted:

Flat 8 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Flat 9 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 9 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	256 Waterloo Road SE1 1AA
Flat 10 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	49 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 5 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	50 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 6 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Fourth Floor 246-250 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH
Flat 7 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Flat 12 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
258 Waterloo Road London SE1 8RG	Flat 15 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH
Flat 2 235 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	Flat 1 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 3 235 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	Flat 2 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 11 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Unit 1 262 Waterloo Road SE1 8RQ
Flat 12 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Unit 2 262 Waterloo Road SE1 8RQ
Flat 13 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Flat 6 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 4 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Flat 10 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 5 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	Flat 11 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 6 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	Flat 3 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 7 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	Flat 4 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 20 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	Flat 5 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH
Flat 3 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	51 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 4 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	Flat 12 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
231 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH	Flat 13 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 1 237 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	Flat 14 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 3 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	Flat 1 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate

Flat 8 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	SE1 8XQ
Flat 9 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ	Flat 10 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
223 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH	Flat 11 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 4 235 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	Flat 18 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Ground To Third Floors 246-250 Waterloo Road SE1 8RD	Flat 19 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 11 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	Flat 2 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 12 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	Flat 15 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 10 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	Flat 16 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 1 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	Flat 17 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ
Flat 2 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	Flat 1 235 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH
Flat 3 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	55 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 2 237 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	56 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 3 237 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	215 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 4 237 Waterloo Road SE1 8XH	52 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 7 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	53 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 8 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	54 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ
Flat 9 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	225 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 4 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	227-229 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 5 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	233 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 6 264 Waterloo Road SE1 8RP	217 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 14 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH	219 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 7 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH	221 Waterloo Road London SE1 8XH
Flat 8 Polychrome Court SE1 8XH	Flat 9 Mawdley House Webber Row Se1 8xq
	The Whitehouse Belvedere Road SE1 8GA
	260 Waterloo Rd Flat 8 SE1 8RH

Re-consultation: 18/10/2016

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

None

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

Neighbours and local groups

Flat 11 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 11 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 12 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 13 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 14 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 14 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 15 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 15 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 2 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ

Flat 3 Mawdley House Webber Row Estate SE1 8XQ

Flat 4 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 4 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 8 260 Waterloo Road SE1 8RH

Flat 9 Mawdley House Webber Row Se1 8xq

The Whitehouse Belvedere Road SE1 8GA

256 Waterloo Road SE1 1AA

256 Waterloo Road SE1 1AA

260 Waterloo Rd Flat 8 SE1 8RH

51 Dodson Street London SE1 7QJ