



**Chief executive's department**  
 Planning division  
 Development management (5th floor - hub 2)  
 PO Box 64529  
 LONDON SE1P 5LX

Mr Ian Liptrot  
 DLA Architecture



**Your Ref:**

**Our Ref:** 16/EQ/0157

**Contact:** Wing Lau

**Telephone:** 020 7525 5729

**E-Mail:** [planning.applications@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:planning.applications@southwark.gov.uk)

**Web Site:** <http://www.southwark.gov.uk>

**Date:** 08/07/2016

Dear Mr Liptrot

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)**  
**PRE-APPLICATION ENQUIRY**

**At:** 256-260 WATERLOO ROAD, LONDON SE1 8RF

**Proposal:** Erection of a top floor extension to create residential accommodation

I write in connection with your pre-application enquiry received on 09/05/2016 regarding a scheme to redevelop the site above. This letter summarises the council's written advice on your proposal and whether, based on the details submitted, it meets local planning requirements

**Summary**

This pre-application follows a previous enquiry (our ref 15/EQ/0293). As previously noted, a number of unsuccessful planning applications have been submitted for roof top extensions to this property over the past fifteen years. The planning history for this site is therefore compelling insofar as establishing the principle of further extensions to the property would be very difficult to achieve given the inherent design challenges of adding an extension on top of an existing extension. The original building is an attractive and well detailed warehouse style building which contributes positively to the local townscape. The existing extension, comprising two storeys is in proportion with the scale of the original three storey building. Whilst the site is considered capable of accommodating an increase in height, a further extension is likely to unbalance the proportions of the building to an unacceptable degree.

The previous pre-application enquiry 15/EQ/0293 was submitted with 3 different options and the applicant has now further explored in detail Option 2, which was a roof top extension which seeks to integrate its external appearance with the existing extension by overlaying cladding onto the existing building creating a single flat and communal storage space. This pre-application advice letter will therefore deal mainly with how the proposal would have satisfied the design concerns.

**Planning Policy**

The statutory development plan for the borough comprises The London Plan consolidated with further alterations (March 2015); The Core Strategy (2011) and saved policies from the Southwark Plan (2007).

The site is located within the:

- Central Activities Zone/Urban Zone
- Air Quality Management Area
- Bankside and Borough District Town Centre
- Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area

The site is not within a conservation area, but the Grade II listed building Mawdley House, Webber Row is just opposite on the north side of the road.

## **Other key material considerations**

The National Planning Policy Framework

### **Land Use Principle**

Policy 3.11 of the Southwark Plan states that all developments should maximise the efficient use of land providing *inter alia* that the proposal responds positively to the local context and complies with all policies relating to design. Whilst additional residential accommodation in this location would make a more efficient use of the site, the planning history demonstrates that design has been the key consideration in all dismissed appeals. This is discussed below.

### **Design**

The subject building is a three storey warehouse building constructed in the first half of the twentieth century. The building was extended in 1998 which added an additional two storeys of residential accommodation in a contrasting appearance. The neighbouring building to the south (No. 262-264 Waterloo Road) is taller than the subject property and permission exists for the neighbouring property to the north (No. 250 Waterloo Road) to extend by an additional storey resulting in a building that would also be higher. Whilst noting that the permission at No. 250 Waterloo Road has not yet been implemented, it is considered that a taller building in this situation could be accommodated whilst relating in a satisfactory manner to both neighbouring properties and the wider townscape.

The key issue in the consideration of this proposal is the manner in which any additional extension to this building relates in visual terms to the current building (as extended).

In response to the previous pre-application comments, the applicant has now proposed to create a 'floating' colonnade at 3rd and 4th floor level, and which is in the same plane as the existing main elevation.

The revised design now has a more comfortable relationship by extending the existing facade upwards with a third floor facsimile of the existing ground floor facade, with the original parapet design shifted up one floor. This has the potential of providing a balanced facade with the original parapet design shifted up one floor. This provides a more balanced facade. This additional modern set back would now sit comfortably behind the taller parapet without the addition being top heavy.

The material palette proposed includes brick infill to prefabricated colonnade, aluminium framed windows, glazed cladding and prefabricated colonnade. The above is considered appropriate, but Officers advise that the prefabricated colonnade should ideally be reconstituted stone.

### **Housing Quality**

It appears that the proposed flats would have good quality of accommodation being dual aspect and of adequate size. Rooflights are proposed to allow for natural light.

### **Other matters**

It was noted in the previous pre-application advice that a planning application would need to be accompanied by additional information detailing how additional requirements for cycle and refuse storage would be provided in accordance with the development plan and guidance.

The applicant has submitted details of cycle parking and refuse storage.

The refuse store with a new platform lift internally appears to be acceptable. The applicant is now proposing that lockers are provided in the communal area on the new 5th floor. This is considered acceptable though it may be inconvenient due to the need to access the upper levels.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal is considered to be appropriate in land use terms. The proposed residential accommodation is considered to be of an acceptable standard for the reasons set out above. The revised design is now considered more acceptable provided it is executed in an excellent way and the materials are of high quality.

For the above reasons the proposal is worth submitting as a planning application in its current form.

This advice is given to assist you but is not a decision of the Council. Further issues may arise following a

formal planning application, where a site visit and public consultation and consultation with statutory consultees would be undertaken.

Please accept this letter as the closure of your current enquiry.

Yours sincerely

*Simon Bevan*  
Director of Planning